

THE ROLE AND FUNCTION OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE COURT IN RESOLVING DISPUTES OVER PERMITS FOR PLACES OF WORSHIP

Yessi Nadia Giatma Saragih ^{a*)}, Anna Erliyana^{a)}

^{a)} *University of Indonesian, Depok, Indonesia*

^{*)} *Corresponding Author: yessi.nadia@ui.ac.id*

Article history: received 31 November 2023; revised 02 December 2023; accepted 04 January 2024

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33751/jhss.v8i1.8404>

Abstract. In addition to serving as the legality of spatial utilization and urban control, the Building Permit for Places of Worship (IMB Rumah Ibadah) also functions as an assurance of religious harmony as stated in Article 2 and Article 3 of the Joint Regulations of the Minister of Religious Affairs and the Minister of Home Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia Number 8 of 2006/Number 9 of 2006 on Guidelines for the Implementation of the Duties of Regional Head/Vice Regional Head in Maintaining Religious Harmony, Empowering the People's Forum for Religious Harmony, and Establishing Houses of Worship. Ideally, the establishment of a house of worship that complies with applicable procedures and rules can help avoid conflicts among religious adherents. In reality, there are issues during the establishment of churches that have led to lawsuits in the Administrative Court, such as the rejection of the building permit (IMB) for the Catholic Church of St. Stanislaus Kostka Kranggan and the suspension of the building permit for GKI BaPos Taman Yasmin. The purpose of this article is to examine the function and role of the Administrative Court in resolving disputes related to church permits. The research method used in this study is juridical normative, and the article is analyzed descriptively based on secondary data, namely literature review. The results of this study indicate that the Administrative Court has carried out its function and role in resolving disputes over church permits. However, some decisions cannot be properly executed.

Keywords: roles; functions; administrative courts; permits; disputes; church

I. INTRODUCTION

Indonesia is a deistic country, although it is not a religious country. This statement is based on the principle of Godhead, formulated as the norm of "God Almighty", which is established as the first principle of Pancasila, which is the basis of our state administration based on religious teaching. then, the first precept is placed in the Preamble of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, Fourth Amendment ("1945 Constitution, Fourth Amendment"). Substantively, the placement of the first principle in the constitutional Preamble signifies the national identity of Indonesia as a non-secular state [1]. The meaning of the first principle in the Preamble of the 1945 Constitution, Fourth Amendment is further elaborated in Article 28E paragraph (1), Article 28I paragraph (1), and Article 29 of the 1945 Constitution, Fourth Amendment, which affirm that religion and worship are human rights. The regulation of freedom of religion and worship in the 1945 Constitution, Fourth Amendment provides recognition that every individual is free to choose their religion and practice their religious worship. In the context of human rights, the State has the primary responsibility to protect, enforce, and promote human rights. As the duty-bearer, the State has three generic obligations related to human rights: to respect, to protect, and to fulfill, including the obligation to protect the freedom of religion and worship [2]. Therefore, in order to fulfill its responsibility in enforcing human rights, the Republic of Indonesia has established various regulations regarding freedom of religion and worship, further regulated in the People's Consultative

Assembly Decree No. XVII/MPR/1998 on the Indonesian National Philosophy on Human Rights (TAP MPR No. XVII/MPR/1998), Law No. 39 of 1999 on Human Rights, and Law No. 12 of 2005 on the Ratification of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) [3]. These regulations guarantee that every person in Indonesia can freely practice their religious worship. Referring to this guarantee, anyone who interferes with the freedom of religion and worship of others will face legal sanctions [4]

The recognition and protection of freedom of religion and worship in the Republic of Indonesia demonstrate that Indonesia is a rule of law country[5]. The concept of a rule of law state, besides meaning a non-authoritarian state (Machtstaat), also implies the recognition of the principles of legal and constitutional supremacy, the separation and limitation of powers according to the constitutional system stipulated in the constitution, the guarantee of human rights in the constitution, the principle of an impartial and independent judiciary ensuring the equality of all citizens before the law, and ensuring justice for everyone, including against abuse of power by those in authority [6]. One of the efforts of the Republic of Indonesia to realize the rule of law is by establishing the Administrative Court (PTUN) [7]. According to Murtiningsih and Adi Kusyandi, the establishment of the Administrative Court is intended to provide protection (based on justice, truth, order, and legal certainty) to justice seekers who feel aggrieved by an administrative act of state officials, through the examination, decision-making, and settlement of disputes in the field of administrative law, while strengthening the principles of a modern rule of law state

