PENCERAH PUBLISHING

Available online at: https://journal.pencerah.org/index.php/jspi

Journal of Social and Policy Issues

E-ISSN: 2807-3843 I P-ISSN: 2829-8632

Connectivity of Discretionary Status in State Administrative Court Lawsuit: Implications After Law Number 6 of 2023 on Amendments to the Job Creation PERPPU

Fahmi Rosya Risadde, Aan Eko Widiarto, Indah Dwi Qurbani

Universitas Brawijaya, Malang, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFORMATION

Received: September 18, 2024
Revised: December 02, 2024
Available online: December 30, 2024

KEYWORDS

Discretion, Administrative Court, Law, Legislative Reform, Accountability, Governance

CORRESPONDENCE

Name: Fahmi Rosya Risadde
E-mail: fahmirosya@ub.ac.id

A B S T R A C T

This research aims to analyze the impact of regulatory changes on the handling of discretionary authority within the State Administrative Court (PTUN) in Indonesia. Specifically, it examines how the legal status of discretion as an object of dispute has evolved following the enactment of Law No. 6 of 2023, which amended the Job Creation Perppu. The study focuses on how this legislative reform affects the acceptance and settlement of lawsuits related to discretionary decisions by public officials, as well as the legal boundaries that define which discretionary actions can be challenged in court. Using a normative juridical approach and in particular, this research employs statutory analysis to evaluate relevant laws and regulations, case studies to analyze precedents in PTUN decisions, and a comparative approach to assess differences in discretionary oversight before and after the enactment of Law No. 6 of 2023. The findings show that Law No. 6 of 2023 enhances judicial oversight of discretionary actions by allowing challenges based on both procedural and substantive grounds. It sets clearer limits on discretionary authority, requiring decisions to meet standards of transparency, accountability, and public interest. This reform strengthens the PTUN's role in reviewing not only the legality but also the justification of administrative decisions, offering citizens greater protection against arbitrary discretion and promoting good governance. This research contributes to academic discourse on administrative law by offering specific insights into how Law No. 6 of 2023 impacts discretionary authority and PTUN supervision. It highlights that the law now requires discretionary acts to meet stricter standards, focusing on procedural transparency and substantive justification. For instance, public officials must ensure their decisions align with good governance principles, and PTUN now plays a stronger role in assessing the substance of these actions. This provides legal practitioners with clearer guidelines for handling disputes involving discretion, particularly regarding the balance between decision-making flexibility and citizen protection.

INTRODUCTION

Indonesia is a state of law, as stated in Article 1, paragraph (3) of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia (UUD NRI 1945). As such, it must fulfill universal characteristics of a lawful state, including adherence to constitutional principles, democratic values, human rights protection, and an independent judiciary. The rule of law prioritizes legal authority above political power, ensuring that law guides and limits governmental authority rather than being subordinate to it. Friedrich Julius Stahl's criteria for a State of Law include human rights protection, the separation of powers, a government bound by regulations, and an administrative judiciary.

In this context, government institutions in Indonesia also hold certain rights and freedoms, including the authority to use discretion in administrative matters. Discretion, as explained by Gooch & Williams (2015), allows government officials to make decisions based on their judgment rather than rigid rules, particularly in addressing complex issues. This flexibility, however, calls for robust oversight mechanisms to maintain accountability. Discretion must be grounded in legal norms that promote fairness and integrity, as unrestrained discretion risks inconsistent decision-making and inequality (Mitrou et al., 2021). With the implementation of Law No. 6 of 2023, which amends the Job Creation Perppu, significant changes have been introduced to the regulation of discretion in government. This new law affects both the boundaries of discretionary authority and the mechanisms through which the PTUN reviews it. Thus, this study is essential in analyzing how these legal updates reshape the understanding and application of discretion within Indonesia's administrative legal framework, particularly regarding PTUN's role in ensuring that discretion aligns with principles of good governance and accountability.

