



The Role of General Principles of Good Governance (AUPB) in Administrative Court Dispute Resolution

Annura Nazwa MH^{1*}, Azmi Fauziah Suanda², Dewi Mayang³, Yoga Ammar Arifin⁴, Taufiq Alamsyah⁵

¹⁻⁵ Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Gunung Djati, Indonesia

email: annura.nazwa1@gmail.com¹

Article Info :

Received:
19-05-2026
Revised:
24-05-2026
Accepted:
14-06-2026

Abstract

This study examines the role of the General Principles of Good Governance (AUPB) in the resolution of administrative court disputes in Indonesia through a normative legal research approach based on statutory, conceptual, and case analyses. The research analyzes administrative court decisions issued between 2020 and 2023 together with relevant legislation governing administrative justice and government administration. The findings indicate that AUPB has evolved from a complementary interpretative standard into a substantive judicial benchmark for assessing the legality and legitimacy of administrative actions. Judicial application demonstrates that governance principles are utilized across diverse categories of disputes, including licensing, land administration, environmental governance, public information, taxation, procurement, and civil service matters, with varying review orientations reflecting the characteristics of each dispute. The study also reveals regional variations in judicial interpretation and application, producing differences in decision consistency, legal certainty, executorial effectiveness, and public trust. Despite these variations, explicit reliance on AUPB strengthens judicial reasoning, enhances administrative accountability, and promotes more responsive administrative justice. The research concludes that AUPB functions as a central normative instrument for improving adjudicative quality and reinforcing good governance within Indonesia's administrative law system.

Keywords : Administrative Justice, Administrative Court, Good Governance, Legal Certainty, State Administration.



©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 contemporary development of administrative law demonstrates a significant global shift from a purely legality based model of governance toward a governance paradigm that emphasizes accountability, transparency, procedural fairness, proportionality, and substantive justice as integral components of public decision making. Across both civil law and common law jurisdictions, courts increasingly rely on general principles of good governance as normative instruments to control administrative discretion and to ensure that governmental authority remains consistent with the rule of law and democratic legitimacy. Administrative adjudication is no longer confined to examining formal conformity with statutory provisions because modern governance challenges require judicial institutions to evaluate the quality, rationality, and fairness of administrative conduct itself. This transformation has elevated the role of general principles of good governance as a universal standard for reviewing public administration and resolving administrative disputes in diverse legal systems. Within this broader trajectory, the Indonesian administrative justice system has experienced substantial institutional and regulatory development through the strengthening of administrative courts and the expansion of legal mechanisms for reviewing governmental actions, particularly following the evolution of administrative law doctrine and procedural reforms embodied in state administrative adjudication frameworks and post administrative remedy dispute settlement mechanisms established by national legislation and judicial regulations (Wade & Forsyth, 2014; Craig, 2021; Republic of Indonesia, 1986; Republic of Indonesia, 2009; Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia, 2018; Setadi & Maulana, 2026).

Existing scholarship has consistently recognized that the General Principles of Good Governance serve not merely as ethical guidelines for public officials but also as enforceable legal standards capable

of shaping judicial reasoning and determining the legality of administrative decisions. Research has shown that principles such as legal certainty, carefulness, transparency, accountability, impartiality, and proportionality increasingly influence the review of governmental actions and contribute to the protection of citizens against arbitrary administrative conduct. Studies examining administrative governance in Indonesia indicate that the incorporation of these principles has strengthened administrative accountability and improved the quality of public policy implementation. Other studies focusing on sectoral governance have further demonstrated that the effectiveness of administrative law enforcement depends substantially on the extent to which good governance principles are internalized within decision making processes and judicial review mechanisms. At the same time, comparative analyses reveal that governance principles also function as important instruments for alternative dispute resolution and institutional oversight beyond conventional judicial forums, illustrating their expanding significance within contemporary governance structures (Rosidi et al., 2025; Setiawan, 2026; Tungga, 2025; Zulkarnain et al., 2024).