(welfare state) through the availability of the Administrative Court [8]. Therefore, anyone who feels aggrieved by the issuance of an Administrative Decision (KTUN) can file a lawsuit in the Administrative Court. The object of disputes in the Administrative Court is the Administrative Decision (KTUN) [9]. One of the Administrative Decisions is the Building Permit (IMB) for places of worship, which is an act of the Administrative Officer, namely the Regent/Mayor as referred to in Article 6 of the Joint Regulation of the two Ministers, which can have certain legal consequences [10], namely granting rights and authority to utilize space for the establishment of places of worship. Generally, the IMB, as a building permit, is issued as a legal document to ensure proper spatial utilization and avoid chaos in urban planning and is a form of control over the use of urban space [11]. However, specifically for the IMB for places of worship, besides being a building permit, it also functions as a guarantee of religious harmony as referred to in Article 2 and Article 3 of the Joint Regulation of the Minister of Religious Affairs and the Minister of Home Affairs No. 8 of 2006/No. 9 of 2006 on Guidelines for the Implementation of the Duties of Regional Heads/Vice Regional Heads in Maintaining Religious Harmony, Empowering the People's Forum for Religious Harmony, and Establishing Houses of Worship ("Joint Regulation") [12].

The Joint Regulation is an administrative procedure regulation that provides detailed provisions regarding the authority to maintain religious harmony, the mechanism for issuing permits for places of worship, and the resolution of conflicts when they arise. In simple terms, the Joint Regulation is applied as a guideline for issuing the IMB for places of worship. Ideally, if the establishment permit or IMB for places of worship is issued after complying with the procedures and rules stipulated in the Joint Regulation, conflicts among religious adherents can be avoided [12]. However, in reality, the IMB for places of worship issued based on valid legal procedures is still often challenged in the Administrative Court. This is evident from cases such as the Lawsuit on the Rejection of the IMB for the Catholic Church of St. Stanislaus Kostka Kranggan and the Lawsuit on the Suspension of the IMB for GKI BaPos Taman Yasmin [13]. This research aims to describe, explore, and analyze in-depth the resolution of disputes over permits for places of worship carried out by the Administrative Court. In previous studies, there have been discussions on the role of the Administrative Court, both in general and specific contexts. Muhammad Kamil Akbar found a study titled "The Role of the Administrative Court in Realizing Good Governance," and Ahmad Bastomi et al. found a study titled "The Role of the Administrative Court as Legal Protection for the Community against Government Legal Actions from the Perspective of the Rule of Law." The findings of both studies indicate that the Administrative Court serves as a means to control the actions of administrative officials and provide legal protection for justice seekers. Maridjo also found a study titled "The Functions of the Administrative Court in Realizing Clean Governance" with the finding that the functions of the Administrative Court have been achieved, although in reality,

the success of the Administrative Court is inversely proportional to the increasing prevalence of corruption, collusion, and nepotism practices in Indonesia.

II. RESEARCH METHODS

The research method used in this writing is juridical-normative, which is a research study that utilizes secondary data, namely literature sources, which may include primary, secondary, and tertiary legal materials. The type of data used in this research is secondary legal materials, specifically literature or literature studies that are relevant to the research topic. All collected data are qualitatively analyzed and processed based on the researcher's understanding and knowledge, both theoretically and practically.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In practice, the implementation of human rights allows for limitations that can be imposed for certain reasons. These limitations are referred to as Limitation Clauses of Rights, as stated in Article 29, paragraph (2) of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights ("UDHR"), which states:

"In the exercise of his rights and freedoms, everyone shall be subject only to such limitations as are determined by law solely for the purpose of securing due recognition and respect for the rights and freedoms of others and of meeting the just requirements of morality, public order, and the general welfare in a democratic society."

These limitations align with the limitations on human rights as stipulated in Article 28J, paragraph (2) of the 1945 Constitution, Fourth Amendment, which states:

"In exercising their rights and freedoms, every person shall be obliged to accept the limitations prescribed by law solely for the purpose of guaranteeing the recognition and respect for the rights and freedoms of others and fulfilling the fair demands of morality, religious values, security, and public order in a democratic society."

Limitations on human rights are also regulated in the implementation of freedom of religion, as stated in Article 18, paragraph (3) of Law No. 12 of 2005 concerning the Ratification of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights ("ICCPR"), which states:

"The freedom to manifest one's religion or beliefs may be subject only to such limitations as are prescribed by law and are necessary to protect public safety, order, health, or morals, or the fundamental rights and freedoms of others."

Article 18 of the 1945 Constitution, Fourth Amendment declares that freedom of religion and worship cannot be restricted under any circumstances (non-derogable rights) (Permatasari 2022), with the following statement:

"The right to life, the right to be free from torture, the right to freedom of thought and conscience, the right to religion, the right to be free from slavery, the right to be recognized as a person before the law, and the right not to be prosecuted based on retroactive laws are human rights that cannot be reduced under any circumstances."

