



SIGn Journal of Social Science

E-ISSN: 2745-374X

jurnal.penerbitsign.com/index.php/sjss/article/view/v6n2-08

Vol. 6 Issue 2: December 2025 – May 2026

Published Online: January 19, 2026

Article Title

Absolute Competence and Characteristics of the Object of State Administrative Disputes in Electricity Infrastructure Construction

Author(s)

Angga Dwian Prakoso*

Universitas Pekalongan, Indonesia || anggawian@gmail.com

*Corresponding Author

Atik Amalia Khusnawati

Universitas Pekalongan, Indonesia || atikamalia93@gmail.com

Purnaning Siwi Kusumastuti

Universitas Pekalongan, Indonesia || purnaningsiwii@gmail.com

Ayi Rayhana Aulia

Universitas Pekalongan, Indonesia || ayi.rayhana.a@gmail.com

Agus Iswahyudi

Universitas Pekalongan, Indonesia || agus.iswahyudi.s52@gmail.com

How to cite:

Prakoso, A. D., Khusnawati, A. A., Kusumastuti, P. S., Aulia, A. R., & Iswahyudi, A. (2026). Absolute Competence and Characteristics of the Object of State Administrative Disputes in Electricity Infrastructure Construction. *SIGn Journal of Social Science*, 6(2), 305-320. <https://doi.org/10.37276/sjss.v6i2.586>



This work is licensed under a [CC BY-4.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

ABSTRACT

*National electricity infrastructure development often triggers complex construction disputes due to the overlap between civil law and state administrative law. This research aims to analyze the parameters of the State Administrative Court's absolute competence, identify the juridical characteristics of dispute objects, and formulate a legal protection framework for construction service providers. The research method utilized is normative legal research, with a statute-based and conceptual approach. Data were analyzed qualitatively through deductive reasoning on twenty authoritative secondary literature sources. The research results show that the absolute competence of the administrative judiciary is rigidly determined by the source of public authority (*acta jure imperii*) used by the government in its capacity as manager of the strategic energy sector. The characteristics of dispute objects in the electricity ecosystem have undergone significant expansion following the enactment of Law Number 30 of 2014. These objects now encompass factual actions such as change order instructions, location determination, and blacklist administrative sanctions. The analysis shows that state administrative officials' decisions in the substation and power transmission licensing process constitute valid grounds for judicial review to prevent abuse of discretion. The research conclusion affirms that the legal reasoning pattern must emphasize legality review based on the General Principles of Good Administration. Optimizing the decision suspension instrument is also required as an emergency measure to protect business actors. More harmonious alignment between construction service law and administrative law is required to ensure legal certainty and the sustainability of national electricity infrastructure development.*

Keywords: Absolute Competence; Construction Services; Dispute Objects; Electricity; State Administrative Court.

INTRODUCTION

The development of electricity infrastructure is a strategic pillar for advancing energy sovereignty and accelerating Indonesia's economic growth. Under Law Number 30 of 2009¹, the state controls the electricity supply. Its implementation is carried out by the central and regional governments, based on the principle of regional autonomy. The intensity of constructing transmission facilities, substations, and power plants requires extensive construction support services. Normatively, this sector is subject to Law Number 2 of 2017². As [Lature \(2018\)](#) argued, the dynamics of accelerative infrastructure development inherently possess the potential to cause complex construction disputes. This complexity arises from the involvement of various stakeholders with diverse legal interests. In the electricity project ecosystem, disputes are no longer limited to technical engineering issues. The problems have extended into the juridical dimension, requiring clarity on the settlement forum, whether through litigation or non-litigation channels.

Traditionally, construction contract disputes are classified as civil law matters arising from the contractual relationship between the service user and the service provider. This view relies on the principle of *pacta sunt servanda*, which holds that contracts govern the parties to them. [Priyambodo \(2021\)](#) noted that construction

¹Law Number 30 of 2009, as amended by Article 42 of Government Regulation in Lieu of Law Number 2 of 2022.

