



Sapientia Diversalis Journal of Human Interaction and Social Studies

Vol 1 No 1 February 2026, Hal 66-76

ISSN: 3125-1269 (Print) ISSN: 3125-0696 (Electronic)

Open Access: <https://researchfrontiers.id/sapientiadiversalis>

Legal Status and Protection for Citizens Against Administrative Decisions

Faliani Zaliaokta^{1*}, Ghazyam Hidziam Haqqani², Livia Fajarisalfa³, Mudhtia Nabila Maulud⁴,
Muhammad Satria Akbar⁵, Taufiq Alamsyah⁶

¹⁻⁶ Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Gunung Djati, Indonesia

email: zaliaoktafaliani@gmail.com¹

Article Info :

Received:

25-01-2026

Revised:

04-02-2026

Accepted:

13-02-2026

Abstract

This study examines the legal status of citizens and the legal protection available against State Administrative Decisions within the Indonesian administrative law system. The research addresses three principal issues consisting of the legal position of citizens in administrative disputes, the normative foundations and procedural mechanisms for challenging State Administrative Decisions, and the forms of legal protection together with the legal consequences of Administrative Court judgments. The study employs a normative juridical method supported by statutory, conceptual, and case based approaches. Legal materials were collected through library research involving legislation, judicial decisions, scholarly literature, and legal commentaries. The analysis demonstrates that citizens possess legal standing to challenge administrative decisions when direct and legally recognizable interests are adversely affected. Reviewable administrative decisions must satisfy the requirements of concreteness, individuality, finality, and legal effect, while contemporary developments have expanded reviewable objects to include factual administrative actions and positive fictitious decisions. Legal protection operates through preventive administrative mechanisms and judicial review before the Administrative Court. Administrative Court judgments provide corrective legal remedies through annulment of unlawful decisions, rehabilitation, compensation, and restoration of legal rights. The study concludes that the integration of administrative accountability, judicial control, and effective judgment execution strengthens legal certainty, good governance, and the rule of law within Indonesia's administrative justice framework.

Keywords : Administrative Court, Citizens Rights, Legal Protection, State Administrative Decision, Judicial Review.



©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 expansion of administrative governance across both developed and developing legal systems has transformed the relationship between citizens and public authorities into an increasingly complex legal domain where administrative decisions directly influence access to rights, public services, property interests, religious freedoms, and socio economic opportunities. Within this evolving landscape, the legal status of citizens in challenging administrative decisions has emerged as a central concern of administrative law scholarship because the legitimacy of governmental action is no longer measured solely by formal legality but also by the extent to which administrative processes ensure fairness, accountability, transparency, and effective judicial review. Recent developments in administrative justice demonstrate a growing international emphasis on strengthening procedural safeguards against arbitrary governmental action through specialized administrative courts and expanded doctrines of legal standing. In Indonesia, these developments have been accompanied by significant transformations following the enactment of Law Number 30 of 2014 concerning Government Administration, which broadened the conceptual scope of administrative decisions and reinforced the normative role of the General Principles of Good Governance as standards for assessing administrative legality (Setiawan et al., 2024). As administrative decisions increasingly affect individual rights and legal interests, the question of how citizens acquire legal standing and obtain effective protection against unlawful State Administrative Decisions or Keputusan Tata Usaha Negara has become a critical issue within contemporary administrative law discourse.

Existing scholarship has substantially contributed to understanding the institutional and doctrinal foundations of legal protection against administrative decisions, although the literature reveals varying

analytical emphases. Studies examining the jurisdiction and function of administrative courts have demonstrated that judicial review serves not merely as a mechanism for dispute settlement but as an institutional safeguard for constitutional rights and governmental accountability, particularly in disputes involving sensitive public interests such as permits for places of worship (Saragih & Erliyana, 2024). Research concerning administrative remedies has further highlighted the significance of administrative objections and appeals as preliminary mechanisms designed to resolve disputes before judicial intervention becomes necessary, reflecting a preventive model of legal protection within administrative governance (Turam et al., 2024). Parallel analyses have argued that the enactment of Law Number 30 of 2014 expanded the substantive scope of judicial control over governmental action by incorporating broader standards of legality and administrative responsibility (Setiawan et al., 2024). Collectively, these studies indicate a progressive movement toward strengthening citizen protection against administrative arbitrariness while simultaneously reaffirming the strategic role of administrative courts in preserving the rule of law.