Article 18 of the Fourth Amendment to the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia states that the freedom of religion and worship cannot be restricted under any circumstances (non-derogable rights) (Permatasari 2022), with the following wording:

"The right to life, the right to be free from torture, the right to freedom of thought and conscience, the right to practice religion, the right to be free from slavery, the right to be recognized as a person before the law, and the right not to be tried under retroactive laws are human rights that cannot be diminished under any circumstances."

Although Article 18 of the Fourth Amendment to the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia states that the freedom of religion and worship cannot be restricted under any circumstances (non-derogable rights), in reality, based on Article 13 and Article 14 of the Joint Regulation, it is explained that freedom of religion and worship in the form of establishing places of worship is limited by the composition of the number of religious population in the village/sub-district or district/city or province, which must be at least 90 individuals. In addition to the limitation on the composition of the number of religious population, the establishment of places of worship is also limited by the requirement of local community support, which must be at least 60 individuals certified by the village/sub-district head, in order to ensure the harmony of religious communities, not disturb public order, and comply with laws and regulations. If these restrictions in the requirements for establishing places of worship are met, the Administrative Officer can issue the Building Permit (IMB) for places of worship. In reality, even if the IMB for places of worship has been issued, there are still conflicts over the establishment of places of worship due to objections from certain individuals or groups, leading to lawsuits in the Administrative Court, such as the Dispute Case of the Catholic Church of St. Stanislaus Kostka Kranggan and GKI BaPos Taman Yasmin.

The Plaintiffs in the Lawsuit on the Rejection of the IMB for the Catholic Church of St. Stanislaus Kostka Kranggan, in decision 102/G/2013/PTUN-BDG, felt aggrieved by the issuance of the Building Permit (IMB) for places of worship, and one of the arguments stated is:

"There is comparative data from 1977 and 2004 based on data from the Research and Development Agency of the Ministry of Religious Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia, verified by the Directorate General of Islamic Guidance and Hajj, the Directorate General of Christian Guidance, the Directorate General of Catholic Guidance, the Directorate General of Hindu and Buddhist Guidance on March 1, 2005, and April 18, 2005, which shows that the growth of Christian and Catholic places of worship reached a total of 284.18%, while the growth of Islamic places of worship was only 64.22%."

In the case of GKI BaPos Taman Yasmin, the Plaintiffs felt aggrieved by the suspension of the Building Permit (IMB) for GKI BaPos Taman Yasmin. In the Plaintiffs' argument in Decision No. 41/G/2008/PTUN-BDG, it is explained that:

"...if there is a third party (Forum Ulama and Islamic Organizations in the City of Bogor) who objects to the

issuance of the IMB for the Church mentioned above, the first step to be taken is consultation; the second step is consultation facilitated by the Mayor; and the third step is for them to resort to legal action by going to court. Specifically, if the consultation fails, the third party (who objects to the issuance of the Church's IMB) should be advised by the Defendant to seek legal recourse in court, so that the Court can decide, not by other means outside the legal process. Based on good intentions, the Congregation Council of GKI Jl. Pengadilan No. 35 Bogor sent a letter to the Mayor of Bogor, numbered 82/MJ - GKI Bgr/III/08, regarding the Follow-up of the Meeting with the Mayor of Bogor on February 28, 2008, concerning the Suspension of the Church's IMB, dated March 28, 2008. In this letter, the Congregation Council of GKI Jl. Pengadilan No. 35 Bogor requested the Mayor of Bogor to facilitate a consultation between the Congregation Council of GKI Jl. Pengadilan No. 35 Bogor and the third party (Forum Ulama and Islamic Organizations in the City of Bogor) who object to the issuance of the Church's IMB. The Congregation Council of GKI Jl. Pengadilan No. 35 Bogor's request to the Mayor referred to the previous meeting (on February 28, 2008 at the Mayor's residence) between the Mayor of Bogor and the Congregation Council of GKI Jl. Pengadilan No. 35 Bogor. The background for the issuance of the Letter from the Head of the City Planning and Park Department of Bogor, Number: 503/208 – DTKP, concerning the Suspension of the Permit, dated February 14, 2008, is related to a Complaint Letter from the Forum Ulama and Islamic Organizations in the City of Bogor, with a Special Number dated October 1, 2006, regarding the Cancellation Request of the Church in Jl. KH Abdullah bin Nuh No. 31, Curug Mekar Village, West Bogor Sub-District, received by the Defendant on February 8, 2008..."