²Law Number 2 of 2017, as amended by Article 52 of Government Regulation in Lieu of Law Number 2 of 2022.

dispute resolution mechanisms are often directed toward arbitration forums or district courts to adjudicate breach of contract. However, the characteristics of electricity projects involve public authority in issuing permits, determining locations, and imposing blacklist sanctions. This indicates a strong intersection with the realm of state administrative law. Therefore, the boundary between private law acts (*acta jure gestionis*) and public law acts (*acta jure imperii*) becomes a crucial issue in determining the absolute competence of the court authorized to adjudicate the matter.

The State Administrative Court (*Pengadilan Tata Usaha Negara*, or PTUN) in Indonesia plays a vital role in advancing good governance by exercising judicial supervision over the actions of administrative officials. According to [Susanti \(2009\)](#), PTUN serves as a means of legal protection for the public and business actors against government actions deemed to violate subjective rights through administrative decisions or actions. Indonesia adopts a duality of jurisdiction system that strictly distinguishes the competence of general courts and administrative courts ([Dani, 2018](#)). In the context of construction services, this competence is frequently tested when the government utilizes its public power prerogatives amidst contract implementation. The resulting disputes are no longer purely contractual but administrative, requiring a legality review by PTUN judges.

The transformation of administrative law following the enactment of Law Number 30 of 2014³ has led to a significant expansion of the meaning of the State Administrative Decision (*Keputusan Tata Usaha Negara*, or KTUN). Article 87 of the Law affirms that KTUN now encompasses factual actions, decisions by officials in the executive, legislative, or judicial branches, and decisions that may entail legal consequences. [Wicaksono et al. \(2020\)](#) highlighted that the discourse on the absolute competence of PTUN to adjudicate government actions in public procurement remains a central theme. This is triggered by divergent interpretations of the object of dispute in judicial practice. The condition is complicated by the existence of suspension instruments for KTUN, which should function as legal protection for construction service providers to prevent the loss of operational rights during the dispute process ([Sahara et al., 2025](#)).

In the electricity sector, the characteristics of administrative dispute objects often manifest in licensing hurdles and rigid bureaucratic procedures. [Junaedi et al. \(2025\)](#) and [Rahmiko et al. \(2025\)](#) found that the licensing process for constructing substations and extra-high-voltage transmission networks is complex and subject to legal dynamics. Issues arise across location determination and environmental approval. Officials' actions that baselessly delay or refuse to issue permits constitute grounds for PTUN disputes that directly impede construction timelines. The lack of clarity in interpreting the legal force of change order instructions also becomes a source of

³Law Number 30 of 2014, as amended by Article 175 of Government Regulation in Lieu of Law Number 2 of 2022.

dispute. Such actions are often not regarded as formal administrative decisions yet possess concrete legal implications for service providers (Setiyawan et al., 2025).

Despite the increase in studies regarding construction disputes, existing literature remains dominated by civil law approaches and arbitration mechanisms. Indahwati et al. (2025) and Wisatrioda et al. (2025) tended to focus their analyses on cost claims arising from delays and on the use of Dispute Boards as alternative solutions. Meanwhile, studies specifically examining PTUN's absolute competence in the characteristics of electricity projects remain very limited. The emphasis on *force majeure* aspects (Triwijaya et al., 2025) and overhead cost claims (Qadri et al., 2025) often stops at the contractual level. These studies have not thoroughly examined state administrative accountability. A research gap exists regarding how PTUN justifies its absolute competence over government actions that simultaneously involve contractual dimensions and public authority in strategic electricity projects.

This research aims to fill this doctrinal void by focusing on three main objectives. First, to analyze the parameters of absolute competence of PTUN in distinguishing between civil contractual disputes and administrative disputes in the construction sector. Second, to identify the juridical characteristics of PTUN dispute objects in construction service administration, particularly regarding factual actions pursuant to the norm expansion in Law Number 30 of 2014. Third, to synthesize doctrinal legal reasoning patterns to formulate a legal protection framework for electricity construction service providers against government administrative actions that do not comply with the General Principles of Good Administration (*Asas-Asas Umum Pemerintahan yang Baik*). The benefits of this research are expected to provide theoretical contributions to the development of state administrative law. Furthermore, this research is expected to provide practical guidance to stakeholders on mitigating administrative dispute risks in national electricity infrastructure projects.