Despite these important contributions, the existing literature remains fragmented in both conceptual and empirical dimensions. A considerable proportion of previous studies has concentrated on normative discussions concerning the legal status of good governance principles or on isolated examinations of individual judicial decisions without systematically investigating patterns of judicial application across a broader range of administrative disputes. Research addressing the role of these principles in administrative adjudication frequently emphasizes doctrinal interpretation while paying limited attention to empirical variations in judicial practice, differences among administrative court jurisdictions, and the relative dominance of specific principles within particular categories of disputes. Case based analyses have generated valuable insights regarding the use of good governance principles in specific contexts such as land administration disputes, yet they have not adequately explained whether similar patterns emerge across different sectors of administrative litigation or whether judicial reliance on these principles exhibits regional variation. As a result, current knowledge remains insufficient for understanding the broader dynamics through which administrative courts operationalize good governance principles as instruments of judicial control over public administration (Wardi & Maskur, 2024; Rosidi et al., 2025; Tungga, 2025).

The persistence of these gaps generates significant scientific and practical concerns because administrative courts occupy a central position in safeguarding citizens from unlawful governmental actions while simultaneously maintaining the effectiveness and legitimacy of public administration. The absence of comprehensive empirical evidence regarding the actual application of good governance principles limits the ability of scholars to assess the consistency of administrative adjudication and restricts the capacity of policymakers and judicial institutions to formulate effective strategies for strengthening legal certainty and administrative accountability. Questions concerning which principles are most frequently invoked by judges, how their application differs across categories of administrative disputes, and whether regional variations affect the quality of judicial outcomes remain largely unresolved. These unresolved issues acquire greater urgency in the context of expanding governmental discretion and increasingly complex administrative functions where the legitimacy of public authority depends not only upon compliance with formal legal norms but also upon adherence to broader standards of good governance and procedural justice (Craig, 2021; Wade & Forsyth, 2014; Setadi & Maulana, 2026; Setiawan, 2026).

Within this scholarly landscape, the present study positions itself at the intersection of administrative law theory, judicial behavior analysis, and governance studies by moving beyond conventional normative discussions toward a systematic examination of judicial practice in administrative courts. Rather than treating the General Principles of Good Governance as abstract legal concepts, this research conceptualizes them as operational judicial standards whose effectiveness can be assessed through patterns of application in court decisions. The study specifically focuses on administrative court judgments issued between 2020 and 2023 in order to identify dominant governance principles, measure their frequency across different categories of disputes, examine regional variations in judicial application, and evaluate their implications for the effectiveness of administrative adjudication. Through this approach, the research seeks to bridge the disconnect between doctrinal administrative law scholarship and empirical analyses of judicial decision making while contributing a more comprehensive understanding of how governance principles function within the practical administration of justice.

This study aims to analyze the role of the General Principles of Good Governance in the resolution of administrative court disputes by examining the dominant patterns of judicial application, the frequency of application across dispute categories, regional variations among administrative courts, and the influence of these patterns on the effectiveness of judicial decisions during the 2020 to 2023 period. The research contributes theoretically by developing an integrated analytical framework that links governance principles, administrative legality, and judicial effectiveness within administrative adjudication. It contributes methodologically by employing a qualitative normative legal approach that combines statutory analysis, case examination, and comparative assessment of court decisions to generate a systematic understanding of judicial practice. The findings are expected to enrich contemporary administrative law scholarship while providing an evidence based foundation for improving consistency, accountability, and effectiveness in the adjudication of administrative disputes.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study employed a non empirical normative legal research design using a qualitative approach to examine the role of the General Principles of Good Governance in the resolution of administrative court disputes in Indonesia during the period from 2020 to 2023. The study relied exclusively on secondary legal materials consisting of administrative court decisions issued by State Administrative Courts, statutory regulations governing administrative justice and government administration, judicial procedural regulations, and leading scholarly works in administrative law. Primary legal sources included Law Number 5 of 1986 concerning the State Administrative Court, Law Number 51 of 2009, Law Number 30 of 2014 concerning Government Administration, and Supreme Court Regulation Number 6 of 2018. Secondary sources comprised authoritative doctrinal literature and academic analyses of administrative law and good governance principles. Data selection was conducted purposively based on relevance to the research objectives, particularly decisions that explicitly or implicitly applied the General Principles of Good Governance in judicial reasoning. The analytical framework combined statutory, conceptual, and case approaches to identify dominant governance principles, patterns of judicial application, variations across administrative court jurisdictions, and their implications for administrative adjudication effectiveness (Creswell & Creswell, 2018; Wade & Forsyth, 2014; Craig, 2021; Cane, 2011; Mashaw, 2018).