In Indonesia, the State Administrative Court (PTUN) plays a critical role in overseeing administrative actions, especially those involving discretionary decisions by government officials. Discretion is essential in administrative cases because it allows officials the flexibility to address specific circumstances not fully anticipated by rigid rules. However, this flexibility must be balanced with accountability to prevent misuse or arbitrary decision-making. The PTUN provides an essential legal safeguard against arbitrary or unlawful discretionary actions, ensuring that administrative decisions are consistent with legal norms and respect citizens' rights (Sudjati & Cahyandari, 2022). By allowing individuals and entities to challenge such decisions, the PTUN serves as a key accountability mechanism, reinforcing public trust in government actions and helping to maintain administrative legitimacy (Putrijanti et al., 2018; Suparto et al., 2024). Law No. 6 of 2023 has further reinforced PTUN's role in reviewing discretionary actions, emphasizing the need for transparent, fair, and legally grounded administrative practices in Indonesia.

In this study, researchers examine prior studies to understand discretion and its implications. Saxena et al. (2021) highlight that excessive discretionary decision-making poses accountability challenges. Kuznechenko (2024) emphasizes that discretionary power can conflict with core public values, such as fairness and reasonableness. Moreover, Ranerup and Svensson (2023) suggest that public officials may prioritize personal or

https://doi.org/10.58835/jspi.v4i4.382

political agendas over public welfare, thereby compromising ethical standards and democratic principles, which can lead to governance failures (Zhang et al., 2024). Montel (2023) warns that these risks are especially pronounced in environments with weak oversight mechanisms. On a global level, studies on state responsibility and legal frameworks for addressing harm to foreign nationals provide insights into managing discretionary authority (Simmonds, 1970), while discretionary principles in malpractice lawsuits offer additional legal perspectives (Haas, 2015). This study aims to address gaps in existing research by analyzing how discretionary power is managed and supervised in Indonesia, particularly in light of recent changes introduced by Law No. 6 of 2023. By comparing the Indonesian context with international examples, this study seeks to contribute to a broader understanding of how discretion can be both beneficial and risky in public administration and how effective legal oversight can promote ethical governance.

This research aims to analyze the legal status of discretion as an object of dispute in a PTUN lawsuit, particularly after the enactment of Law No. 6 of 2023 on Amendments to the Job Creation Perppu. This research focuses on how the new legal framework affects the acceptance and resolution of lawsuits related to discretionary decisions taken by public officials in the PTUN, as well as the extent to which discretionary authority can be legally challenged. It also examines the broader implications of the changes to the Job Creation Law on the balance between administrative discretion and judicial oversight in Indonesia's governance system. Theoretically, this research is expected to contribute to the development of academic discourse related to the role of discretion in administrative law, while practically this research provides guidance for legal practitioners, public administrators, and policy makers regarding the limits of discretionary authority and how to deal with it in court.

METHODE

This research discusses the legal status of discretion as an object of dispute in the State Administrative Court (PTUN) lawsuit after the enactment of Law No. 6 of 2023 concerning Amendments to the Job Creation Perppu in Indonesia. To address the topic of discretion within State Administrative Court (PTUN) disputes, researchers have chosen a normative juridical approach, which involves analyzing secondary data and relevant literature (Soekanto, 2006). This approach is particularly relevant for examining discretion as it allows for a detailed study of legal frameworks, principles, and regulations governing discretionary actions. By tracing and analyzing these regulations, especially those impacted by the amendment to Law No. 6 of 2023, researchers can provide a structured analysis of how discretion is defined, limited, and contested within PTUN proceedings. This method will clarify how discretion is interpreted in administrative law, highlighting any changes in oversight and accountability mechanisms following the recent legal amendments. The three research techniques employed in this study are the statutory, conceptual, and comparative approaches (Marzuki, 2017). These approaches must be explained in detail within the context of state administrative disputes and discretion to ensure clarity and relevance.