METHOD

This research utilizes a normative legal research design or doctrinal research. This method positions law as a closed normative system comprising principles, rules, and statutory regulations (Qamar & Rezah, 2020). The method selection is based on the necessity to address jurisprudential issues regarding absolute competence and the characteristics of administrative dispute objects. The research is conducted through an in-depth review of legal materials without conducting empirical case evaluations. As explained by Dani (2018), the position of the administrative judiciary in Indonesia requires doctrinal study to clarify the dichotomy between the government's public law acts and private law acts. Therefore, this research is prescriptive, aiming to formulate a robust legal argumentation framework for the legal protection of construction service providers in the electricity ecosystem.

To achieve the research objectives comprehensively, two main approaches are employed: the statute approach and the conceptual approach. The statute approach is applied by systematically reviewing Law Number 5 of 1986⁴, Law Number 30 of 2014, Law Number 2 of 2017, and Law Number 30 of 2009. Meanwhile, a conceptual approach is used to develop a fundamental understanding of the doctrine of absolute competence and the characteristics of KTUN. The integration of these two approaches enables the researcher to identify the limits of PTUN's authority when dealing with hybrid construction contracts, particularly in strategic electricity projects.

The legal materials in this research are classified into primary and secondary legal materials (Sampara & Husen, 2016). Primary legal materials consist of related legislation. Secondary legal materials include various current scientific research articles and other authoritative literature. These legal materials are treated as objects of analysis to extract patterns of doctrinal legal reasoning, without conducting direct observations of primary court verdicts. This aligns with the research limitations, focusing the study on synthesizing prior literature. Examples of analysis include electricity licensing and operational cost claims. Material collection is conducted through a selective literature review to ensure the validity of data on the administrative aspects of substations, extra-high-voltage overhead lines, and other transmission infrastructure.

The data analysis technique employed is a qualitative analysis method, with a deductive reasoning pattern based on the legal syllogism (Irwansyah, 2020). This technique operates by establishing statutory regulations and the General Principles of Good Administration as the major premise. Administrative legal facts in electricity projects obtained from secondary references are established as the minor premise. Through such deductive inference, this research will produce a conclusion regarding the validity of PTUN's absolute competence and the conclusive characteristics of dispute objects. This analysis must be used in the Results and Discussion chapter to critically dissect whether a change order instruction constitutes a pure administrative action or a contractual breach.

In addition to the deductive syllogism, a legal synchronicity technique is used to test the consistency between general regulations (*lex generalis*) and special regulations (*lex specialis*). This synchronization is crucial to address the research objective regarding the legal protection of service providers. This considers the norm intersection between the expansion of dispute objects in Law Number 30 of 2014 and the dispute resolution procedures in Law Number 2 of 2017. Thus, all legal materials are processed interpretively and argumentatively to produce legal propositions that are coherent, systematic, and methodologically accountable, in support of the development of PTUN legal science in Indonesia.

⁴Law Number 5 of 1986, as amended several times, lastly by Law Number 51 of 2009.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Parameters of PTUN Absolute Competence in Electricity Construction Service Disputes

Determining PTUN's absolute competence in construction service disputes requires a fundamental understanding of the duality of the jurisdiction system. This system separates the authority between general courts and administrative courts. Doctrinally, PTUN's absolute competence is based on the characteristics of the legal subject acting as a State Administrative Official and the legal nature of the action performed. Based on the analysis by [Dani \(2018\)](#), the position of administrative judicature in Indonesia is transforming from a personal-organizational approach toward a functional approach. Under this approach, any entity performing government functions can be considered a State Administrative Official. This includes State-Owned Enterprises (SOEs) in the electricity sector. Therefore, PTUN's absolute competence is not limited to formal government agencies but extends to every administrative action taken by a public authority.