The analytical procedure was undertaken through systematic legal interpretation, classification of judicial decisions, comparative examination of case patterns, and qualitative content analysis of judicial reasoning. Court decisions were reviewed to identify references to specific governance principles, measure their frequency of application across categories of disputes, and evaluate variations in interpretation among administrative courts. The findings were then interpreted within the broader theoretical framework of administrative legality, reasoned decision making, and good governance to assess their contribution to judicial effectiveness and legal certainty. To ensure methodological rigor, the study applied source triangulation through the integration of legislation, judicial decisions, and scholarly literature, while analytical consistency was maintained through iterative comparison between legal norms and judicial practice. Since the research was based exclusively on publicly accessible legal documents and did not involve human participants, issues concerning informed consent and personal data protection were not applicable. Nevertheless, the study adhered to principles of academic integrity, transparency, and accurate legal interpretation throughout the research process.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Dominant Patterns of General Principles of Good Governance in Administrative Court Decisions

The analysis of administrative court decisions issued between 2020 and 2023 demonstrates that the General Principles of Good Governance function as substantive standards through which judges evaluate the legality and legitimacy of administrative action. Judicial reasoning increasingly extends beyond formal statutory compliance and incorporates broader principles of administrative fairness. This development reflects the contemporary evolution of administrative law toward reasoned governance and accountable public decision making (Mashaw, 2018). The doctrinal foundation of this approach is consistent with the understanding that administrative legality must be interpreted in conjunction with principles that constrain discretionary power (Wade & Forsyth, 2014).

A review of selected decisions indicates that legal certainty and due care emerged as the most frequently invoked principles in judicial consideration. Judges commonly relied on these principles

when examining procedural defects, jurisdictional irregularities, and deficiencies in factual verification undertaken by administrative authorities. Similar tendencies have been observed in contemporary studies of Indonesian administrative adjudication that identify legal certainty as a central element of administrative justice (Indymadjid, 2024). The prominence of these principles illustrates a judicial preference for ensuring predictability and procedural integrity within governmental decision making.

The dominant position of legal certainty can be understood through the structural characteristics of administrative disputes. Most claims brought before administrative courts challenge the validity of governmental decisions that allegedly deviate from statutory procedures or exceed delegated authority. Administrative courts therefore employ legal certainty as a mechanism for preserving consistency between governmental action and legal norms established within the rule of law framework (Craig, 2021). Judicial intervention becomes necessary when procedural irregularities undermine the legitimacy of administrative decisions.

Due care occupies a similarly important position because many disputes originate from inadequate administrative investigation and insufficient factual assessment. Judicial findings frequently reveal that public officials issue decisions without comprehensive examination of relevant evidence or stakeholder interests. Such practices create risks of arbitrariness and increase the likelihood of unlawful administrative conduct. Recent scholarship concerning administrative discretion emphasizes that careful examination of facts represents a fundamental safeguard against abuse of authority (Al'anam et al., 2025).

The relationship between legal certainty and due care demonstrates that administrative courts rarely evaluate procedural legality in isolation. Judicial reasoning frequently combines both principles in order to assess the formal validity and substantive rationality of administrative action. This interpretive pattern reflects a broader understanding that good governance requires compliance with legal norms as well as responsible decision making practices. Comparable observations appear in studies examining disputes involving civil servant transfers and administrative personnel management (Ago et al., 2025).

Table 1. Dominant AUPB Principles Identified in Administrative Court Decisions During 2020 to 2023

AUPB Principle	Relative Judicial Frequency	Primary Judicial Function
Legal Certainty	Very High	Review of authority and procedural legality
Due Care	Very High	Evaluation of factual accuracy and administrative prudence
Transparency	High	Assessment of information disclosure obligations
Accountability	Moderate	Examination of responsibility for administrative action
Proportionality	Moderate	Balancing public interest and individual rights
Professionalism	Moderate	Evaluation of administrative competence

Source: Processed by the author from qualitative analysis of administrative court decisions and normative legal materials based on Republic of Indonesia (1986), Republic of Indonesia (2009), Republic of Indonesia (2014), and Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia (2018).

The pattern presented in Table 1 indicates that legal certainty and due care constitute the principal normative foundation of judicial review in administrative disputes. Transparency appears as a complementary principle that strengthens procedural fairness and public accountability. Judges frequently connect transparency with citizens' rights to receive adequate information regarding administrative decisions. This tendency corresponds with comparative governance scholarship emphasizing openness as a prerequisite for legitimate public administration (Aulia et al., 2026).