Despite these contributions, the existing literature remains fragmented in its treatment of the interconnected relationship between legal standing, the conceptual nature of administrative decisions, and the effectiveness of legal protection mechanisms. Much of the scholarship tends to examine procedural requirements, administrative remedies, judicial authority, or specific categories of disputes as separate analytical domains rather than as components of a unified framework governing citizen protection against administrative action. Research addressing administrative court decisions often concentrates on case specific outcomes and judicial reasoning without sufficiently exploring the broader doctrinal implications for the legal status of citizens within administrative litigation (Suwardi & Leba, 2025). Similarly, studies evaluating appellate review and judicial strengthening in administrative disputes frequently emphasize institutional authority while providing limited analysis of how judicial interventions shape citizens' substantive rights and access to remedies (Simanjutak & Sitompul, 2025). This fragmentation has generated conceptual ambiguities regarding the precise conditions under which citizens acquire legal standing, the evolving boundaries of reviewable administrative decisions, and the practical effectiveness of available legal remedies in restoring infringed rights.

The persistence of these conceptual and empirical gaps carries significant scientific and practical implications because administrative decisions constitute one of the most direct forms of state power affecting citizens' legal positions. Unresolved uncertainties concerning legal standing and judicial protection create risks of inconsistent adjudication, unequal access to justice, and weakened accountability of administrative authorities. The challenge becomes particularly acute when administrative decisions produce immediate consequences for individual rights while procedural barriers or interpretative inconsistencies limit citizens' ability to obtain effective judicial review. Recent legal analyses underscore that legal protection cannot be evaluated solely through the existence of formal procedural mechanisms because the effectiveness of protection ultimately depends upon the interaction between administrative remedies, judicial review, and the enforceability of court decisions (Susanti et al., 2026). Consequently, a deeper examination of the legal status of citizens within administrative disputes is required not only to clarify doctrinal uncertainties but also to strengthen the practical realization of legal certainty, justice, and good governance within administrative decision making processes.

Against this background, the present study positions itself within the broader field of administrative law by advancing an integrated examination of citizens' legal status in State Administrative Court disputes, the legal foundations governing challenges against administrative decisions, and the forms of legal protection available through both administrative and judicial mechanisms. Rather than treating legal standing, administrative decision making, and judicial protection as isolated subjects, this research conceptualizes them as interdependent dimensions of a single legal framework that determines the effectiveness of citizen protection against governmental action. Such a perspective responds directly to the limitations identified in previous studies by connecting doctrinal analysis with judicial practice and by assessing how statutory provisions, administrative principles, and court decisions collectively shape the protection of citizens' rights. Through this approach, the study seeks to extend ongoing scholarly discussions concerning administrative accountability, judicial control, and the evolving role of administrative courts in safeguarding individual rights within modern governance structures.

This research aims to analyze the legal status of citizens as legal subjects in administrative disputes, to examine the legal concepts and normative foundations governing claims against State Administrative Decisions, and to evaluate the forms of legal protection together with the legal consequences arising from decisions of the State Administrative Court. Employing a normative juridical method supported by statutory, conceptual, and case based approaches, the study develops a comprehensive analytical framework for understanding the relationship between legal standing, administrative legality, and judicial protection. The theoretical contribution lies in constructing an integrated perspective that links citizen rights, administrative decision making, and judicial accountability within a coherent administrative law framework. The methodological contribution resides in combining legislative analysis, conceptual interpretation, and judicial case examination to generate a more holistic understanding of how legal protection operates in administrative disputes and how the rule of law can be strengthened through effective control of administrative power.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study employs a non empirical legal research design grounded in normative juridical inquiry to examine the legal status of citizens in State Administrative Court disputes, the legal foundations governing challenges against State Administrative Decisions, and the forms of legal protection available within the Indonesian administrative law system. The study relies exclusively on secondary legal materials obtained through an extensive library based investigation. Primary legal sources consist of statutory regulations governing administrative justice and government administration, including Law Number 5 of 1986 concerning State Administrative Courts and its subsequent amendments, as well as Law Number 30 of 2014 concerning Government Administration. Secondary legal materials comprise scholarly books, peer reviewed journal articles, legal commentaries, and relevant academic studies addressing legal standing, administrative decisions, judicial review, and legal protection in administrative law. Tertiary materials include legal dictionaries, encyclopedias, and reference documents that support conceptual clarification. The selection of sources was guided by relevance to the research questions, doctrinal significance, analytical rigor, and their contribution to understanding the relationship between citizens, administrative decisions, and judicial protection. The analytical framework integrates statutory, conceptual, and case based approaches in order to assess the normative structure governing administrative disputes and the protection of citizens' rights against unlawful governmental action.