Role of the Administrative Court in Resolving Disputes over the Establishment of Places of Worship

In Indonesia, the Administrative Court (PTUN) functions to provide legal protection for justice seekers by examining the legality of administrative decisions issued or not issued by government officials or bodies, in accordance with applicable laws and regulations [14]. At the first instance, PTUN has the function to examine, adjudicate, and resolve disputes within the scope of administrative disputes [15], while at the appellate level, PTUN functions to review and adjudicate administrative disputes at the appellate level. In addition to providing protection (based on justice, truth, order, and legal certainty) to justice seekers (justiciables) who feel aggrieved by an administrative act, PTUN also serves as a means of social oversight or control in efforts to address abuses of power [16]. Based on the Indonesian Electronic Dictionary, there are various meanings of the phrase 'media,' including:

1. Tools
2. Communication tools such as newspapers, magazines, radio, television, film, posters, and banners.

3. Something that is located between two parties (individuals, groups, etc.).
4. Intermediary; mediator. Meanwhile, the phrase 'means' has two meanings:
5. Everything that can be used as a tool to achieve a purpose or goal; instrument; medium.
6. Conditions, efforts, etc.

In the Administrative Law Act, social oversight or control carried out through PTUN is done by receiving, examining, and adjudicating whether there is abuse of authority committed by government officials. This oversight is carried out when there is a lawsuit filed by the public or civil law entities until the dispute is resolved through a final and binding court decision. In resolving disputes over the establishment of places of worship, the Plaintiffs in the lawsuits on the Building Permit (IMB) for the Catholic Church of St. Stanislaus Kostka Kranggan and the Suspension of the IMB for GKI BaPos Taman Yasmin oversee and control the government officials by filing lawsuits through PTUN, so that PTUN can receive, examine, and adjudicate whether there is abuse of authority. Based on the Decision of the Jakarta Administrative High Court No. 166/B/2014/PT.TUN.JKT dated October 6, 2014, which annulled the Decision of the Bandung Administrative Court No. 102/G/2013/PTUN-BDG dated March 20, 2014, it was stated that there was no element of abuse of power by the Bekasi City Government in issuing the Building Permit for the Catholic Church of St. Stanislaus. Meanwhile, based on Decision No. 41/G/2008/PTUN-BDG dated September 4, 2008, and Decision No. 241/B/2008/PT.TUN.JKT dated February 2, 2009, there was an element of abuse of power or authority in the issuance of the Suspension Letter for the IMB of GKI BaPos Taman Yasmin. Thus, PTUN has acted as an intermediary between justice seekers and government officials, and therefore, the government officials must comply with the decisions issued by PTUN.

Once PTUN has issued its decision, according to Article 108 to Article 114 and Article 115 to Article 119 of the Administrative Law Act, it is stated that within a maximum period of four months after the court decision becomes final and binding, if the government officials do not implement the court decision (revoking the administrative decision), the disputed administrative decision automatically loses its legal force. On the other hand, if the court decision requires the government officials to revoke the administrative decision and issue a new one, but they fail to do so within three months, the citizens can submit an application to the chief judge of the court to order the government officials to implement the court decision [17]. If government officials do not comply with the PTUN decision, they may be subject to coercive fines and/or administrative sanctions as stipulated in Article 116, paragraph (4) of the Administrative Law Act, which states:

"In the event that the defendant refuses to implement a final and binding court decision, the respective official shall be subject to coercive measures, such as the payment of a coercive fine and/or administrative sanctions."

In addition, the President, as the head of the government, can intervene to ensure that government officials comply with the PTUN decisions. The President is responsible for the development of civil servants and government officials. As the head of government responsible for the development of the public administration apparatus, the President is also responsible for ensuring that every government official complies with all applicable laws and regulations, including complying with court decisions in accordance with the principles of the rule of law [17]. In a rule of law society, every individual has an equal standing in the eyes of the law, and no one is above the law. Both government officials and citizens have equal rights before the law. Therefore, compliance with the law by government officials is crucial as an embodiment of legal awareness. If government officials do not adhere to PTUN decisions, it may undermine the enforcement of the law and lead to a tendency for the people to disregard the judiciary and the law in Indonesia [18].