The prevalence of transparency related reasoning has become increasingly visible in disputes involving licensing and public services. Courts often consider whether affected individuals were

provided with sufficient explanations regarding administrative decisions and procedural outcomes. Transparency functions not merely as an informational obligation but also as a mechanism for preventing arbitrary governmental conduct. Similar conclusions emerge from studies examining administrative sanctions and public policy governance reforms in Indonesia (Rahmawan et al., 2025; Setiawan, 2026).

Judicial reliance on accountability and proportionality demonstrates a gradual movement toward substantive administrative justice. Accountability allows courts to examine whether governmental actors can justify the consequences of their decisions. Proportionality encourages judges to balance administrative objectives against the protection of individual rights. This interpretive development reflects broader trends in modern administrative law where procedural compliance alone is considered insufficient for achieving justice (Cane, 2011; Hidayat & Frinaldi, 2025).

The findings further reveal that administrative courts increasingly integrate multiple governance principles within a single judicial assessment. Rather than applying one principle independently, judges frequently construct interconnected reasoning that combines legal certainty, due care, transparency, and accountability. Such integration strengthens the normative coherence of judicial review and expands the capacity of courts to control administrative discretion. Similar developments have been identified in studies concerning land administration governance and public participation within administrative decision making processes (Lukman & Al Ghalib, 2025; Banjarnahor et al., 2026).

From a theoretical perspective, the dominance of these governance principles confirms that AUPB has evolved from a supplementary interpretive doctrine into a central instrument of administrative adjudication. Administrative courts increasingly employ these principles to bridge the gap between positive law and substantive justice. The resulting jurisprudential pattern supports the argument that democratic legitimacy depends not only on lawful authority but also on the quality of governmental reasoning and administrative conduct (Mashaw, 2018, Rosidi et al., 2025). This trajectory strengthens the role of administrative courts as institutions responsible for maintaining legality, accountability, and public trust in governance.

Sectoral Application of General Principles of Good Governance Across Administrative Dispute Categories

The analysis of administrative court decisions demonstrates that the application of the General Principles of Good Governance varies significantly across categories of administrative disputes. Judicial reasoning does not apply governance principles in a uniform manner because each dispute type presents distinct administrative risks and legal concerns. This finding confirms that AUPB functions as a contextual standard rather than a rigid doctrinal formula within administrative adjudication (Indymadjid, 2024). The adaptive nature of AUPB reflects the broader evolution of administrative law toward problem oriented governance review (Hidayat & Frinaldi, 2025).

Tax disputes constitute one of the most intensive areas of AUPB application because administrative decisions concerning taxation directly affect financial obligations and legal rights. Judicial review in this sector primarily focuses on procedural legality, administrative authority, and the conformity of governmental actions with statutory requirements established under Law Number 30 of 2014 and Law Number 51 of 2009 (Republic of Indonesia, 2014; Republic of Indonesia, 2009). Courts frequently evaluate whether administrative agencies have exercised their powers within legally prescribed limits. Such an approach reflects the traditional legality model of administrative review described by Wade and Forsyth (2014).

Licensing disputes reveal a different pattern of governance review because judicial examination extends beyond procedural compliance toward the quality of administrative decision making. Administrative courts often assess whether licensing authorities conducted adequate factual assessments before issuing or revoking permits. Studies concerning permit related disputes indicate that deficiencies in administrative assessment frequently become the central basis for judicial intervention (Heriansyah et al., 2025). This orientation illustrates the growing influence of substantive administrative justice within Indonesian administrative adjudication.

Land disputes exhibit a complex interaction between administrative authority, property rights, and public administration. Judicial reasoning in this category commonly focuses on institutional competence, document verification, and administrative consistency in land registration processes. The transformation of land administration institutions has increased the importance of governance principles

as mechanisms for ensuring administrative reliability (Lukman & Al Ghalib, 2025). Similar concerns appear in disputes involving land measurement inconsistencies and conflicting administrative records (Nurhikmah et al., 2026).

The comparative analysis of dispute categories reveals identifiable patterns regarding the governance concerns examined by administrative courts. These patterns are summarized in Table 2, which synthesizes findings derived from statutory analysis, administrative court decisions, and doctrinal literature. The table demonstrates that different sectors generate distinct judicial priorities even though they operate within the same governance framework. This diversity illustrates the functional flexibility of AUPB within administrative dispute resolution.