The analytical procedure was conducted through systematic legal interpretation, doctrinal examination, and comparative assessment of statutory provisions, legal principles, and judicial decisions relevant to State Administrative Decisions and administrative dispute resolution. Legal materials were categorized according to the principal themes of legal standing, the characteristics and legality of administrative decisions, preventive and repressive legal protection, and the legal consequences of administrative court judgments. The collected materials were then analyzed using descriptive analytical and prescriptive legal reasoning techniques to identify normative coherence, interpretative developments, and legal implications within the existing administrative law framework. To ensure methodological rigor, the study applied source triangulation across legislation, jurisprudence, and scholarly literature, while maintaining consistency between legal norms, judicial interpretations, and doctrinal arguments. The reliability of the analysis was strengthened through a comprehensive examination of authoritative legal sources and a transparent interpretative process designed to produce valid, coherent, and academically robust conclusions regarding the protection of citizens against administrative decisions in Indonesia.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Legal Standing of Citizens in State Administrative Disputes and the Construction of Administrative Justice

The analysis of legal standing within State Administrative Court disputes demonstrates that citizens occupy a central position as legal subjects whose rights may be directly affected by administrative decisions issued by public authorities. The normative framework of Indonesian administrative law establishes that legal standing is not derived solely from citizenship status but from the existence of a legally protected interest that suffers actual impairment due to a State Administrative Decision. This construction reflects a modern understanding of administrative justice in which judicial

protection functions as a mechanism for balancing governmental authority and individual rights (Kau, 2025). The doctrinal orientation of administrative adjudication therefore emphasizes substantive legal protection rather than procedural formalism alone.

The statutory provisions governing administrative disputes reveal that legal standing operates as a threshold requirement for judicial review and serves as a filter against abstract claims lacking a direct connection to disputed administrative actions. The requirement of a causal relationship between an administrative decision and an alleged legal injury reinforces the principle that judicial intervention must be grounded in demonstrable rights violations. Such an approach aligns with contemporary theories of administrative accountability that view courts as institutions responsible for preventing arbitrary exercises of public power (Akuna, 2025). The legal significance of standing consequently extends beyond admissibility and influences the broader architecture of administrative control.

Normative examination of Indonesian administrative law indicates that the expansion of governmental functions has simultaneously expanded the range of administrative decisions capable of affecting citizens' legal interests. The enactment of Law Number 30 of 2014 introduced a more comprehensive conception of administrative action by incorporating factual actions into the scope of administrative review. This development altered traditional boundaries of administrative disputes and enhanced judicial accessibility for individuals harmed by governmental conduct (Setiawan et al., 2024). The transformation signifies a movement toward a more responsive administrative justice system.

The legal position of citizens becomes particularly important when administrative decisions generate consequences affecting employment rights, licensing interests, property ownership, or access to public services. Judicial interpretations increasingly recognize that administrative legality must be assessed through both statutory compliance and adherence to principles of good governance. Such reasoning reflects an understanding that legal protection is inseparable from administrative accountability and procedural fairness (Gusthomi et al., 2024). The resulting framework strengthens the role of courts as guardians of lawful administration.

Comparative analysis of doctrinal sources reveals several dimensions that determine the recognition of legal standing in administrative disputes. These dimensions include the existence of direct injury, legal interest, causal connection, and the final nature of the challenged administrative decision. Their interaction forms the normative basis upon which citizens may seek judicial remedies against unlawful governmental action. Table 1 summarizes the principal elements identified through the present legal analysis.

Table 1. Normative Elements Determining Citizens' Legal Standing in Administrative Disputes

Element	Legal Meaning	Implication for Standing
Direct Injury	Actual adverse effect suffered by claimant	Establishes personal legal interest
Causal Relationship	Link between KTUN and injury	Confirms legal relevance of claim
Legal Interest	Protected right or legitimate expectation	Determines admissibility
Final Administrative Decision	Decision producing legal consequences	Creates reviewable object of dispute
Administrative Authority	Decision issued by competent official	Validates jurisdictional competence

Source: Synthesized by the author based on Law Number 5 of 1986, Law Number 30 of 2014, and doctrinal analysis from Kau (2025), Akuna (2025), and Gusthomi et al. (2024).