The juridical foundation of PTUN's absolute competence is limitatively regulated in Article 47 of Law Number 5 of 1986. The Article states that the court is tasked with and authorized to examine, decide, and resolve a state administrative dispute (hereinafter, an administrative dispute). However, a crucial limitation arises in Article 2 of the Law. This provision excludes KTUN issued under the Civil Code. In the context of construction disputes, the intersection between private law acts (*acta jure gestionis*) and public law acts (*acta jure imperii*) often becomes a point of dispute regarding the authority to adjudicate. Disputes arising solely from a construction breach of contract are within the authority of the general court or an arbitration institution. This aligns with the principle of autonomy of will as defined in Article 1 point 5 and point 6 of Law Number 2 of 2017.

The escalation of PTUN's absolute competence occurs when government actions in construction contracts are no longer based on an equal footing with private legal subjects. Such actions shift to the use of unilateral and coercive public authority. Article 1 point 5 and point 6 of Law Number 30 of 2014⁵ clarify that authority is the right of Government Officials to take decisions and/or actions. In electricity projects, Commitment-Making Officers often issue administrative decisions such as determining tender winners or imposing blacklist sanctions. As emphasized by [Wicaksono et al. \(2020\)](#), the discourse on PTUN's absolute competence in adjudicating government actions in public procurement must be viewed from the nature of the action. Actions constituting a manifestation of public power remain subject to judicial review to prevent the abuse of authority.

⁵Article 1, as amended by Article 175 point 1 of Government Regulation in Lieu of Law Number 2 of 2022.

The characteristics of electricity projects qualified as National Strategic Projects reinforce the public law dimension in construction implementation. The authority granted by Law Number 30 of 2009 to the government to regulate electricity supply creates an asymmetric legal relationship. In the electricity infrastructure development licensing stage, disputes often arise due to officials' failure or delay in issuing administrative decisions. [Junaedi et al. \(2025\)](#) and [Rahmiko et al. \(2025\)](#) highlighted that administrative hurdles in this pre-construction phase constitute a pure administrative dispute. The object of the dispute is the refusal or silence of officials causing concrete legal consequences for the sustainability of energy infrastructure projects.

PTUN's absolute competence also encompasses the review of government actions that intersect with contract implementation but constitute regulatory implementation. For instance, a change order instruction based on national energy technical policy is no longer merely a matter of contractual performance fulfillment. Such action constitutes a challenge to the legality of the administrative action. [Setiyawan et al. \(2025\)](#) and [Wisnuaji et al. \(2025\)](#) indicated that uncertainty in interpreting the legal force of administrative instructions often encourages *forum shopping*. However, under Article 50 of Law Number 5 of 1986, PTUN has priority to examine whether there are elements of abuse of authority (*onrechtmatige overheidsdaad*). Such actions are not within the competence of civil judges or arbitrators.

The synthesis of various current references demonstrates that PTUN's competence parameters are multidimensional. This covers infrastructure sustainability aspects through price adjustment analysis ([Sumantri et al., 2025](#); [Yanuar et al., 2025](#)). Other issues include operational cost claims arising from policy interventions ([Qadri et al., 2025](#)) and *force majeure* risk mitigation in SOE procurement ([Triwijaya et al., 2025](#)). Although alternative dispute resolution mechanisms such as arbitration or Dispute Boards are legally recognized ([Indahwati et al., 2025](#); [Wisatrioda et al., 2025](#)), these avenues are only authorized to resolve disputes of a private-commercial nature. Conversely, legal protection for service providers' administrative rights remains under PTUN supervision ([Susanti, 2009](#); [Sahara et al., 2025](#)).

In conclusion, PTUN's absolute competence in the electricity construction sector is determined by the presence of public authority elements. The analysis of legal principles in agreements ([Wiraantaka et al., 2025](#)) and the implications of government breach of contract ([Lo et al., 2025](#)) demonstrate that modern construction disputes have transcended the boundaries of pure civil law. The application of the legal syllogism to Article 2 of Law Number 9 of 2004 yields a significant conclusion. PTUN remains authorized to adjudicate construction disputes as long as the action constitutes a derivation of Government Function as

regulated in Article 1 point 2 of Law Number 30 of 2014⁶. The strict separation of competence based on the *acta jure imperii* parameter serves as a guarantee of legal certainty for parties in organizing national electricity infrastructure.