Table 2. Patterns of AUPB Application Across Categories of Administrative Disputes

Dispute Category	Primary Governance Concern	Frequently Applied AUPB	Judicial Review Orientation
Taxation	Procedural legality	Legal certainty	Legality review
Licensing	Administrative fairness	Due care	Substantive review
Land	Authority verification	Legal certainty	Mixed review
Procurement	Proportionality and competition	Fair competition	Substantive review
Environment	Sustainability and public interest	Public interest orientation	Justice oriented review
Public Information	Transparency and access rights	Openness	Rights based review
Civil Service	Professional administration	Professionalism and fair treatment	Administrative fairness review

Source: Developed by the author from analysis of administrative court decisions, statutory regulations, and relevant literature including Ago et al. (2025), Heriansyah et al. (2025), Labibah and Lestari (2023), Lukman and Al Ghalib (2025), Alfurqan et al. (2026), Rahmawan et al. (2025), Pertiwi et al. (2023), and Desiana et al. (2026).

Procurement disputes demonstrate a stronger orientation toward proportionality, fairness, and competitive neutrality than many other categories of administrative litigation. Administrative courts frequently examine whether procurement procedures preserve equal opportunities among participants and prevent arbitrary governmental preferences. Governance reform studies indicate that procurement disputes often emerge from disproportionate administrative sanctions or procedural irregularities during tender processes (Rahmawan et al., 2025). Judicial scrutiny in this sector therefore emphasizes substantive fairness rather than purely procedural legality.

Environmental disputes present a distinctive model of governance review because judicial reasoning frequently incorporates broader public interests. Administrative decisions concerning environmental permits affect collective interests that extend beyond the immediate parties involved in litigation. Research on environmental administrative disputes shows that courts increasingly evaluate governmental actions through substantive justice considerations rather than narrow procedural standards (Alfurqan et al., 2026). This trend reflects the expanding relationship between environmental governance and administrative accountability.

Public information disputes emphasize transparency and access to governmental information as central elements of administrative legality. Administrative courts reviewing such disputes frequently assess whether public authorities have fulfilled obligations related to openness and accountability. Similar patterns can be observed in disputes involving village administrative decisions where access to information influences the legitimacy of governmental action (Labibah & Lestari, 2023). The judicial orientation in these cases is closely connected to the protection of procedural rights within democratic governance structures.

Civil service disputes involve a different governance context because they concern professional administration and equitable treatment within the public sector. Cases involving transfers, promotions, disciplinary measures, and personnel decisions require courts to evaluate whether administrative discretion has been exercised consistently and fairly (Ago et al., 2025). The increasing significance of administrative remedies under PERMA Number 6 of 2018 has reinforced the role of procedural fairness in resolving these disputes (Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia, 2018; Desiana et al., 2026). Sectoral variation in AUPB application ultimately demonstrates that administrative courts tailor governance review to the institutional characteristics and legal risks embedded within each category of dispute, a pattern consistent with contemporary theories of administrative legality and reasoned governance advanced by Craig (2021) and Mashaw (2018).

Judicial Effectiveness and Regional Variation in the Application of General Principles of Good Governance

The analysis of administrative court decisions indicates that the application of the General Principles of Good Governance varies across administrative court jurisdictions in Indonesia. Differences are reflected in the intensity of judicial reliance on governance principles, the breadth of legal interpretation, and the structure of judicial reasoning. Administrative courts operate within a common statutory framework established by Law Number 5 of 1986, Law Number 51 of 2009, and Law Number 30 of 2014, yet judicial outcomes continue to demonstrate interpretive diversity (Republic of Indonesia, 1986; Republic of Indonesia, 2009; Republic of Indonesia, 2014). This phenomenon illustrates the dynamic relationship between legal norms and judicial discretion within administrative adjudication.

Variations in AUPB application emerge primarily from the open textured nature of administrative law principles. Unlike detailed statutory provisions, governance principles provide normative standards that require contextual interpretation by judges. Administrative law scholarship recognizes that broad principles often generate different judicial approaches depending on institutional culture and case complexity (Wade & Forsyth, 2014; Cane, 2011). Judicial discretion therefore becomes a significant factor shaping regional differences in administrative review.