Although there is a legal basis that requires government officials to comply with PTUN decisions, in practice, government officials may not necessarily comply or implement PTUN decisions, even if they have become final and binding. One of the examples is the actions of the Bogor City Government in resolving the case of the Suspension of the IMB for GKI BaPos Taman Yasmin. The PTUN Jakarta judge, through Decision No. 241/B/2008/PT.TUN.JKT dated February 2, 2009, declared the Suspension of the IMB for GKI BaPos Taman Yasmin invalid. Therefore, the Bogor City Government should have facilitated the construction of GKI BaPos Taman Yasmin Church based on the Building Permit (IMB) No. 645.8-372 issued by the Mayor of Bogor on July 13, 2006. However, the Bogor City Government issued a new IMB and relocated the place of worship to a donated land of 1,668 square meters near RS Muhammadiyah Bogor (BBC 2021). This happened because the Bogor City Government lacked self-respect and legal awareness to mediate and take a firm stance to ensure compliance with Decision No. 41/G/2008/PTUN-BDG dated September 4, 2008, and Decision No. 241/B/2008/PT.TUN.JKT dated February 2, 2009, as well as Decision No. 127 PK/TUN/2009 dated December 9, 2010.

In contrast, the Bekasi City Government demonstrated self-respect and legal awareness by taking firm measures to mediate various parties and ensure compliance with Decision No. 166/B/2014/PT.TUN.JKT dated October 6, 2014, and Decision No. 109 PK/TUN/2015 dated December 23, 2015. As a result, the Bekasi City Government was able to oversee the construction of the Catholic Church of St. Stanislaus Kostka Kranggan based on the Building Permit No. 503/0545/I-B/BPPT.I/XII/2012 dated December 17, 2012, regarding the Permit for Building Construction. According to Paulus F. Lontung, as quoted by the Supreme Court, the execution of decisions in PTUN is regulated differently from civil courts. Essentially, the execution in PTUN emphasizes the self-respect and legal awareness of administrative officials to voluntarily implement the court decision without immediate enforcement measures (*dwangmiddelen*) imposed directly by the court. Several factors may cause government

officials not to comply voluntarily with PTUN decisions. Firstly, there is a lack of implementing regulations regarding coercive fines (*dwangsom*) and administrative sanctions as stipulated in Article 116 of the Administrative Law Act. Secondly, weak legal reasoning may affect the quality of PTUN decisions. However, there is a principle stating that court decisions should be considered correct (*res judicata pro*), and therefore, the final and binding decisions must be complied with. Thirdly, it relates to the legal culture among government officials. The lack of respect and attitude towards the law as a social reality can contribute to non-compliance. Additionally, there may be a vested interest between government officials as the defendants and third parties, leading to a commitment to defend the disputed decision [19]. Other measures are needed to compel government officials to comply with PTUN decisions.

The Function of the Administrative Court in Resolving Places of Worship Disputes

Philipus M. Hadjon explains that the administrative court has three functions: advisory function, referral function, and judicial function, operating under the Supreme Court [20]. In terms of the judicial function, Aju Putrijanti identifies two roles of the administrative court: first, as an institution that controls government administrative actions, and second, as a provider of legal protection to the public against government legal actions in the field of public law. The legal protection provided by the administrative court is repressive, as it resolves disputes [9]. There are various aspects to consider in discussing the role of the administrative court in resolving disputes regarding the establishment of Places of Worship. In terms of the nature of the case, the administrative court functions for norm execution or policy-making. In terms of testing, the administrative court assesses government actions based on legal validity (*rechtmatigheids*) and suitability of objectives (*doelmatigheidstoetsing*). In terms of time, the administrative court evaluates all facts and circumstances at the time the decision is issued (*ex-tunc*) or assesses all changes in facts and circumstances at the time the decision is issued (*ex-nunc*). In terms of the content of the verdict, the administrative court determines the validity of an action or decision, including cancellation through the execution of the verdict.

Norm Execution Decision (NormExecutionDecision)

Maridjo explains that according to Montesquieu's original concept of the three powers of the state, the judicial power is the enforcement of the law, and judicial decisions serve as norm execution decisions. The characteristic of norm execution is that the decision is made on specific cases that usually do not extend to the future. In resolving the cases of the rejection of the Building Permit for the St. Stanislaus Kostka Catholic Church in Kranggan and the freezing of the Building Permit for the GKI BaPos Taman Yasmin, the administrative court, through its verdict, forces the parties to comply with the applicable norms.

Legal Validity Testing (rechtmatigheidstoetsing) and Ex-Tunc Testing

Koraag, Sarapun, and Midu state the following regarding testing:

"Testing in administrative remedies is different from testing in the administrative court. In the administrative court, testing is only carried out in terms of the application of the law as determined by Article 53 paragraph (2) letters (a) and (b) of Law No. 9 of 2004 on Amendments to Law No. 5 of 1986 concerning the Administrative Court, which is whether the administrative decision is issued in contradiction to the prevailing legislation and violates the General Principles of Good Governance (AAUPB), while in administrative remedies, testing is conducted both in terms of the application of the law and in terms of discretion by the deciding authority, thus the testing is more comprehensive" [21]

The administrative court can only test administrative decisions based on the facts and circumstances obtained at the time the decision is issued, or "*ex-tunc*" testing [22]. Furthermore, "*ex-tunc*" testing is used to test validity. This testing is based on the prevailing legislation and the violation of the General Principles of Good Governance (AAUPB).