B. Juridical Characteristics of the Object of State Administrative Disputes in Electricity Infrastructure Construction

The identification of the juridical characteristics of administrative dispute objects must be based on the expansion of the meaning of KTUN. This is mandated by Article 87 of Law Number 30 of 2014. Before the enactment of this provision, administrative dispute objects were narrowly limited by Article 1 point 9 of Law Number 51 of 2009. However, through the norm in Article 87 of Law Number 30 of 2014, KTUN must be interpreted more broadly. This meaning now encompasses factual actions and officials' decisions, potentially causing legal consequences. This semantic expansion provides significant juridical consequences for electricity projects. Every administrative policy that hampers or nullifies service providers' rights can be considered a dispute object subject to review by the PTUN ([Wicaksono et al., 2020](#); [Sahara et al., 2025](#)).

The characteristics of dispute objects in the electricity infrastructure are typically manifested through licensing instruments. Article 23, Article 24, and Article 25 of Law Number 30 of 2009⁷ establish the obligation to possess an Electricity Supply Business License. The authorized official's decision to reject or revoke such a license constitutes a classic KTUN, causing direct legal consequences for the corporation. As analyzed by [Junaedi et al. \(2025\)](#) and [Rahmiko et al. \(2025\)](#), administrative hurdles in the substation licensing process often culminate in administrative disputes. This condition is triggered by the licensing authority's non-compliance with procedures established in electricity and public service regulations ([Susanti, 2009](#); [Ningrum, 2016](#)).

One of the most fundamental juridical novelties in the construction sector is the recognition of factual actions as objects of dispute. This is based on Article 1 point 8 of Law Number 30 of 2014⁸. Factual actions are concrete acts performed by Government Officials to execute government functions without a formal written decision. During transmission project implementation, change order instructions are often issued via field administrative directives. [Setiyawan et al. \(2025\)](#) emphasized that the legal force of change order instructions must be viewed as administrative actions possessing concrete legal implications. If such instructions are given without compensation certainty, the action becomes an administrative

⁶Article 1, as amended by Article 175 point 1 of Government Regulation in Lieu of Law Number 2 of 2022.

⁷Articles 23 to 25, as amended by Article 42 points 15 to 17 of Government Regulation in Lieu of Law Number 2 of 2022.

⁸Article 1, as amended by Article 175 number 1 of Government Regulation in Lieu of Law Number 2 of 2022.

dispute object because it originates from the abuse of discretionary authority (Wiraantaka et al., 2025; Wisnuaji et al., 2025).

Another crucial dispute object is the decision regarding the determination of tender winners and the cancellation of the procurement process. Normatively, Article 80 and Article 81 of Presidential Regulation Number 46 of 2025 regulate the objection mechanism as an administrative effort. The characteristics of procurement disputes in electricity projects are highly complex, as they involve strategic technical assessments. Wicaksono et al. (2020) observed that unilateral tender cancellation decisions are often challenged through PTUN. This is because such actions are deemed to violate the principles of carefulness and transparency. The procurement decision fulfills the criterion of finality in a broad sense as regulated in Article 87 letter d of Law Number 30 of 2014 (Ningrum, 2016).

The imposition of administrative sanctions in the form of blacklisting service providers constitutes the most destructive administrative dispute object for business actors. Article 78 and Article 80 of Presidential Regulation Number 46 of 2025 grant authority to Service Users to impose such sanctions. The blacklist sanction is an individual and final decision that directly terminates the service provider's civil rights. Sahara et al. (2025) asserted that the suspension instrument for blacklist decisions through PTUN constitutes emergency legal protection. This instrument serves to prevent irreparable losses while the legality examination of the sanction takes place in court (Susanti, 2009; Triwijaya et al., 2025).