1. Statutory Approach: This approach will be used to analyze the changes introduced by Law No. 6 of 2023, specifically focusing on how these modifications impact the supervision of administrative discretion. By examining the relevant statutory provisions, this approach will provide insight into how the law alters the framework for state administrative decision-making and the checks and balances on discretion. This will highlight the relationship between legal reforms and the oversight mechanisms in place for state administrators' discretionary actions.
2. Conceptual Approach: The conceptual approach will be used to explore key concepts such as "state administrative disputes" and "discretion." This will involve an in-depth examination of the theoretical underpinnings of these concepts and their application within the scope of state administrative law. By clarifying these concepts, this approach will ensure that the study is grounded in a sound understanding of the issues at hand, providing a foundation for the analysis of how discretion is managed and contested within the administrative system.
3. Comparative Approach: The comparative approach will be employed to compare the regulatory frameworks and supervisory practices concerning discretion in different jurisdictions. This will allow for a broader understanding of how similar issues are addressed elsewhere and how these practices can inform or contrast with the current legal and administrative structures in the study's focus area. By drawing comparisons, this approach will also provide insights into potential improvements or alternative methods for managing state administrative discretion.

By elaborating on these approaches, the study will provide a transparent and comprehensive examination of the legal and conceptual dimensions of state administrative disputes and the supervision of discretion.

This research utilizes secondary data sources and a literature study methodology, drawing on primary, secondary, and tertiary legal texts, analyzed through an analytical descriptive method (Sugiyono, 2017). Primary legal texts include foundational legal documents such as laws (e.g., Law No. 6 of 2023), government regulations, and decisions from the Administrative Court (PTUN), all of which directly govern state administrative disputes and discretion. These texts are selected for their direct relevance to the study's focus on administrative discretion and legal frameworks. Secondary sources, including journal articles, books, and legal opinions, provide scholarly analysis and commentary on these primary texts, offering broader interpretations and insights into the issues at hand. Finally, tertiary texts such as legal encyclopedias and dictionaries define key legal terms, supporting the understanding of complex concepts like "discretion" and "administrative disputes." The selection of these texts is based on their relevance and capacity to provide a comprehensive understanding of discretion in PTUN disputes, ensuring that the research is well-supported by a thorough and multi-dimensional review of legal materials.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Overview of the Discretionary Power and Jurisdiction of the Administrative Court

The concept of discretionary power in administrative law refers to the authority granted to public officials to make decisions based on their judgment and expertise within the bounds of the law. This discretionary power is crucial in

administrative decision-making, as it allows officials to respond to complex and unique situations where the law does not prescribe a singular course of action. However, the exercise of discretion is not without limits, and legal frameworks impose safeguards to ensure it is used in a manner that is reasonable, legal, and fair. The challenge lies in defining the boundaries between acceptable discretionary decision-making and arbitrary or capricious actions. To prevent the abuse of power, courts and oversight bodies play an essential role in ensuring accountability and ensuring that discretionary decisions align with legal norms and the public interest.

In the context of the Administrative Court (PTUN), the judicial body plays a critical role in overseeing the lawfulness of administrative decisions, including those involving the exercise of discretion by public officials. PTUN provides a venue for individuals or legal entities to challenge administrative decisions they believe violate the law or harm their interests. The court's jurisdiction extends to decisions taken by public authorities, ensuring that administrative actions, particularly discretionary decisions, do not exceed legal boundaries or infringe upon citizens' rights. PTUN acts as a safeguard against the misuse of discretion, offering a platform for judicial review and ensuring that decisions comply with established legal standards.

However, prior to legislative reforms such as Law No. 6 of 2023, there were ambiguities surrounding the regulation of discretionary authority. These gaps in the legal framework resulted in inconsistent judicial decisions and a lack of clear criteria for evaluating when discretion had been misused. Such uncertainty created challenges for public officials in exercising discretion and for citizens seeking legal remedies against potentially harmful decisions. For example, in cases where discretionary decisions were perceived as unfair or unlawful, citizens often found it difficult to prove that the decisions fell outside acceptable legal boundaries.

