INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS
ISSN(print): 2643-9840, ISSN(online): 2643-9875
Volume 06 Issue 03 March 2023
DOI: 10.47191/ijmra/v6-i3-29, Impact Factor: 7.022
Page No. 1087-1092

Rechtsvacuum in Execution of Administrative Sanctions and Forced Penalty Decisions and Implications of Settlement Personnel Disputes

Eka Deviani[1], Marlia Eka Putri AT[2], Daffa Ladro Kusworo[3]
[1,2,3]Law Faculty of Lampung University, Indonesia

ABSTRACT: The problem that occurs next is that not many TUN Courts have handed down dwangsom in decisions to strengthen the executable decision, as a result of implementing regulations for coercive measures that are not yet available.Under Government Regulation (PP) Number 43 of 1991 concerning Compensation and Processes for its Implementation in the State Administrative Court, Article 117 of Law No. 51 of 2009 is implemented by the regulation specified in that regulation. The two main rules of the PP are compensation and compensation. Because forced money (dwangsom) is distinct from compensation or compensation, from a legal standpoint, the PP still does not take into account the laws on forced money techniques. The term "legal vacuum" (rechtsvacuum) refers to a situation where some things have not been covered by positive legislation, given that the law itself cannot address all facets of life that are constantly evolving.The methodology taken in this text is juridical-normative, or based on legal material and looking at concepts, theories, legal principles, and statutory rules. The study's findings indicate that there are varying and mutually counterproductive norms regarding the quantity of forced money to be paid, the kinds of administrative sanctions to be applied, and the methods for carrying them out, along with transfers of positions and the filling of the Plaintiff's positions by other people, all of which delay the administration of justice.

KEYWORDS: Administrative Sanctions, Execution, Forced Money

I. INTRODUCTION

Execution in the decision of the State Administrative Court becomes part of the implementation of a decision through the assistance of other parties who are not part of the litigants. Of course, the execution can only be carried out if the status of the decision has permanent legal force (BHT) as stated in Article 116 of Law No. 51 of 2009 concerning the Second Amendment to Law no. 5 of 1986 concerning the State Administrative Court (UU Peratun). The need for execution is interpreted if the decision handed down has a consideration in granting all or part of a lawsuit that is binding for each person in the case and the community (erga omnes) accompanied by the burden of obligations that must be carried out by the defendant immediately.(Sari & Wibowo, 2023) This has relevance between the level of public compliance and the authority of the State Administrative Court, where decisions carried out by state administrative bodies or officials properly, the authority of the Administrative Court will also be good. However, TUN officials often neglect the matters governed in decisions by exceeding the deadline, namely 90 working days. although in essence not all classifications of types of PTUN decisions can be executed, for example for an injunction contained in a decision that renders invalid or the cancellation of the State Administrative Decision (KTUN) but is not accompanied by a specific obligation to revoke or provide rehabilitation to the defendant or compensation, then no need for execution. Only the nature of a condemnatory decision, or one that contains an order to the losing party, can be executed, while a decision that refers to its declaratory or constitutive nature does not require execution because it applies automatically.(Badriyah Khaleed, 2018)

The means of execution which are part of the State Administrative Court Procedural Laws function as a coercive measure for the party that has suffered a defeat to immediately carry out the decision contained in the verdict in accordance with the specified time. the demand for execution, which only comes into play in sentencing judgments. Yet, it is frequently discovered that the choice cannot be executed precisely or at all for a variety of reasons. This indicates that the decision's quality is poor in that it cannot be implemented at all because doing so is impossible.(Undang Undang Nomor 5 Tahun 1986 Tentang Peradilan Tata Usaha Negara (Lembaran Negara Tahun 1986 Nomor 77, Tambahan Lembaran Negara Nomor 3344)) For instance, forcing the

defendant to act in accordance with Article 97 of the Law on State Administrative Court while, in reality, this was outside of the defendant's authority. For instance, the lurah is compelled to issue land ownership certificates despite the fact that this is plainly beyond his scope of authority. After the ruling has been given final, binding effect, the situation has changed. In a workplace dispute, for instance, the Plaintiff must be reinstated in his prior position, but it turns out that this post has already been filled. For instance, it may turn out that the defendant's authority has been transferred to another official, making it difficult for him to comply with a court order because he is no longer allowed. The punishments imposed, particularly for employment disputes, are not significantly different from those imposed when Article 116 of the Administrative Court Law's process is used. Only that after the decision was made or after it was given permanent legal standing, changes in the situation were discovered that affected how it was implemented. Based on these modifications, the actions taken to carry out the Plaintiff's rehabilitation will make use of the mechanism provided forth in Article 117 of the Administrative Court Code, namely the settlement mechanism through the Head of the Court in question to arbitrate the determination of compensation. According to Article 117 paragraph (1) of the Administrative Court Code and Article 116 paragraph (1), the head of the court in question is the head of the first level court (PTUN).