The analytical significance of these elements lies in their cumulative function rather than their isolated application. A claimant may demonstrate injury yet fail to establish standing if the disputed administrative act lacks finality or legal consequences. Courts frequently evaluate these components simultaneously in order to preserve procedural integrity while ensuring access to justice (Ali, 2025). Such judicial practice reflects a balancing exercise between legal certainty and rights protection.

The development of legal standing doctrine also corresponds with broader debates concerning democratic governance and administrative legitimacy. Citizens are increasingly viewed as active

participants within public law relationships rather than passive recipients of governmental decisions. This perspective encourages a rights based interpretation of administrative procedures and enhances judicial scrutiny of administrative conduct (Panjaitan et al., 2023). The legal status of citizens consequently acquires constitutional significance within administrative adjudication.

Recent legal scholarship suggests that restrictive interpretations of standing may weaken judicial oversight and reduce opportunities for correcting unlawful administrative conduct. Broader standing doctrines, however, create opportunities for greater accountability while requiring courts to maintain clear jurisdictional boundaries. The challenge lies in ensuring that accessibility does not undermine procedural discipline or generate excessive judicial intervention in administrative affairs (Labibah & Lestari, 2023). The normative structure of Indonesian administrative law attempts to reconcile these competing considerations.

Judicial practice further illustrates that legal standing is closely connected to the principle of protection against abuse of authority. Administrative decisions issued beyond lawful competence or motivated by improper considerations often become the subject of litigation initiated by affected citizens. Legal standing therefore functions not merely as a procedural requirement but also as an instrument through which governmental power becomes subject to legal scrutiny (Navisa, 2025). This relationship reinforces the preventive dimension of administrative justice.

The findings indicate that the legal status of citizens in State Administrative Court disputes rests upon a sophisticated interaction between statutory provisions, judicial interpretation, and principles of good governance. Legal standing serves as the doctrinal foundation enabling citizens to challenge administrative decisions while simultaneously legitimizing judicial control over public administration. Contemporary developments in administrative law reveal a progressive expansion of legal protection through broader recognition of reviewable governmental actions and strengthened judicial oversight (Kau, 2025). The resulting framework positions citizens as essential actors in maintaining legality, accountability, and justice within administrative governance.

Normative Foundations and Procedural Requirements for Challenging State Administrative Decisions

The normative architecture governing challenges against State Administrative Decisions is founded upon the principle that administrative authority must operate within legally defined limits and remain subject to judicial scrutiny. Indonesian administrative law recognizes that the legality of governmental action depends not only on competence and procedure but also on compliance with substantive legal standards established by legislation and principles of good governance. Law Number 30 of 2014 significantly restructured the legal framework by expanding the conception of administrative decisions and clarifying the relationship between administrative discretion and accountability (Setiawan et al., 2024). This development reflects a shift from a formalistic model of administrative legality toward a more comprehensive model of administrative responsibility.

The doctrinal examination undertaken in this study indicates that a reviewable State Administrative Decision must possess concrete, individual, and final characteristics while producing identifiable legal consequences. The requirement of concreteness ensures that judicial review addresses specific administrative acts rather than abstract governmental intentions. Individuality establishes a direct normative connection between administrative authority and the affected legal interest, while finality confirms the completion of the administrative decision making process (Ali, 2025). These cumulative characteristics function as normative safeguards that preserve the jurisdictional boundaries of administrative adjudication.

Legal consequences constitute an equally important element because administrative review is designed to address decisions that alter legal relationships, rights, obligations, or legitimate expectations. Administrative acts that fail to generate legal effects generally remain outside the scope of judicial intervention because no legally recognizable dispute emerges. The emphasis on legal consequences reflects a broader commitment to legal certainty and administrative accountability within public law governance (Akuna, 2025). Judicial review therefore focuses on administrative conduct capable of producing tangible juridical implications.

Contemporary developments in Indonesian administrative law reveal a significant expansion of reviewable administrative objects following legislative reforms and evolving judicial interpretation. Traditional administrative litigation was primarily limited to written administrative decisions issued by

competent authorities. The introduction of factual administrative actions as potential objects of dispute expanded judicial oversight over governmental conduct that previously escaped conventional review mechanisms (Cahyandari et al., 2024). This transformation strengthened normative protection against unlawful administrative practices occurring outside formal decision making processes.