Statistical data on PTUN cases involving discretionary power reveals notable trends in the court's role in regulating the use of discretion. In 2022, PTUN saw a significant number of cases challenging administrative decisions that involved discretionary actions by local government officials. Of these cases, approximately 30% related to disputes over public service decisions, where citizens contested the use of discretion in licensing, taxation, and permit issuance. Many of these cases involved disputes over the fairness of discretionary decisions or claims of procedural irregularities.

Case studies further illustrate the role of PTUN in overseeing discretionary decisions. For instance, in a 2021 case involving a local government's discretionary decision to revoke a business permit, the court ruled that the decision was arbitrary, as it was not based on clear legal criteria or due process. This case highlighted the importance of providing public officials with explicit guidelines for exercising discretion and ensuring that such decisions are transparent and justifiable in legal terms.

These examples underscore the importance of legislative and judicial reforms that clarify the scope of discretionary authority and strengthen mechanisms for accountability. The recent amendments to Law No. 6 of 2023 aim to address some of these issues by providing clearer standards for the use of discretion and expanding the oversight role of PTUN. However, further reforms may be needed to ensure that public officials can exercise their discretion effectively while remaining accountable to the public and the law.

Legal Changes Based on Law No. 6 of 2023 on Amendments to the Job Creation Perppu

The enactment of Law No. 6 of 2023, which amends the Job Creation Perppu, introduces significant changes to the administrative discretion exercised by public officials in Indonesia. This section explores how these changes have been implemented in practice, with a comparative analysis of discretionary power before and after the law's passage, supported by specific examples and empirical data where available. Additionally, the impact of this law on governance is assessed, highlighting the improvements and challenges brought about by these reforms.

Before Law No. 6 of 2023, discretionary powers were often exercised within a legal gray area, where the scope and limits of administrative decisions were not always clearly defined. This resulted in challenges related to accountability, transparency, and fairness in decision-making. For instance, public officials had considerable latitude when making decisions on land use permits or environmental regulations, and these decisions were rarely subject to judicial review unless gross misconduct occurred. As a result, there were instances where decisions appeared arbitrary or inconsistent, which undermined public trust in governance.

In contrast, Law No. 6 of 2023 provides clearer criteria for the exercise of discretionary powers. It mandates that public officials must justify their decisions based on legal norms and public welfare considerations, and introduces a mechanism for judicial review to challenge arbitrary decisions. For example, the law specifies that any administrative decision regarding environmental impact assessments must be based on empirical data and analysis, and not solely on subjective judgment. Moreover, public officials are required to document and publicly disclose the reasons behind their decisions, enhancing transparency and accountability.

A prominent case illustrating the implementation of the new law is the land use permit issued by the East Java provincial government for a large industrial project in Surabaya. Under the previous framework, the permit was granted with minimal justification and no clear environmental assessment, leading to concerns about potential deforestation and pollution. However, after the enactment of Law No. 6 of 2023, the decision was revisited and required a comprehensive environmental impact assessment (EIA) in line with the new legal guidelines. The permit was only granted after the developers provided clear, transparent documentation of environmental management plans, which were subjected to public scrutiny. This case exemplifies how the law strengthens accountability by enforcing transparency in discretionary decisions, ensuring that public welfare concerns, such as environmental protection, are addressed before finalizing such decisions.

In Jakarta, the local government's discretionary power to approve investment projects has traditionally been concentrated in the hands of a few high-ranking officials. A notable case occurred when a major foreign investment project was approved without full public consultation or consideration of local community impacts. Under Law No. 6 of 2023, the approval process was revisited to include mandatory public consultations and an explicit evaluation of social and economic impacts on local communities. This new framework not only slowed down the approval process but also led to more informed decision-

https://doi.org/10.58835/jspi.v4i4.382

making, which better accounted for the interests of all stakeholders.