Case number 23/G/2018/PTUN.PDG, in which the decision granted and included the Defendant's (West Pasaman Regent) obligation to restore the Plaintiff's rights (rehabilitation), including one of which is by returning the Plaintiff to his original position, is an actual illustration of the difficulty in carrying out a staffing dispute decision (as Regional Secretary of West Pasaman Regency). Because another individual has already been lawfully appointed to the office, it will be challenging to implement the a quo ruling. Article 116 of the State Administrative Court Law, which has a floating nature, is the issue with the legal content of the execution of state administrative court rulings (floating norm). In addition to the issue with norms, there are court judgments that, as was said in the preceding section, cannot be implemented (are non-executable). Based on the nature of each issue, both of these difficulties need to be given different care. Article 116 of the State Administrative Court Law is a "floating standard" because, in practice, the court chairman just acts as a supervisor and does not actually carry out the actual implementation (vide Article 119 of the Law on State Administrative Court). The third issue is that, as a result of adopting regulations for coercive measures that are not yet available, not many TUN Courts have issued dwangsom in decisions to enhance the executable decision. What exists is the Government Regulation (PP) Number 43 of 1991 concerning Compensation and Processes for its Implementation in the State Administrative Court, which implements Article 117 of the Administrative Court Law (Compensation for Civil Service Rehabilitation that cannot be Implemented). The two main rules of the PP are compensation and compensation. Because forced money (dwangsom) is distinct from compensation or other forms of remuneration from a legal standpoint, the PP still does not include any rules on forced money mechanisms.

II. METHODS

The methodology used in this writing is juridical-normative, or based on legal material, and it involves looking at literature that is relevant to the topic of writing as well as concepts, theories, and legal and legislative principles. In this instance, the explanation of the execution of state administrative court rulings is supported by all relevant legal sources. Law No. 30 of 2014 Concerning Government Administration (UU AP) and its implementing regulations as well as Law No. 5 of 1986 Concerning the State Administrative Court as most recently amended by Law No. 51 of 2009 Concerning the Second Amendment to Law No. 5 of 1986 Concerning the State Administrative Court are used as primary legal sources in this paper's discussion (State Administrative Court Law). The secondary legal texts studied include legal works on administrative law, legal theory, and state administrative justice procedural law.(Ali, 2021)

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Execution of Administrative Sanctions Decisions and State Administrative Court Coercion

According to the provisions of Article 116 Paragraphs (3) and (4) of Law Number 9 of 2004, if a TUN Officer is ordered by a court to fulfill the obligation to issue a KTUN but three months later the obligation is still unfulfilled, the plaintiff may submit a request to the appropriate Head of Court asking that the Court order the execution of the decision. The official in question may be subject to compelled measures, such as the forced payment of money and/or administrative punishment, if the defendant still refuses to comply with the court's order. In addition to sanctions in the form of forced payment of money as mentioned above, the imposition of sanctions can also be in the form of administrative sanctions. The essence of administrative sanctions is the exercise of government power by government organs without having to go through the judicial process as an instrument of administrative law enforcement. Pilpus M. Hadjon further explained:

Rechtsvacuum in Execution of Administrative Sanctions and Forced Penalty Decisions and Implications of Settlement Personnel Disputes

a. Real coercion (bestuursdwang); Real coercion is defined as a real action to move, empty, obstruct, repair in its original condition what is being done or has been done which is contrary to the obligations determined by laws and regulations.
b. Forced money, sometimes known as "dwangsom," is enforced as a substitute to actual compulsion.
c. Administrative fines are more "condemnatoir" in nature than "reparatoir," according to this definition. there are rules for the maximum fine that may be imposed.
d. Revocation of favorable State Administrative Decisions is a sanction related to the power to stipulate State Administrative Decisions. It is a form of administrative action. The revocation functions as a sanction and can be either reparatory or condemnatory.
e. Bail; Security deposit for a positive judgment, such as permits. A security deposit may be required in order to obtain a permit, and if those criteria are not satisfied, the security deposit is deemed forfeited. associated with a successful outcome (granting permission for example). The security deposit is "condemnatoir," which is associated with coercion, reparatoir, which is preventive in character, and reparatoir, which is associated with reimbursement for losses.
f. Additional or special forms; Additional or special administrative punishments, such as warnings or disclosing the offender's name. It can be argued that administrative sanctions are tools of administrative law enforcement used by organs of government officials in carrying out government functions (executive), as the implementation of legislation in the field of administrative law without having to go through the judicial process, after taking into account the nature of the six types of administrative sanctions listed above (parate executie).(Wiyono, 2019)