Verdict Content

Budi Sastra Panjaitan explains that a judge's verdict is a statement made by a state official with the authority to do so, pronounced in a court session, and aims to conclude or resolve a case or dispute between the parties. There are three forms of strength in a judge's verdict, namely:

- a. Binding force (*bindende kracht*)
- b. Evidential force (*bewizende kracht*)
- c. Enforcement force (*executoriale kracht*) (Panjaitan 2016).

Philipus M. Hadjon, as cited by Hidayat Pratama Putra, explains three legal consequences if an administrative official issues an invalid administrative decision, namely nullity by operation of law, void, or voidable.

"An invalid decision can have the consequences of '*nietigheid van rechtswege*' (nullity by operation of law), '*nietig*' (void), or '*vernietigbaar*' (voidable). '*Nietig*' means that the legal act is considered nonexistent. Consequently, the legal consequences of that act are deemed to have never existed. '*Vernietigbaar*' means that the legal act and its consequences are considered valid until annulled by a judge or other competent body. '*Nietigheid van rechtswege*' means that the legal consequences of an act are considered nonexistent without the need for a decision annulling the act. Government actions can be nullity by operation of law, void, or voidable depending on the essential deficiencies found in the decision..." (Putra 2020).

In Indonesia, an administrative decision that harms citizens is declared null or invalid as referred to in Article 53 paragraph (1) of Law No. 9 of 2004 on Amendments to Law No. 5 of 1986 concerning the Administrative Court, which states:

"Any individual or legal entity who feels that their interests are harmed by an administrative decision may submit a written lawsuit to the competent court, which contains a demand for the contested administrative decision to be declared null or invalid, with or without a claim for compensation and/or rehabilitation."

Based on Article 97 paragraph (7) of the Administrative Court Law, the content of the verdict or the operative part of the verdict can take the following forms:

- a. Lawsuit rejected. Thus, the Panel of Judges has affirmed the contested administrative decision.
- b. Lawsuit granted. Thus, the Panel of Judges does not validate the contested administrative decision based on the existing legal facts. Based on Article 97 paragraphs (8) and (9) of the Administrative Court Law, the administrative court's decision can impose obligations on the State Administrative Official. The obligations may include:
 - 1) Revocation of the contested administrative decision; or
 - 2) Revocation of the relevant administrative decision and issuance of a new administrative decision;
 - 3) Issuance of an administrative decision if the lawsuit is based on Article 3 of the Administrative Court Law, which includes:
- c. A state administrative body or official failing to issue a decision, even though it is their duty. Such an action can be considered a state administrative decision.
- d. A state administrative body or official failing to issue a decision requested, even though the prescribed time limit has passed. Such an action can be considered a rejection of the request.
- e. If the regulations do not specify a time limit for issuing the requested decision, after four months have passed since the request, the state administrative body or official is deemed to have rejected the request.
- f. Lawsuit not acceptable if the lawsuit does not meet the specified requirements, lacks legal basis, is vague, contradicts morality/public order, has an unclear object, or has an incomplete subject.
- g. Lawsuit expired if:
 - 1) Revocation of the contested administrative decision;
 - 2) Revocation of the relevant administrative decision and issuance of a new administrative decision;

Based on the case of the rejection of the building permit for the Catholic Church of St. Stanislaus Kostka Kranggan, the legally binding decision is the Decision of the Jakarta State Administrative High Court No. 166/B/2014/PT.TUN.JKT dated October 6, 2014, which annulled the Decision of the Bandung State Administrative Court No. 102/G/2013/PTUN-BDG dated March 20, 2014. Although there was an attempt to file a Request for Judicial Review to the Supreme Court, the Request for Judicial Review was not accepted based on Decision No. 109 PK/TUN/2015 dated December 23, 2015. In the case of the suspension of the building permit for GKI BaPos Taman Yasmin, the legally binding decision is the Decision No. 241/B/2008/PT.TUN.JKT dated February 2, 2009, which upheld the Decision of the Bandung State Administrative Court No. 41/G/2008/PTUN-BDG dated September 4, 2008. Although there was an attempt to file a Request for Judicial Review to the Supreme Court, the Request for Judicial Review was not accepted based on Decision No. 127 PK/TUN/2009 dated December 9, 2010.