The comparative examination of court decisions suggests that some administrative courts employ AUPB as a central analytical framework, while others use it as a complementary justification alongside statutory provisions. Courts that explicitly integrate governance principles tend to construct more comprehensive legal reasoning and engage more extensively with issues of administrative fairness. This tendency aligns with the concept of reasoned administration, which emphasizes transparent and accountable governmental decision making as a foundation of democratic legitimacy (Mashaw, 2018). Differences in reasoning style consequently influence the perceived quality of judicial decisions.

Institutional factors also contribute to regional variation in governance review. Differences in case composition, administrative complexity, and local governance challenges create distinct judicial environments that shape the interpretation of administrative legality. Studies examining the relationship between governance and administrative law suggest that legal institutions frequently adapt normative standards to the realities of public administration within their jurisdictions (Setadi & Maulana, 2026; Setiawan, 2026). Such adaptation strengthens contextual justice while simultaneously creating risks of doctrinal inconsistency.

The implications of regional variation can be observed through several dimensions of administrative adjudication effectiveness. These dimensions are summarized in Table 3 based on the comparative analysis of judicial decisions and relevant administrative law literature. The table demonstrates that variation generates both positive and negative consequences for administrative justice. Some effects enhance judicial responsiveness, while others raise concerns regarding legal predictability.

Table 3. Regional Variation and Judicial Impact of AUPB Application

Analytical Dimension	Observed Pattern	Implication for Administrative Justice
-----------------------------	-------------------------	---

Judicial Interpretation	Diverse	Flexible review of administrative actions and decisions
Application Intensity	Different across Administrative Courts	Variable judicial outcomes and standards of review
Use of Multiple Principles	Increasing	Stronger judicial reasoning and more comprehensive legal assessment
Consistency of Decisions	Moderate	Need for harmonization of administrative jurisprudence
Executorial Effectiveness	Higher where AUPB is explicitly applied	Better institutional compliance with court judgments
Public Trust	Improved	Greater legitimacy of administrative adjudication

Source: Developed by the author from analysis of administrative court decisions and literature including Herlambang et al. (2025), Chairunisa et al. (2025), Zulkarnain et al. (2024), Rosidi et al. (2025), Ritonga et al. (2026), Setadi and Maulana (2026), Setiawan (2026), and Tungga (2025).

One important consequence of interpretive diversity concerns the consistency of judicial outcomes. Courts that rely on different combinations of governance principles may reach different conclusions when examining comparable administrative actions. Administrative law theory accepts a degree of interpretive flexibility, yet excessive divergence may weaken legal certainty and reduce predictability for litigants (Craig, 2021). Consistency therefore remains an important objective within the development of administrative jurisprudence.

The effectiveness of administrative court judgments is closely connected to the quality of judicial reasoning. Decisions that clearly articulate governance principles often provide stronger normative justification for the annulment or correction of administrative actions. Research concerning the executorial function of administrative courts demonstrates that well reasoned judgments are more likely to encourage institutional compliance and restore public confidence in administrative governance (Herlambang et al., 2025). Explicit reliance on AUPB therefore contributes to the practical effectiveness of judicial remedies.

Regional variation also affects public perceptions of legitimacy and fairness. Citizens tend to evaluate administrative justice not only through legal outcomes but also through the transparency and rationality of judicial reasoning. Comparative governance studies indicate that accountability mechanisms gain greater public acceptance when decisions are grounded in recognizable principles of good governance and procedural fairness (Zulkarnain et al., 2024; Aulia et al., 2026). Judicial engagement with AUPB consequently strengthens institutional credibility within the administrative justice system.

The relationship between governance principles and legal certainty remains a central issue in contemporary administrative law. Governance principles promote substantive justice and administrative accountability, yet their effectiveness depends on relatively consistent judicial interpretation across jurisdictions. Similar concerns appear in studies addressing the legal consequences of administrative decisions that violate governance standards and the importance of strengthening AUPB implementation within specialized regulatory sectors (Rosidi et al., 2025; Tungga, 2025). Harmonization through jurisprudential development and judicial capacity building therefore represents an important strategy for balancing flexibility with predictability.

The findings ultimately demonstrate that regional variation in AUPB application generates significant consequences for administrative justice, legal certainty, executorial effectiveness, and public trust. Moderate interpretive diversity supports contextual adjudication and allows courts to respond to different administrative realities. Excessive variation, however, may weaken coherence within the administrative legal system and create uncertainty regarding judicial standards. Administrative courts achieve the highest level of effectiveness when governance principles are applied through consistent yet context sensitive judicial reasoning that aligns legality, fairness, and institutional accountability.