The technical execution of decisions in the form of the imposition of administrative sanctions is, in reality, carried out by government officials or entities that have the ability to do so in accordance with statutory requirements because the TUN Court's authority only performs a judicial role (basic regulations). The provisions of Article 116 paragraph (4) of Law Number 9 of 2004 provide a mechanism for carrying out the State Administrative Court's decision in the form of coercive measures, such as the payment of a forced amount of money, and/or administrative sanctions against the defendant. This is true for dwangsom, also known as forced money (administrative official). State Businesses) that fail to follow the requirements of Article 97, subsections b and c when implementing State Administrative Court judgements. In contrast, the provisions of Article 116 paragraph (4) of Law Number 9 of 2004 provide a mechanism for carrying out the decision of the State Administrative Court through coercive measures such as payment of a forced amount of money and/or administrative sanctions against the defendant. This is known as dwangsom, or forced money (administrative official). State Businesses) that fail to comply with Article 97 Subsections B and C and implement State Administrative Court judgements.(Putra, 2021)

One could argue that the use of forced money under the idea of administrative law is a sort of administrative sanction used by government organs or officials as an alternative to real coercion (bestuursdwang) in carrying out their duties. The legal purpose of these sanctions, which were imposed directly without a court order, is "reparatoir," which means that they are meant to stop future harm or loss while also restoring the situation to how it was before. The clarification of Law Number 9 of 2004's Article 116 Paragraph (4) emphasizes that the imposition in the form of payment of an amount of forced money determined by the Judge because of his position stated in the verdict on when deciding to grant the plaintiff's claim is what is meant by "The official concerned is subject to forced money" in this provision. From this clause, it can be concluded that the Administrative Court Judge has the power, as a result of his position, to decide whether to order State Administrative Officials who refuse to follow the State Administrative Court's judgment to make a forced payment of money (dwangsom).(Pratama et al., 2020)

According to Article 116 paragraphs (3) and (4) of Law 51/2009, "dwangsom" is interpreted strictly as the amount of money given if the defendant is unwilling to carry out the decision (as an assurance that the decision is carried out). Dwangsom is also recognized as a coercive measure in civil law, namely under Articles 606a and 606b of the Regulation op de Rechtsvordening (RV). Judge cannot, in theory, decline to hear the Plaintiff's dwangsom claim on the basis that there are no specific dwangsom provisions in the applicable statutes. Although there are general guidelines for dwangsom, few TUN court justices have imposed forced payment or dwangsom penalty orders, which would strengthen the decision's executability. Since that there is no method for imposing forced money, Article 116(4) of the Administrative Court Law does not provide a solid legal foundation for imposing forced money in the case of forced execution. The decision Number 15/G/2017/PTUN.SMD, which deals with a labor dispute, serves as an illustration of a Plaintiff's claim for compelled money that the TUN court refused. In his petition, the plaintiff asked the judges to impose a second sentence (assesoir) in the form of dwangsom.Basically, dwangsom function is not for replaces the principal sentence of a real execution decision. But as a psychological punishment because The defendant neglected to carry out the contents of the court decision thereby causing harm to the Plaintiff.(D. Pattipawae & Salmon, 2022)

2. Implementation of the Authority of the Metro City National Land Agency for Defects in the Substance of Land Ownership Certificates