In the case of the rejection of the building permit for the Catholic Church of St. Stanislaus Kostka Kranggan, the panel of judges of the Jakarta State Administrative High Court, through Decision No. 166/B/2014/PT.TUN.JKT, upheld the Administrative Decision No: 503/0545/I-B/BPPT.I/XII/2012 dated December 17, 2012, regarding the Building Permit (IMB) for the Catholic Church of St. Stanislaus Kostka Kranggan, which was issued in accordance with the procedures and regulations stipulated in Article 14 of the Joint Regulation of 2 Ministers and Article 3(2) of the Bogor Mayor Regulation No. 16 of 2006 concerning the Procedures for Granting Permits for the Establishment of Places of Worship. Furthermore, the Mayor of Bekasi has fulfilled the Principle of Diligence in issuing the building permit for the Catholic Church of St. Stanislaus Kostka Kranggan.

IV. CONCLUSION

Based on the discussion, it can be concluded that: The State Administrative Court has fulfilled its functions and roles in resolving the cases of the rejection of the Building Permit for the St. Stanislaus Kostka Catholic Church in Kranggan and the freezing of the Building Permit for the GKI BaPos Taman Yasmin. However, it is observed that State Administrative Officials may not always comply with or enforce the decisions of the Administrative Court, even when the decisions have legal force. The enforcement in the Administrative Court emphasizes the self-respect and legal awareness of State Administrative Officials to voluntarily implement the judge's verdict without coercion (*dwangmiddelen*). In practice, despite the Administrative Court fulfilling its functions and roles, the GKI Yasmin was not able to be constructed and officially recognized based on the Decree of the Mayor of Bogor No.: 645.8-372 Year 2006 dated July 13, 2006, regarding the Building Permit for GKI Taman Yasmin. Therefore, it is necessary to undertake a series of efforts to ensure the maximum enforcement of the verdict, including: Administrative efforts: The plaintiff can request compensation or damages for the unenforceable verdict from the Court President. The District Court can send letters to the parties who fail to enforce the verdict, including to the President as the Head of Government, urging them to promptly enforce the verdict. Coercive measures: The Administrative Court can seek assistance from bailiffs at the District Court to execute the verdict. Bailiffs play a role in enforcing the payment of fines by officials who fail to comply with the Administrative Court's verdict. Criminal measures: The government needs to establish a policy of criminalizing contempt of court to uphold the dignity and honor of the judiciary, ensuring that verdicts are fully complied with.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Susanto, "Kedudukan Dan Fungsi Pembukaan Undang-Undang Dasar 1945 Pembelajaran Dari Tren Global," *Jurnal Legislasi Indonesia*, Vol. 18, Pp. 184-203, 2021.