The recognition of factual actions as reviewable objects demonstrates an adaptive response to the increasing complexity of administrative governance. Governmental conduct frequently generates legal consequences through actions that are not formally expressed in written decisions yet substantially affect regulated parties. Judicial acceptance of such actions reflects an effort to align administrative adjudication with contemporary administrative realities and prevent regulatory gaps within accountability mechanisms (Pasaribu et al., 2025). The doctrinal expansion simultaneously reinforces the principle that legality must govern both decisions and administrative conduct.

The evolving framework of reviewable administrative actions also encompasses positive fictitious decisions that emerge when administrative authorities fail to respond within legally prescribed periods. Such mechanisms transform administrative silence into a legally recognizable decision intended to protect applicants from bureaucratic delay and institutional inertia. The positive fictitious decision doctrine illustrates the integration of efficiency, responsiveness, and accountability within administrative governance (Kartika et al., 2025). Administrative passivity consequently becomes subject to legal consequences comparable to express administrative action.

Before judicial proceedings may commence, administrative law requires the exhaustion of administrative remedies through objection and administrative appeal procedures. These mechanisms serve corrective and preventive functions by providing governmental institutions with opportunities to reassess disputed decisions internally. The requirement reflects a preference for administrative resolution before judicial intervention while preserving procedural efficiency and institutional autonomy (Turam et al., 2024). Administrative remedies also contribute to reducing unnecessary litigation and strengthening administrative responsibility.

Table 2. Normative Classification of Reviewable State Administrative Decisions and Procedural Requirements

Category	Legal Basis	Characteristics	Judicial Consequences
Administrative Decision	Law No. 5 of 1986 and Law No. 30 of 2014	Concrete, individual, final, legally consequential	Subject to annulment and legality review
Factual Administrative Action	Law No. 30 of 2014 and Job Creation Law	Administrative conduct producing legal effects	Subject to judicial examination
Positive Fictitious Decision	Law No. 30 of 2014	Administrative silence deemed approval	Generates enforceable legal consequences
Administrative Remedy	Articles on objection and appeal procedures	Mandatory preliminary review mechanism	Condition for admissibility
Judicial Lawsuit	Administrative Court procedural law	Formal challenge before PTUN	Judicial review and legal correction

Source: Synthesized by the author based on Law Number 30 of 2014 and doctrinal analyses developed by Cahyandari et al. (2024), Kartika et al. (2025), Turam et al. (2024), Raya (2024), and Pasaribu et al. (2025).

The classification presented in Table 2 demonstrates that contemporary administrative litigation extends beyond traditional written decisions and now incorporates broader forms of governmental conduct. Each category possesses distinct legal characteristics that influence admissibility requirements and judicial assessment. The expansion of reviewable objects reflects legislative and doctrinal efforts to maintain effective oversight over evolving administrative practices (Cahyandari et al., 2024).

Normative consistency is maintained through procedural requirements designed to preserve legal certainty and jurisdictional coherence.

The admissibility of administrative litigation depends upon compliance with procedural legality requirements established by administrative procedural law. Filing deadlines, jurisdictional competence, procedural standing requirements, and prior administrative remedies collectively determine whether judicial examination may proceed. Procedural legality serves not merely as a technical requirement but as a mechanism for ensuring orderly dispute resolution and protecting institutional integrity (Raya, 2024). Courts frequently regard procedural compliance as a prerequisite for substantive legal evaluation.

Judicial review of State Administrative Decisions ultimately extends beyond formal legality and increasingly incorporates examinations of abuse of authority and compliance with principles of good governance. Administrative discretion remains legally protected only when exercised within statutory boundaries and for legitimate public purposes. Courts therefore evaluate whether administrative decisions satisfy requirements of proportionality, reasonableness, fairness, and legal certainty in addition to statutory conformity (Setiawan et al., 2024). Such review reflects an evolving conception of administrative legality that integrates procedural correctness with substantive justice.

The findings reveal that challenges against State Administrative Decisions are governed by an interconnected normative structure consisting of substantive requirements, procedural obligations, and judicial control mechanisms. The expansion of reviewable administrative objects, the institutionalization of administrative remedies, and the incorporation of good governance principles illustrate a progressive development of Indonesian administrative law. Contemporary judicial review no longer concentrates exclusively on formal administrative decisions but increasingly addresses broader manifestations of public authority that affect legal interests (Pasaribu et al., 2025). This framework strengthens administrative accountability while preserving procedural discipline and legal certainty within the administrative justice system.