Article 116 of the Administrative Court Code contains provisions for the execution or application of TUN court judgments. The implementation of rulings based on Article 117 of the Administrative Court Code do have one particular, though. The specification in question states that the Defendant must notify the Chief Judge of the first instance of any difficulties encountered in carrying out the decision in order to begin the process of assessing compensation. According to the provisions of Article 117, paragraph 1, of the Administrative Court Law, the Defendant is required to inform the head Court and the Plaintiff if the judgment cannot be implemented because of a change after it has been made. Even yet, in line with Article 116, paragraph 4, of the Second Amendment to the Administrative Court Law (UU 51/2009), the Defendant in the employment dispute judgment may be subject to coercive measures if his party refuses to implement the BHT decision. This was put into effect with the caveat that the Chief Justice would not be notified if the defendant had difficulties or complications during the execution. The challenges facing the staffing industry in question include; the court's decision cannot be carried out by the Defendant because he is no longer authorized due to either of the following circumstances: 1. The official who issued the subject of the dispute has transferred authority to another person, making it impossible for him to do so; or 2. The position/position mentioned in the decision has been filled by someone else, making it impossible for the Plaintiff to be reinstated in it. Hence, the next mechanism is the implementation of coercive measures (administrative sanctions and/or forced money (dwangsom)), if the Defendant does not notify the Chief Judge as required by Article 117 paragraph (1) of the Administrative Court Code and does not carry out the judgment. The laws concerning the method for applying dwangsom and administrative punishments, however, are merely attempts.(D. R. Pattipawae, 2019)

When a TUN court ruling is not followed by TUN authorities, judges typically do not dare to use coercion in the form of dwangsom. The judges relied on the plaintiffs' petitum, which unintentionally omitted a dwangsom, in addition to the absence of comprehensive and explicit guidelines regulating the dwangsom system. The judges did not dare to utilize the dwangsom as a means of forcing execution because the petitum did not contain a dwangsom request. Dwangsom thus becomes a punishment that is only referenced in the regulations themselves and cannot be derived in actual practice (inconcrete).

Indeed, there is no statute that specifically addresses compelled money. As a result, when the court takes coercive measures, it is only based on Article 116, Paragraph 4, of the Administrative Court Code as the primary rule, and lacks any other justification for doing so. The State Administrative Chamber/G.4/SEMA 7 2012, which is based on SEMA No.7 of 2012, regulates this provision. The formulation of the TUN chamber for the imposition of dwangsom indicates that dwangsom can be imposed depending on the petitum of the Plaintiff's case. While coercive methods still need additional regulations, such as how to enforce administrative punishments on coercive measures, there is only one regulatory mechanism in place at this time—the imposition of dwangsom. Therefore the author uses the Rechtsverfijning legal construction method to determine specifically how the arrangements are at least regulated by the government so that coercive measures have provisions for their implementation in accordance with Article 116 paragraph (7) of the Administrative Court Law.(Simanjuntak, 2014)

Rechtsverfijning, often known as "legal narrowing," is the refinement or narrowing of the law's general norms by defining more precise qualities to help people understand what a law regulates. Giving notions that are still often used in law particular qualities is known as rechtsverfijning. Moreover, it is done by adding exclusions to how the relevant statute is applied. The type of administrative sanctions that support coercive measures are still not regulated in this discussion's example of coercion under Article 116 paragraph (4) jo. paragraph (7); or what is the specific conception related to the implementation of forced money, keeping in mind that forced money cannot be equated with compensation and compensation (stand alone).

Regarding Article 116 of the Law on State Administrative Court, which is of a floating nature, the issue of the legal substance of the execution of the state administrative court decision exists (floating norm). In addition to the issue with norms, there are court judgments that, as was said in the preceding section, cannot be implemented (are non-executable). Based on the nature of each issue, both of these difficulties need to be given different care. Article 116 of the State Administrative Court Law is a "floating standard" because, in practice, the court chairman just acts as a supervisor and does not actually carry out the actual implementation (vide Article 119 of the Law on State Administrative Court).(Undang Undang Nomor 30 Tahun 2014 Tentang Administrasi Pemerintahan (Lembaran Negara Tahun 2014 Nomor 292, Tambahan Lembaran Negara No. 5601))

In fact, the means of coercion for the implementation of court decisions were instead handed over to government officials. The tools or instruments of coercion to enforce court decisions based on Article 116 of the Law on State Administrative Court are administrative sanctions and forced money (dwangsom). The same thing is then also regulated in Article 72 paragraph (1), Article 80 paragraph (2), and Article 81 paragraph (2) of Law No. 30 of 2014 concerning Government Administration (UU AP).