- [2] V. H. Situmorang, "Kebebasan Beragama Sebagai Bagian Dari Hak Asasi Manusia," *Jurnal Ham*, Vol. 10, No. 1, P. 57, Jul. 2019, Doi: 10.30641/Ham.2019.10.57-67.
- [3] Budiyo, "Politik Hukum Kebebasan Beragama Dan Berkepercayaan Di Indonesia," *Politik Hukum Kebebasan Beragama*, Vol. 2, Pp. 108–119, 2013.
- [4] E. Simanjuntak, "Prospek Ombudsman Republik Indonesia Dalam Rangka Memperkuat Pelaksanaan Eksekusi Putusan Peradilan Tata Usaha Negara," *Jurnal Hukum Dan Peradilan*, Vol. 3, Pp. 163–176, 2014.
- [5] E. Hidayat, "Perlindungan Hak Asasi Manusia Dalam Negara Hukum Indonesia," Pp. 80–87, 2020.
- [6] Z. Ridlwan, "Negara Hukum Indonesia Kebalikan Nachtwachterstaat," *Fiat Justitia Jurnal Ilmu Hukum*, Vol. 5, Pp. 141–152, 2012.
- [7] D. Puspita, O. S. Matompo, And M. Y. Hasmin, "Peranan Jurusita Pengganti Dalam Pelaksanaan Tugas Pokok Dan Fungsi Peradilan Tata Usaha Negara (Studi Pada Pengadilan Tata Usaha Negara Palu)," Pp. 1720–1732, 2020.
- [8] Murtiningsih And A. Kusyandi, "Eksistensi Ptun Sebagai Wujud Perlindungan Hukum Kepada Warga Negara Dari Sikap Tindak Administrasi Negara," *Jurnal Yustitia*, Pp. 236–248, 2019.
- [9] A. Putrijanti, "Jurisprudence Of State Administrative Courts In The Development Of State Administrative Law," *Jurnal Penelitian Hukum De Jure*, Vol. 21, No. 2, P. 161, Jun. 2021, Doi: 10.30641/Dejure.2021.V21.161-174.
- [10] D. Riza, "Pengaturan Terhadap Hakikat Keputusan Tata Usaha Negara Menurut Undang-Undang Peradilan Tata Usaha Negara Dan Undang-Undang Administrasi Pemerintahan," *Jurnal Bina Mulia Hukum*, Vol. 3, No. 1, Sep. 2018, Doi: 10.23920/Jbmh.V3n1.7.
- [11] R. E. W. Rambe, "Pembangunan Rumah Ibadah Di Kota Medan Dalam Konteks Perizinan (Studi Terhadap Peraturan Bersama Menteri Agama Dan Menteri Dalam Negeri Nomor 9 Dan Nomor 8 Tahun 2006 Tentang Izin Pembangunan Rumah Ibadah)," *Usu Law Journal*, Vol. 4, Pp. 151–158, 2016.
- [12] Ardiansah, "Legalitas Pendirian Rumah Ibadah Berdasarkan Peraturan Bersama Menteri Agama Dan Menteri Dalam Negeri Nomor 9 Tahun 2006," *Jurnal Toleransi: Media Komunikasi Umat Beragama*, Vol. 6, 2010, [Online]. Available:
- [13] A. Purijanti, "Kewenangan Serta Obyek Sengketa Di Peradilan Tata Usaha Negara Setelah Ada Uu No. 30 2014 Tentang Administrasi Pemerintah," *Mmh*, Pp. 425–430, 2015.
- [14] D. R. Pattipawae, "Pelaksanaan Eksekusi Putusan Pengadilan Tata Usaha Negara Di Era Otonomi," *S A S I*, Vol. 25, No. 1, Pp. 92–106, 2019.
- [15] K. M. Siregar, "Kedudukan Pengadilan Tata Usaha Negara Di Indonesia," *Jurnal Al-Maqasid : Jurnal Ilmu-Ilmu Kesyariahan Dan Keperdataan*, Vol. 6, Pp. 88–100, 2020.
- [16] E. Susanti, "Pengadilan Tata Usaha Negara (Ptun) Sebagai Media Pengawasan Masyarakat Untuk Mewujudkan Pemerintahan Yang Bersih Dan Berwibawa," 2020.
- [17] A. W. Dinata, "Legal Implications Of Non-Compliance With The Decision Of The State Administrative Court In Terms Of The Implementation Of Regional Autonomy And The Unitary State," *Jurnal Hukum Peratun*, Vol. 4, No. 1, Pp. 1–30, Mar. 2022, Doi: 10.25216/Peratun.412021.1-30.
- [18] B. Kurniawan And S. Hadi, "Kepatuhan Pejabat Tata Usaha Negara Terhadap Putusan Pengadilan Tata Usaha Negara Berdasarkan Asas-Asas Pemerintahan Yang Baik," *Ijlil*, Vol. 1, No. 2, Pp. 149–177, Feb. 2021, Doi: 10.35719/Ijl.V1i2.96.
- [19] U. Untoro, "Self-Respect Dan Kesadaran Hukum Pejabat Tata Usaha Negara Menuju Keadilan," *Pandecta: Research Law Journal*, Vol. 13, No. 1, Pp. 37–49, Aug. 2018, Doi: 10.15294/Pandecta.V13i1.7856.
- [20] M. K. Akbar, "Peran Peradilan Tata Usaha Negara Dalam Mewujudkan Pemerintahan Yang Baik," *Jurnal Program Magister Hukum Fakultas Hukum Universitas Indonesia*, Vol. 1, Pp. 352–363, 2020, [Online]. Available:
- [21] S. Koraag, R. M. S. Sarapun, And S. Midu, "Terjadinya Sengketa Tata Usaha Negara Akibat Dikeluarkannya Keputusan Pejabat Tata Usaha Negara," *Lex Administratum*, Vol. 9, Pp. 75–85, 2021.
- [22] U. Dani, "Memahami Kedudukan Pengadilan Tata Usaha Negara Di Indonesia: Sistem Unity Of Jurisdiction Atau Duality Of Jurisdiction? Sebuah Studi Tentang Struktur Dan Karakteristiknya / Understanding Administrative Court In Indonesia: Unity Of Jurisdiction Or Duality Of Jurisdiction System? A Study Of Hierarchy And Characteristic," *Jurnal Hukum Dan Peradilan*, Vol. 7, No. 3, P. 405, Dec. 2018, Doi: 10.25216/Jhp.7.3.2018.405-424.