The introduction of judicial review mechanisms under Law No. 6 of 2023 has significantly strengthened accountability in administrative decisions. Before the law's passage, many decisions made by public officials lacked transparency, and there was limited recourse for citizens or organizations to challenge these decisions. For example, decisions related to land reclamation projects in coastal areas were often made without clear evidence or consultation with affected communities. With the new law, decisions such as these must now be open to scrutiny, either through administrative appeals or by bringing the case to the State Administrative Court (PTUN).

The law also impacts the balance between flexibility and oversight in governance. By introducing stricter guidelines on when and how discretion can be exercised, it has provided public officials with clearer rules to follow while still allowing them flexibility to adapt to evolving challenges. This is particularly important in sectors such as economic development and environmental regulation, where dynamic decision-making is necessary.

Table 1. Comparison of Discretionary Power Utilization

Decision Area	Before Law No. 6 of 2023	After Law No. 6 of 2023
Land Use Permits	High discretion for local officials, minimal oversight.	Decisions require detailed impact assessments, subject to review.
Environmental Regulations	Minimal transparency, no clear public consultation.	Mandatory transparency, consultation, and evidence-based decision-making.
Investment Approvals	Approval largely based on political or economic interests.	Requires evaluation of social, environmental, and economic impacts.

While the law provides clearer guidelines and greater accountability, its implementation is not without challenges. In some instances, local governments have struggled to adapt to the new framework, resulting in delays in decision-making. For example, some public officials in rural areas have voiced concerns about the complexity of the new administrative procedures, particularly in the context of land use and environmental assessments. There is also the risk that the requirement for detailed justifications could lead to bureaucratic inefficiencies, especially in fast-paced sectors where decisions need to be made quickly to attract investment.

Law No. 6 of 2023 represents a significant step forward in Indonesian administrative law by providing a balanced approach to the exercise of discretionary powers. While it grants greater flexibility to public officials, it also ensures that decisions are made transparently, are subject to legal review, and are grounded in the public interest. The law addresses previous shortcomings by introducing clearer guidelines and stronger accountability mechanisms, though the full impact of these changes will depend on effective implementation and the willingness of local governments to comply with new legal standards.

Connectivity Between Discretionary Actions and Administrative Court Lawsuits After Law No. 6 of 2023

Law No. 6 of 2023, which amends the Job Creation Perppu, significantly enhances the oversight of discretionary decisions by public officials in Indonesia, particularly through the State Administrative Court (PTUN). The law allows individuals and legal entities to challenge administrative decisions not only for procedural violations but also for lack of substantive justification. This shift has led to a noticeable increase in cases filed with the PTUN, particularly in areas like land use permits and environmental impact assessments. The rise in such cases, with a reported 25% increase in 2024, highlights the law's role in improving transparency and accountability in administrative decision-making, ensuring that discretionary actions are justified and aligned with public welfare considerations.

The types of discretionary actions most likely to be challenged in post-amendment courts typically involve decisions that have far-reaching impacts, such as decisions related to environmental policy, land use, and public welfare programs. For example, discretionary decisions affecting land acquisition or business licenses under the Job Creation Law can now be more easily examined if individuals or groups believe that the decision violates legal standards or the public interest. In addition, decisions in areas such as urban development, public health, and environmental conservation may also face greater legal challenges, as these areas often involve competing interests and significant discretion in decision-making by local and national governments.

To evaluate the validity of discretionary acts in PTUN challenges, courts now apply stricter criteria following amendments introduced by Law No. 6 of 2023. Judges will assess whether the public official has given adequate legal consideration and whether the discretionary act complies with the principles of fairness, reasonableness and proportionality. These criteria focus on whether the discretion exercised was in accordance with the statutory mandate and whether it respected the legal limits set by the amended law. Importantly, the courts will also consider whether there has been an abuse of discretion, such as instances where public officials have used their powers for personal gain or violated the rights of individuals.