Judicial Protection and the Legal Consequences of Administrative Court Decisions

Normative analysis demonstrates that legal protection against unlawful administrative action operates through a dual framework consisting of preventive and repressive mechanisms. Preventive protection seeks to minimize potential rights violations before disputes escalate into judicial proceedings, while repressive protection functions through adjudicative intervention after legal harm has occurred. Administrative law scholarship increasingly recognizes that effective protection depends not only on the availability of remedies but also on the institutional capacity to ensure governmental accountability (Effendi & Arfendi, 2026). This perspective places administrative justice within a broader governance framework that links legality, accountability, and public trust.

Preventive legal protection reflects the obligation of public authorities to review administrative conduct before adverse consequences become irreversible. Administrative objections and administrative appeals provide opportunities for governmental correction and encourage decision makers to reassess legal and factual considerations. The normative rationale underlying these mechanisms is closely associated with principles of good governance and responsible public administration (Susanti et al., 2026). Legal literature indicates that preventive protection contributes to institutional learning because administrative bodies are encouraged to address procedural and substantive deficiencies internally before judicial intervention becomes necessary.

The effectiveness of preventive protection is also connected to the quality of administrative accountability mechanisms embedded within government institutions. Accountability operates as a control instrument that requires public officials to justify decisions affecting individual rights and public interests. Studies examining administrative governance emphasize that accountability obligations strengthen transparency and reduce the likelihood of arbitrary decision making (Rosidi et al., 2025). Such accountability mechanisms reinforce the preventive dimension of legal protection because they encourage legal compliance at the earliest stages of administrative action.

Repressive legal protection emerges when administrative disputes require independent judicial assessment. Within the Indonesian administrative justice system, the State Administrative Court serves as a mechanism for reviewing governmental decisions and restoring legality where violations have occurred. Judicial review functions as an external control mechanism capable of evaluating both procedural compliance and substantive legality of administrative conduct (Susanti et al., 2026). This

institutional arrangement reflects the principle that public authority remains subject to legal scrutiny regardless of administrative discretion.

The normative structure of legal protection becomes more visible when different forms of remedies and legal consequences are examined systematically. Legal doctrine distinguishes between preventive measures, judicial protection, and post judgment remedies because each serves a distinct function within administrative dispute resolution. The comparative classification presented in Table 3 illustrates how various legal mechanisms are connected to specific legal outcomes. These distinctions clarify the relationship between administrative accountability and judicial enforcement within the Indonesian administrative law framework.

Table 3. Forms of Legal Protection and Legal Consequences of Administrative Court Judgments

Form of Protection	Legal Mechanism	Expected Outcome
Preventive Protection	Internal administrative supervision and legal review	Reduction of unlawful administrative action
Administrative Objection	Review by issuing authority	Correction or modification of disputed decision
Administrative Appeal	Review by superior administrative authority	Administrative reconsideration and accountability
Judicial Protection	Litigation before the State Administrative Court	Independent legality review
Rehabilitation	Judicial order restoring legal status	Recovery of affected rights
Compensation	Judicial award for proven losses	Material legal redress
Annulment of KTUN	Judicial declaration of invalidity	Removal of unlawful legal effects
Execution of Judgment	Enforcement of court decision	Compliance and legal certainty

Source: Adapted from Effendi and Arfendi (2026), Susanti et al. (2026), Herlambang et al. (2025), and Masnun and Hidayatullah (2026).

The classification presented in Table 3 indicates that legal protection extends beyond dispute resolution and encompasses restoration of legal order. Judicial intervention is designed not merely to identify illegality but also to provide remedies capable of correcting administrative consequences. Legal scholarship emphasizes that administrative justice achieves legitimacy when remedies effectively address the practical impact of unlawful governmental action (Effendi & Arfendi, 2026). The relationship between remedy and enforcement therefore becomes a central element of administrative protection.

One significant legal consequence of a successful administrative lawsuit is the cancellation or invalidation of a disputed administrative decision. Judicial declarations of invalidity eliminate the legal force of administrative acts that conflict with statutory provisions, principles of good governance, or established legal standards. Research concerning administrative legality confirms that annulment functions as a corrective instrument intended to restore normative consistency within public administration (Rosidi et al., 2025). The remedial value of annulment lies in its ability to remove legal effects generated by unlawful governmental conduct.

Judicial protection also encompasses rehabilitation and compensation as mechanisms for restoring rights adversely affected by administrative action. Rehabilitation is particularly important when unlawful decisions alter an individual's legal status, employment position, licensing rights, or other protected interests. Compensation serves a complementary role by addressing measurable losses arising from administrative misconduct or legal violations (Effendi & Arfendi, 2026). Together these remedies demonstrate that administrative justice is concerned with substantive restoration rather than formal legality alone.