CONCLUSION

The role of the General Principles of Good Governance in administrative court dispute resolution extends beyond a supplementary legal reference and operates as a substantive normative framework guiding judicial review of administrative action. Judicial reasoning increasingly relies on governance principles to assess legality, fairness, proportionality, transparency, accountability, and administrative responsibility within diverse categories of disputes regulated under Indonesian administrative law. Variations in application across dispute sectors demonstrate the contextual adaptability of AUPB, while differences among administrative court jurisdictions reflect evolving interpretative approaches shaped by institutional experience and judicial discretion. The analysis further shows that explicit incorporation of AUPB contributes to stronger legal reasoning, improved consistency of adjudication, greater legal certainty, more effective implementation of judgments, and enhanced public confidence in administrative justice. These findings confirm that AUPB serves as a critical mechanism for connecting administrative legality with substantive justice, strengthening governmental accountability, and advancing the effectiveness and legitimacy of Indonesia's administrative court system.

REFERENCES

- Ago, M. S., Mardatillah, W., & Saodana, S. (2025). A Legal Analysis of Administrative Disputes Related to the Transfer of Civil Servants in the Makassar City Government. *Journal of Law, Politic and Humanities*, 6(2), 1014-1022.
- Al'anam, M., Fitriyana, L., & Zainsyah, L. A. (2025). Unlawful Acts of Governance: Characteristics and Limits of Discretion. *Indonesian Journal of Administrative Law and Local Government*, 2(2), 78-90.
- Alfurqan, I., Tekayadi, S. K., & Prawiranegara, K. (2026). Concept of Resolving State Administrative Disputes Related to Environmental Issues from the Perspective of Substantive Justice. *Jurnal Multidisiplin Sahombu*, 6(01), 60-71.
- Aulia, S., Simanjutak, S. I., Padang, A. A. C., & Mubin, M. (2026). Fair Play Principles in Good Governance: Comparative Regulations and Implementation in Indonesia and Malaysia. *IUS POSITUM: Journal of Law Theory and Law Enforcement*, 1-18.
- Banjarnahor, D. N., Togatorop, F., & Saadoon, A. R. (2026). Optimization Of State Investment Governance Based On Meaningful Participation In Order To Realize The General Principles Of Good Government (AAUPB) And The Rule Of Law Indonesia. *Judge: Jurnal Hukum*, 6(07), 2249-2259.
- Chairunisa, C., Sihombing, A. M., & Harahap, H. A. (2025). The urgency of establishing a legal basis for amicus curiae in the administrative court system. *Lexovate: Jurnal Perkembangan Sistem Peradilan*, 2(1), 43-55.
- Desiana, W., Abdussamad, Z., & Rahim, E. (2026). Reconstructing Administrative Remedies from the Perspective of Administrative Justice Principles and Legal Certainty. *Journal of Public Representative and Society Provision*, 6(1), 256-274.
- H.W.R. Wade, & C.F. Forsyth. (2014). *Administrative Law* (11th ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Heriansyah, H., Fathullah, F., Kamseno, S., & Mabsuti, M. (2025). Juridical Analysis of the Serang Administrative Court Decision No. 24/G/2020/PTUN-SRG on the Building Permit Process for a Poultry Farm in Panyaungan Jaya Village According to Law No. 5 of 1986 on the Administrative Court. *Fox Justi: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum*, 15(03), 982-992.
- Herlambang, P. H., Ramadhani, S., & Chandra, F. (2025). The Executorial Role of the Administrative Court in Controlling Abuse and Restoring Trust. *Semarang State University Undergraduate Law and Society Review*, 5(2), 1266-1292.
- Hidayat, A., & Frinaldi, A. (2025). The Evolution and Contemporary Relevance of Administrative Law in Modern Government Governance. *Journal of Social Research*, 5(1), 310-315.
- Indymadjid, R. Z. (2024). Peran Asas-Asas Umum Pemerintahan Yang Baik Dalam Penyelesaian Sengketa Tata Usaha Negara Dan Hukum Acara. *JURNAL ILMIAH NUSANTARA*, 1(4), 1007-1014.
- Jerry L. Mashaw. (2018). *Reasoned Administration and Democratic Legitimacy: How Administrative Law Supports Democratic Government*. Cambridge University Press.
- John W. Creswell, & J. David Creswell. (2018). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.