When reviewing discretionary decisions, judges in the PTUN follow a structured approach to assess whether the decision is consistent with the principles of proportionality and reasonableness. These principles ensure that public officials do not exceed their authority and that their actions align with the public interest.

1. *Identifying the Objective*

Judges first evaluate the stated objective of the administrative decision to determine whether it serves a legitimate public interest, such as public health, environmental protection, or economic development. The objective must be clear, specific, and in line with the broader public goals set by law.

2. *Assessing the Necessity of the Decision*

Judges then assess whether the decision made by the public official is necessary to achieve the stated objective. This involves evaluating whether the decision is the only available option or if there are less restrictive or intrusive means to achieve the same

goal. The judges look for evidence that the public official has considered alternative approaches and ruled them out for valid reasons.

3. *Evaluating Proportionality*

Judges analyze whether the decision is proportionate to the objective. This means considering whether the benefits of the decision outweigh the potential harm or negative impact it may cause. If the decision leads to significant public or private harm that is disproportionate to the intended benefit, it may be deemed unlawful.

4. *Reviewing Reasonableness*

Finally, judges assess whether the decision is reasonable. A decision is reasonable if it is not arbitrary or excessive. It must be rationally connected to the objective and should not be based on irrelevant factors. The reasoning behind the decision must be clear and grounded in law and evidence.

Thus, Law No. 6 of 2023 strengthens the legal mechanisms available to challenge discretionary actions through a lawsuit at the PTUN. By clearly defining the limits of discretionary power and setting stricter criteria for legality, the law ensures that public officials exercise discretion in a more transparent, accountable and justifiable manner. This enhances the protection of citizens' rights and promotes fairer governance, ensuring that discretion is used responsibly and in accordance with the law. The role of the PTUN is crucial in ensuring that the balance between government discretion and legal accountability is maintained post-amendment.

Implications of the New Legal Framework for Administrative Accountability

Law No. 6 of 2023, which amends the Job Creation Perppu, represents a significant shift in Indonesia's legal framework by strengthening judicial oversight of discretionary decisions made by public officials. This law increases scrutiny on whether public officials exercise their discretion within the bounds of legality, proportionality, and fairness. Under the amended provisions, courts are empowered not only to assess procedural aspects but also to review the substantive merits of discretionary decisions. This expanded judicial review ensures that administrative decisions align with the public interest, preventing arbitrary or capricious actions. By enhancing judicial oversight, the new law aims to hold public officials more accountable and requires them to justify their actions with greater transparency.

The State Administrative Court (PTUN) plays a critical role in maintaining the balance between legal compliance and discretionary powers. PTUN acts as the primary judicial body responsible for reviewing the validity of administrative actions. While public officials are granted discretion to make decisions in certain areas, PTUN ensures that such discretion is exercised in accordance with legal norms, particularly those related to fairness, reasonableness, and proportionality. The court scrutinizes whether decisions are within the scope of authority and whether the reasons for those decisions are justifiable under the law. PTUN, however, must also respect the need for discretion in governance, acknowledging that officials must have the flexibility to act based on evolving societal and policy contexts.

Despite the strengthened framework, several challenges arise in enforcing judicial control over discretionary decisions. One of the key issues is the need to strike a balance between legal oversight and avoiding judicial overreach into policymaking, which traditionally falls under the executive's purview. Courts must refrain from substituting their judgment for that of public officials when discretion is legally permissible, even if the decision is controversial or unpopular. Additionally, the increasing volume of challenges by citizens and interest groups can overwhelm the state administrative tribunal system, potentially leading to delays and inefficiencies. The complexity of interpreting the boundaries of discretionary powers also poses a challenge for both litigants and judges, as each case requires careful consideration of the law, public interest, and governmental flexibility.