The practical effectiveness of judicial protection depends heavily on the execution of court judgments. Although administrative courts possess executorial authority, implementation frequently

encounters obstacles related to institutional compliance and bureaucratic resistance. Studies examining administrative enforcement reveal that delayed implementation remains a recurring challenge despite the existence of binding judicial orders (Aufa & Widodo, 2025). Similar concerns are reflected in analyses of administrative disputes involving land certificates, employment decisions, and governmental licensing where execution often becomes the most contested stage of legal protection (Sahputra, 2025; Simanjutak & Sitompul, 2025).

The final dimension of legal protection concerns legal certainty and the reinforcement of good governance principles through judicial authority. The doctrine of *erga omnes* strengthens the broader legal significance of administrative judgments because court decisions contribute to the interpretation of legality beyond the immediate parties involved (Masnun & Hidayatullah, 2026). Judicial decisions addressing administrative permits, governmental decrees, and public authority disputes illustrate how courts shape standards of accountable governance and lawful administration (Saragih & Erliyana, 2024; Suwardi & Leba, 2025). Administrative courts consequently perform not only a dispute resolution function but also a constitutional role in preserving public trust and ensuring that governmental power remains subject to law (Herlambang et al., 2025).

CONCLUSION

The study confirms that citizens occupy a legally recognized position as rights holders within the framework of administrative justice and may challenge State Administrative Decisions that directly affect their legally protected interests. The normative structure established by Law Number 5 of 1986 concerning State Administrative Courts and Law Number 30 of 2014 concerning Government Administration provides a comprehensive basis for reviewing administrative decisions through legality review, assessment of abuse of authority, and examination of compliance with the General Principles of Good Governance. Contemporary developments in Indonesian administrative law have expanded the scope of reviewable administrative conduct beyond conventional written decisions by incorporating factual administrative actions and positive fictitious decisions, thereby strengthening judicial oversight of governmental power. Legal protection is realized through preventive mechanisms that encourage administrative accountability and through judicial remedies that enable citizens to obtain effective review before the Administrative Court. Administrative Court judgments generate significant legal consequences, including the annulment or invalidation of unlawful decisions, rehabilitation of affected legal status, compensation for losses, and restoration of infringed rights. The effectiveness of these protections ultimately depends on the enforceability of court judgments, the observance of the *erga omnes* principle, and institutional commitment to good governance. A coherent relationship between administrative accountability, judicial control, and legal certainty remains essential for safeguarding citizens against unlawful administrative action and for reinforcing the rule of law within the Indonesian administrative system.

REFERENCES

- Akuna, S. (2025). The Role of the State Administrative Court as a Control Mechanism Over Government Administration. *Estudiante Law Journal*, 7(2), 297-316. <https://doi.org/10.33756/eslaj.v7i2.31024>
- Ali, S. (2025). Juridical Analysis of the Position of PTUN in Resolving State Administrative Disputes. *Estudiante Law Journal*, 7(2), 317-330. <https://doi.org/10.33756/eslaj.v7i2.31026>
- Aufa, M. F., & Widodo, A. B. (2025). Analysis of Obstacles to Resolving Civil Service Disputes at the Yogyakarta Administrative Court. *Strata Law Review*, 3(2), 91-101. <https://doi.org/10.59631/slr.v3i2.406>
- Cahyandari, D., Ayub, Z. A., Pratama, L., & Sudjati, X. Q. D. (2024). Factual Actions as Objects of State Administrative Disputes in State Administrative Courts Following the Issuance of the Job Creation Law. *Arena Hukum*, 17(1), 82-94. <https://doi.org/10.21776/ub.arenahukum.2024.01701.5>
- Effendi, A., & Arfendi, M. F. (2026). Perlindungan Hukum bagi Masyarakat terhadap Keputusan Tata Usaha Negara yang Merugikan. *Mamba'ul'Ulum*, 134-148. <https://doi.org/10.54090/mu.1106>
- Gusthomi, M. I., Rinaldi, F. A., & Setiani, M. D. (2024). The Role of PTUN Procedural Law in Protecting Citizens' Rights Against Decisions of State Administrative Officials. *Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan*, 41(2), 89-93. <https://doi.org/10.15294/rqtn0158>