- Labibah, H. A., & Lestari, A. A. (2023). Status of Dispute Resolution of Village Head Decision Based on Commercial Administrative Decision Law. *Journal of Development Research*, 7(2), 310-316.
- Lukman, F. A., & Al Ghalib, M. F. (2025). The Structural Transformation of Land Administration Institutions in Aceh Province within the Framework of Public Land Administration Services Based on the General Principles of Good Governance (AAUPB). *Staatsrecht: Jurnal Hukum Kenegaraan dan Politik Islam*, 5(2).
- Mujianto, D., Daim, N. A., & Aji, R. B. (2023). Urgensi Pelaksanaan Peradilan Perdata Secara Elektronik Ditinjau Dari Prinsip Good Governance. *Law and Humanity*, 1(1), 1-18.
- Nurhikmah, E., Djaja, N., Sadina, A. S., & Nugraha, D. P. (2026). Legal Certainty and Due Care in Land Measurement: Evaluating Inconsistency Land Official's Action. *Jurnal Ius Constituendum*, 11(2), 446-468.
- Paul Craig. (2021). *Administrative Law* (9th ed.). Sweet & Maxwell.
- Pertiwi, A. P., Rompis, A. E., & Nurzaman, R. A. (2023). the Elimination of State Administrative Court'S Authority To Decide Positive Fictitious Decisions After the Amendment To Law Number 30 of 2014 Connected With the General Principles of Good Governance. *Jurnal Poros Hukum Padjadjaran*, 5(1), 107-124.
- Peter Cane. (2011). *Administrative Law* (5th ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Rahmawan, A. B., Nariswari, A. A., & Sholihah, A. Z. (2025). Administrative Sanction Governance Reform: Optimising the Application of Administrative Sanctions in Indonesia. *Arena Hukum*, 18(1), 73-101.
- 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 Year 1986 Number 77.
- 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 Year 2009 Number 160.
- 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 Year 2014 Number 292.
- Ritonga, N., Rojak, N., Nst, A., Ismaini, K., Nurhaliza, S., Hasibuan, T. S., ... & Wardani, F. (2026). The Role of State Administrative Law in Realizing Effective and Efficient Public Services. *Golden Ratio of Data in Summary*, 6(1), 71-77.
- Rosidi, A., Suradana, I. M., & Rahman, O. (2025). Legal Consequences of State Administrative Decisions That Violate Good Governance: An Analysis of Islamic Law and Positive Law on the SDGs. *Profetika: Jurnal Studi Islam*, 26(02), 559-578.
- Setadi, S., & Maulana, R. (2026). The Relationship Between Law and Government Science: A Literature Review on Constitutional Law and Administrative Law. *SADANA: International Journal of Education, Law, Technology, Economics and Agriculture*, 1(1), 1-11.
- Setiawan, R. (2026). Administrative Law Analysis of Strategies for Improving Public Policy Quality in Indonesia. *Journal of State Public Policy*, 1(2), 1-13.
- Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia. (2018). *Supreme Court Regulation Number 6 of 2018 concerning Guidelines for Settlement of Government Administrative Disputes after Administrative Remedies (Peraturan Mahkamah Agung Nomor 6 Tahun 2018)*. Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia.
- Tungga, B. (2025). Urgency of Strengthening The General Principles of Good Governance (AUPB) to Enforce Health Administrative Law in Indonesia. *Audito Comparative Law Journal (ACLJ)*, 6(3), 146-160.
- Wardi, A. D., & Maskur, A. (2024). Settlement of Land Disputes Certificate of Ownership Rights Number 251/Mojosongo Subdistrict Jebres District Surakarta City Review of General Principles of Good Government In Law Number 30 Of 2014 Concerning Government Administration:(Study of State Administrative Court Decision 48/G/2023/PTUN. SMG). *Journal of Law, Politic and Humanities*, 4(5), 1649-1657.
- Zulkarnain, I. F., Abd Razak, S. S., Saferdin, W. F. H. W. M., & Firdaus, U. F. (2024). Ombudsman in Malaysia: An Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) in promoting good governance principles. *Environment-Behaviour Proceedings Journal*, 9(SI22), 265-271.