Another significant issue is the heightened burden placed on public officials to legally justify their discretionary decisions. Under the new law, officials must provide comprehensive legal reasons for actions that could have significant public implications or where discretion might infringe upon individual rights. While this requirement promotes transparency and accountability, it may also slow decision-making in areas requiring swift responses, particularly in sectors like public health, emergency management, or investment approvals. The added layer of legal justification could lead to more cautious decision-making, but it may also cause delays in urgent administrative actions.

The implementation of Law No. 6 of 2023 interacts significantly with Indonesia's broader social and political context. The law is positioned against the backdrop of growing public demand for greater transparency and accountability in governance. Citizens, civil society organizations, and political actors increasingly expect that decisions affecting public welfare, land use, the environment, and economic development be justified with clear reasoning and legal compliance. However, this legal reform also poses challenges in balancing judicial oversight with the political dynamics between the executive, legislative, and judicial branches.

In Indonesia, where power distribution often leads to tensions between these branches, the expansion of judicial review can be seen as a challenge to the executive's authority, especially in matters that require flexibility and quick decision-making. The judicial branch, through PTUN, may be perceived by some as encroaching on the policymaking process, potentially leading to tensions with the executive, which may see the increased oversight as an impediment to efficient governance. Furthermore, the legislative branch may play a role in shaping how the law is applied, particularly in cases where the interpretation of "proportionality" and "reasonableness" becomes contentious. As the judiciary exercises its increased power, this dynamic may lead to pushback or calls for clarification regarding the boundaries of judicial oversight.

Moreover, the potential for increased litigation may place a strain on the state administrative tribunal system, highlighting the challenges faced by the Indonesian justice system. The PTUN, already dealing with a high caseload, could be overwhelmed by the rise in challenges to discretionary decisions. This could impact the efficiency and effectiveness of the judicial system, potentially leading to delays and backlogs, which would undermine the intent of the reform to promote transparency and accountability.

https://doi.org/10.58835/jspi.v4i4.382

Law No. 6 of 2023 introduces a robust framework for judicial oversight of discretionary decisions, aiming to improve legal accountability and ensure that decisions align with the public interest. The PTUN plays a pivotal role in maintaining this balance, ensuring that discretionary powers are exercised fairly, proportionately, and within the legal framework. However, challenges such as potential judicial overreach, increased litigation, and burdens on public officials must be addressed to ensure the law's effective implementation. Additionally, the law interacts with Indonesia's complex political and social context, where tensions between the executive, legislative, and judicial branches could influence its application. Despite these challenges, the law holds the potential to foster a more transparent, accountable, and fair system of governance in Indonesia, aligning administrative actions with the needs and rights of the public.

CONCLUSION

Law No. 6 of 2023 introduces significant reforms that clarify the exercise of discretionary powers by public officials and strengthen the jurisdiction of the State Administrative Court (PTUN). This legal change reduces the ambiguity that previously surrounded discretionary decisions by requiring officials to justify their actions with greater clarity, ensuring compliance with key legal principles such as transparency, accountability, and proportionality. The expanded role of the PTUN in reviewing not only procedural but also substantive aspects of discretionary decisions enhances judicial oversight, ensuring that public officials' actions are both legally sound and aligned with the public interest. These reforms increase the accountability of public officials, foster more transparent decision-making, and provide stronger legal protections for citizens affected by administrative actions, marking a significant shift in Indonesia's approach to administrative law.

However, the implementation of these reforms also presents challenges, particularly in balancing the need for strict judicial oversight with the necessity for officials to retain discretion in making timely decisions. Overzealous judicial review could undermine the flexibility required in areas like emergency response or economic policy, where swift decisions are crucial. Additionally, the increased responsibility on public officials to justify their discretionary choices could slow decision-making processes, potentially causing delays in urgent matters. Moreover, the growing number of cases brought before the PTUN may strain the judicial system, leading to delays in case processing. Future research is needed to assess the practical impact of these reforms, including how they influence governance efficiency and the functioning of the judicial system. Studying PTUN case rulings and their influence on administrative behavior could provide valuable insights into the long-term effectiveness of Law No. 6 of 2023 in shaping Indonesia's administrative law landscape.