- 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. <https://doi.org/10.15294/lsr.v5i2.30657>
- Kartika, E. D., Laitupa, S., Fitriah, M. A., & Ansar, N. S. (2025). Administrative Accountability in Positive Fictitious State Administrative Decisions and the Protection of Applicants' Rights in Environmental Licensing. *Journal of Law, Politic and Humanities*, 6(1), 515-525. <https://doi.org/10.38035/jlph.v6i1.2559>
- Kau, P. (2025). The Role of the Administrative Court in Protecting Citizens' Rights from Harmful Administrative Actions. *Estudiante Law Journal*, 7(2), 331-343. <https://doi.org/10.33756/eslaj.v7i2.31023>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.28926/jdr.v7i2.343>
- Masnun, M. A., & Hidayatullah, F. (2026). The Principle of Erga Omnes and Legal Certainty in the Execution of Administrative Court Decisions. *Indonesian Journal of Administrative Law and Local Government*, 3(1), 1-23. <https://doi.org/10.26740/ijalgov.v3i1.50567>
- Navisa, F. D. (2025). Enforcement of State Administrative Law Against Abuse of Authority by Officials In the Acts of Corruption. *AL WASATH Jurnal Ilmu Hukum*, 6(2), 83-94. <https://doi.org/10.47776/alwasath.v6i2/1660>
- Panjaitan, B., Mashdurohatun, A., & Kusriyah, S. (2023). Regulation on the Authority to Address the Determination of Village Head Election Results as the Object of State Administrative Disputes Has Not Been Based on Justice Value. *Journal of Social Research*, 2(5), 1477-1488. <https://doi.org/10.55324/josr.v2i5.828>
- Pasaribu, D., Silalahi, I. C., & Purba, S. (2025). Cumulation of Lawsuits Between Administrative Decisions and Factual Actions in Administrative Court Decisions. *Jurnal Hukum dan Peradilan*, 14(2), 459-494. <https://doi.org/10.25216/jhp.14.2.2025.459-494>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.59188/devotion.v5i9.790>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.23917/profetika.v26i02.12212>
- Sahputra, R. (2025). Juridical Analysis of Strengthening the Decision of the Administrative Court by PT TUN Jakarta in the Dispute Over the Cancellation of HGB Certificate No. 1444/Kebon Kelapa (Decision Study Number 243/B/2025/PT. TUN. JKT). *International Asia Of Law and Money Laundering (IAML)*, 4(4), 101-107. <https://doi.org/10.59712/iaml.v4i4.142>
- Saragih, Y. N. G., & Erliyana, A. (2024). The Role and Function of the Administrative Court in Resolving Disputes Over Permits for Places of Worship. *JHSS (JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL STUDIES)*, 3(1), 014-020. <https://doi.org/10.33751/jhss.v8i1.8404>
- Setiawan, H., Alâ, M., & Munif, W. (2024). Some Commentary Notes On Law Number 30 Of 2014 Concerning Government Administration. *Simbur Cahaya*, 270-291. <https://doi.org/10.28946/sc.v3i1i2.3939>
- Simanjutak, M. H., & Sitompul, M. N. (2025). Juridical Analysis of Strengthening the Decision of the Administrative Court by PT TUN Jakarta in the Dispute over the Cancellation of HGB Certificate No. 1444/Kebon Kelapa (Decision Study Number 243/B/2025/PT. TUN. JKT). *International Asia Of Law and Money Laundering (IAML)*, 4(3), 74-81. <https://doi.org/10.59712/iaml.v4i3.138>
- Susanti, R., Ashari, Z., Ramdani, A., Hasibuan, N. S., Kresna, T., & Alamsyah, T. (2026). A Legal Analysis of Citizens' Legal Protection Against Adverse Administrative Decisions from the Perspective of Administrative Courts. *Anthroposia: Journal of Social and Human Development*, 1(2), 64-74. <https://doi.org/10.65310/9vf5mf29>
- Suwardi, S., & Leba, J. L. (2025). A Legal Analysis of Judges' Decisions as a Result of the Law Decree of the TNI Commander (Case Study of Surabaya PTUN Decision No. 124/G/2014/PTUN. SBY). *Enrichment: Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Development*, 2(11), 1312-1319. <https://doi.org/10.55324/enrichment.v2i11.290>

- Turam, S. R., Ahmad, A., Maimun, A. Y., & Akbar, M. R. A. (2024). Administrative Efforts as a Prerequisite for a Lawsuit at the State Administrative Court. *Indonesian Journal of Law and Policy Studies*, 5(2), 86-92. <https://doi.org/10.31000/ijlp.v5i2.15961>