Rechtsvacuum in Execution of Administrative Sanctions and Forced Penalty Decisions and Implications of Settlement Personnel Disputes

These are sanctions imposed on government officials who have violated administrative laws, as defined by Government Regulation (PP) Number 48 of 2016 Governing Processes for Implementing Administrative Sanctions on Government Officials. The adoption of PP 48/2016 as a lex specialist of the Administrative Court Law and Law No. 30/2014, as well as an enlargement of the administrative punishments provisions from the AP Law (UU AP). Because the AP Law has not yet defined administrative sanctions, it is important to keep in mind that there are certain variations between forced effort administrative punishments under the Administrative Court Law and general administrative sanctions under PP 48/2016.

a. Administrative sanctions are those imposed after a decision has been made and their implementation is directed at TUN officials (Defendant) who do not carry out the decision, as stated in Article 116, paragraph 4, of the Administrative Court Code (as a forced measure according to the Administrative Court Law).
b. Although PP 48/2016 states that administrative sanctions are often enforced on public servants who violate administrative laws, the imposition does not occur through the courts (before filing a lawsuit). This study uses administrative sanctions of coercive measures, not administrative sanctions generally, as a result of these distinctions.

Yet, it turns out that there are substantial discrepancies between the AP Law and the TUN Judiciary Law at the normative level with regard to the use of administrative punishments and forced money as tools of coercion for carrying out court orders. One of these is that administrative sanctions are interpreted to include forced money in the AP Law, whereas forced money and administrative punishments are distinguished in the TUN Judicial Law. In addition, the TUN Judicial Law interprets forced money as the Plaintiff's right if the decision has not been implemented, as opposed to the AP Law, which only interprets forced money as a security deposit that will be returned to the Defendant if the judgement is carried out (vide Article 116 of the TUN Judicial Law). Although these two contradictory conventions are still in effect at this time, this might lead to confusion in daily life. Government Regulation (PP) No. 48 of 2016 Governing Processes for Applying Administrative Sanctions on Government Employees currently governs the use of administrative penalties as a means of carrying out court orders. It's just that Article 35 of the PP regulates an objection mechanism for administrative sanctions to the Administrative Court with a request to determine whether or not there is an element of abuse of authority, so this regulation is counterproductive for the purpose of imposing administrative sanctions.

There are three issues with Article 35 PP No. 48 of 2016: • The imposition of administrative sanctions based on the execution of a court decision cannot become the subject of a dispute in the state administrative court because it is prohibited by Article 2 letter e of the Law on State Administrative Court (in Law No. 51 of 2009) A request for an evaluation of the components of abuse of power, based on Article 21 of the AP Law Jo, is the method mentioned in Article 35 of PP No. 48 of 2016. It is not the intention of Supreme Court Regulation No. 4 of 2015 to contest the implementation of administrative sanctions. If the objection does not seek administrative punishment from the implementation of the court's judgment, then the State Administrative Court should be contacted using the regular litigation process rather than asking for evidence of abuse of power. Because Article 21 of the AP Law must be viewed in conjunction with Articles 17 to 20, which are meant to address decisions and/or acts that result in state losses as a result of official or personal error, and article 24A paragraph (5) of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia (1945 Constitution) stipulates that the procedural law of the Supreme Court and judicial bodies under it must be regulated in law, so that the regulation of court authority through government regulations is not justified. So based on these three arguments, Article 35 PP No. 48 of 2016 cannot be implemented.

Determining the legal construction of the type of administrative sanction turns out to cause new problems. In the field of staffing, after the TUN Officer is subject to severe administrative sanctions as a coercive measure, the official does not have the authority to return the Plaintiff to his original position, revoke the KTUN which is the object of the dispute and rehabilitate the Plaintiff by returning the Plaintiff to his original position. Considering that severe administrative sanctions are only related to permanent dismissal so when the Defendant is dismissed, can the Defendant still be able to execute, will the decision be abandoned after the forced administrative sanction is imposed.

Due to the conceptual difference, the imposition in this situation can be specific (separated) from the provisions of Article 7 letter d PP Number 48/2016 in order to fill the legal void of coercive administrative punishments. According to the article a quo, the TUN Officer must make a decision and carry it out; however, if the TUN Officer (Defendant) does not do so after 90 working days, compulsory measures are meant as an administrative consequence. According to Government Regulation Number 48 of 2016 concerning Procedures for Imposing Administrative Sanctions on Government Officials, administrative sanction types are typically divided into three categories: light administrative sanctions, moderate administrative sanctions, and severe administrative sanctions. The design of any future administrative consequences for TUN officials who choose not to implement a court order that is legally binding will still be seen as the Defendant's arbitrary acts since they choose not to implement the order. (By way of 2021) Arbitrary actions by TUN officials are subject to severe administrative sanctions, according to Article 17 jo. Article 80 paragraph (3) of Law No. 30/2014 Governing Government Administration (UU AP).