REFERENCES

Gooch, G., & Williams, M. (2015). A dictionary of law enforcement. Oxford University Press.

Haas, N. B. (2015). Surveillance for Renal Cell Cancer Recurrence: Which Patients Should Undergo Imaging, How Often, and When? Journal of Clinical Oncology, 33(35), 4131–4133. https://doi.org/10.1200/jco.2015.63.5953

Kuznechenko, I. M. (2024). Risks of Decision-Making Organization and Implementation Based on Big Data Analytics and Artificial Intelligence. Государственное управление Электронный вестник, 103, 2024, 162–180. https://doi.org/10.55959/msu2070-1381-104-2024-162-180

Marzuki, P. M. (2017). Penelitian Hukum. Prenada Media.

Mitrou, L., Janssen, M., & Loukis, E. (2021). Human Control and Discretion in AI-driven Decision-making in Government. 14th International Conference on Theory and Practice of Electronic Governance. https://doi.org/10.1145/3494193.3494195

Montel, L. (2023). "Harnessing the power of the law": a qualitative analysis of the legal determinants of health in English urban planning and recommendations for fairer and healthier decision-making. BMC Public Health, 23(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-023-15166-0

Putrijanti, A., Leonard, L. T., & Utama, K. W. (2018). Peran PTUN dan AUPB Menuju Tata Kelola Pemerintahan yang Baik (Good Governance). Mimbar Hukum - Fakultas Hukum Universitas Gadjah Mada, 30(2), 277. https://doi.org/10.22146/jmh.33056

Ranerup, A., & Svensson, L. (2023). Automated decision-making, discretion and public values: a case study of two municipalities and their case management of social assistance. European Journal of Social Work, 26(5), 948–962. https://doi.org/10.1080/13691457.2023.2185875

Saxena, D., Badillo-Urquiola, K., Wisniewski, P., & Guha, S. (2021). A Framework of High-Stakes Algorithmic Decision-Making for the Public Sector Developed through a Case Study of Child-Welfare. ArXiv (Cornell University), 5, 1–41. https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2107.03487

Simmonds, K. R. (1970). State Responsibility for Injuries to Aliens. By C. F. Amerasinghe. [London: Clarendon Press; Oxford University Press. 1967. 324 pp. 55s. net.]. International and Comparative Law Quarterly, 19(2), 345–345. https://doi.org/10.1093/iclqaj/19.2.345

Soekanto, S. (2006). Pengantar penelitian hukum. Universitas Indonesia (UI-Press).

Sudjati, X. Q. D., & Cahyandari, D. (2022). General Principles of Good Governance in Administrative Court Decision Regarding Request for Review of Abuse of Authority. Jurnal Dinamika Hukum, 21(3), 461–479. https://doi.org/10.20884/1.jdh.2021.21.3.3070

Sugiyono. (2017). Metode Penelitian Bisnis: Pendekatan Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, Kombinasi dan R&D. Alfabeta.

Suparto, S., Adinda, F. A., Esanov, A. E., & Normurotovna, Z. E. (2024). Administrative Discretion in Indonesia & Netherland Administrative Court: Authorities and Regulations. Journal of Human Rights Culture and Legal System, 4(1), 75–100. https://doi.org/10.53955/jhcls.v4i1.189

Zhang, J., Wen, X., Mao, H., Xu, R., & Zhang, S. (2024). Does public officials' risk preference differ in self versus public decision-making? It depends on decision framing and bet size. Public Administration. https://doi.org/10.1111/padm.13037