Rechtsvacuum in Execution of Administrative Sanctions and Forced Penalty Decisions and Implications of Settlement Personnel Disputes

Another option for the government to specify a special administrative sanction for an official who refuses to carry out a decision may be subject to disciplinary punishment in the form of recurrent postponement of the Defendant's allowances for 1 (one) month, so long as the Defendant still refuses to carry out the decision. In the event that the defendant is still unwilling to comply the following month, the sanction will remain in place, postponing payment of the defendant's allowance for an additional month. This concept is predicated on the idea that the decision cannot simply be reversed and that the Defendant must bear responsibility (government accountability). Because the basic income is a requirement for all government employees and civil servants, it is not possible to withhold the Defendant's basic salary, hence benefits owned by the Defendant are withheld rather than the basic salary. Hence, withholding the Defendant's allowance for one month at a time is the legal interpretation of this kind of coercive administrative discipline. In essence, coercion was used to get the defendant to agree to follow the decision. If coercion is used, it does not prohibit the defendant from carrying out the decision, nullifies the main penalty, and cannot take the place of the decision.

CONCLUSIONS

In essence, the Administrative Court Law already provides a mechanism for coercive measures related to the execution of the TUN Court's decision, as in Article 116 paragraph (4). However, the content of the a quo article still contains gaps. For example regarding the provision of forced money (dwangsom) which is imposed if the Defendant does not execute the decision by the deadline of 90 (ninety) working days. There is no regulation pertaining to the forced money, therefore it is unclear how much the nominal must be paid, who the institution or agency is that handles sanctions, or whether the forced money is paid from private or public property. Also, the classification of administrative sanctions, which up to now has been said to be obvious, has not yet been determined for administrative sanctions. Through the rechtsverfining method, the government can take 2 alternatives to overcome the problem of the legal vacuum of coercive measures, namely by. Regulating procedures for implementing forced measures in a new legal product; or and Updating existing legal products. For example, PP No. 48/2016 was updated by including the types of forced administrative sanctions and the procedures for implementing them. Or renewal of PP No. 43/1991 stated nominal provisions to the procedure for paying dwangsom. Considering that the two PPs still do not explicitly regulate the forced effort referred to in Article 116 paragraph (7) of the Administrative Court Law

REFERENCES

1) Ali, Z. (2021). *Metode Penelitian Hukum* (L. Wulandari (ed.)). Sinar Grafika.
2) Badriyah Khaleed, S. H. (2018). *Mekanisme Pengadilan Tata Usaha Negara (PTUN)*. Media Pressindo.
3) Pattipawae, D. R. (2019). Pelaksanaan Eksekusi Putusan Pengadilan Tata Usaha Negara Di Era Otonomi. *Sasi*, *25*(1).
4) Pattipawae, D., & Salmon, H. (2022). Penerapan Uang Paksa (Dwangsom) Dalam Eksekusi Putusan Tatausaha Negara Terhadap Ketidakpatuhan Pejabat Tun. *Community Development Journal: Jurnal Pengabdian Masyarakat*, *3*(3).
5) Pratama, I. W. D. C., Dewi, A. A. S. L., & Suryani, L. P. (2020). Upaya Paksa terhadap Pejabat yang Tidak Melakukan Putusan Pengadilan Tata Usaha Negara Denpasar. *Jurnal Preferensi Hukum*, *1*(2).
6) Putra, F. A. S. (2021). Problem Eksekutorial Putusan Hakim Pengadilan Tata Usaha Negara. *Justisi*, *7*(1).
7) Sari, L. P., & Wibowo, A. (2023). Pelaksanaan Putusan Peradilan Tata Usaha Negara (PTUN): Pengadilan tata usaha negara, Hukum, Indonesia, Putusan pengadilan. *Jurnal Penelitian Multidisiplin*, *2*(1).
8) Simanjuntak, E. (2014). Prospek Ombudsman Republik Indonesia Dalam Rangka Memperkuat Pelaksanaan Eksekusi Putusan Peradilan Tata Usaha Negara. *Jurnal Hukum Dan Peradilan*, *3*(2).
9) Undang Undang Nomor 30 Tahun 2014 tentang Administrasi Pemerintahan (Lembaran Negara Tahun 2014 Nomor 292, Tambahan Lembaran Negara No. 5601).
10) Undang Undang Nomor 5 Tahun 1986 Tentang Peradilan Tata Usaha Negara (Lembaran Negara Tahun 1986 Nomor 77, Tambahan Lembaran Negara Nomor 3344).
11) Wiyono, R. (2019). *Hukum Acara Peradilan Tata Usaha Negara*. Sinar Grafika.