Within the scope of National Strategic Projects in electricity, the decision on location determination constitutes a crucial administrative dispute. The characteristics of this dispute involve reviewing land acquisition procedures and environmental impact evaluations. Sebastian et al. (2025) identified that amendments to Environmental Impact Analysis (EIA) documents often trigger disputes. This condition arises when administrative authorities disregard negotiation procedures and transparency in information. Juridically, every decision changing the environmental status of an electricity project is an administrative dispute object. This object is subject to judicial review to guarantee justice for all parties (Dani, 2018; Wisatrioda et al., 2025).

The characteristics of construction administrative dispute objects also extend to operational cost claims arising from government policies that hamper construction. Normative analysis of overhead cost claims shows that officials' decisions to reject valid claims constitute arbitrary actions. Qadri et al. (2025) and Yanuar et al. (2025) noted that administrative rejection of price adjustments is often triggered by officials' fear of audit risks. However, legally, such actions disregard the principles of infrastructure sustainability. The synchronization between Law Number 2 of 2017 and Law Number 30 of 2014 positions the claim

rejection as a dispute object amenable to review on administrative propriety grounds (Lo et al., 2025; Sumantri et al., 2025).

In sum, the legal characteristics of administrative dispute objects in the electricity infrastructure are no longer limited to rigid written decisions. The spectrum of objects encompasses factual actions, officials' negligence, and coercive regulatory sanctions. All these objects share a common thread: the existence of legal consequences arising from the abuse of authority. By applying the legal syllogism, it can be concluded that every administrative instrument in electricity infrastructure development is subject to review by the PTUN. This applies as long as the action meets the criteria of substance, authority, and procedure as set out in Article 1 point 7 of Law Number 30 of 2014⁹.

C. Synthesis of Legal Reasoning Patterns and Legal Protection Framework for Service Providers

Resolving construction disputes in the electricity sector at PTUN requires a pattern of legal reasoning oriented toward legality review based on the General Principles of Good Administration. Article 10 of Law Number 30 of 2014 establishes the principles of legal certainty, utility, and carefulness as the main parameters for judges in deciding cases. In the context of substation construction, judges' reasoning must not merely be fixated on procedural formalities. Judges must consider officials' carefulness in assessing the technical risks faced by service providers (Susanti, 2009; Wiraantaka et al., 2025). Synchronization between administrative norms and contractual legal principles becomes crucial. This is to ensure that every discretion of state administrative officials remains within the corridor of public accountability (Dani, 2018; Wicaksono et al., 2020).

The most progressive legal protection for construction service providers is the use of the instrument to suspend the implementation of KTUN. This is as regulated in Article 67 of Law Number 5 of 1986. The Article provides plaintiffs with the option to request a suspension of the decision's implementation while the trial is ongoing. The condition is the existence of urgent circumstances that result in losses difficult to repair. In blacklist sanction disputes, this suspension instrument functions as an operational safeguard for the company. Sahara et al. (2025) highlighted the urgency of harmonizing Article 67 with procurement regulations to guarantee legal certainty for service providers.

The effectiveness of legal protection also relies heavily on the optimization of administrative remedies before the case is submitted to court. Article 75, Article 76, and Article 77 of Law Number 30 of 2014 mandate resolution through administrative objections and appeals. In the practice of electricity infrastructure development, this mechanism frequently intersects with government breach-of-

⁹Article 1, as amended by Article 175 number 1 of Government Regulation in Lieu of Law Number 2 of 2022.

contract claims. Lo et al. (2025) emphasized that the government's failure to fulfill its administrative obligations often triggers chain disputes. Therefore, PTUN's legal reasoning pattern must be capable of identifying whether the government's rejection of service provider claims constitutes an arbitrary action (Lature, 2018; Lo et al., 2025).

The restoration of service providers' financial rights through administrative mechanisms is a crucial aspect in ensuring the sustainability of energy infrastructure. Analysis of overhead cost claims demonstrates that officials' decisions to reject reasonable compensation often disregard the principle of distributive justice. Qadri et al. (2025) and Yanuar et al. (2025) asserted that the legal reasoning pattern must accommodate changing economic conditions. Rigid administrative refusal of price adjustments constitutes an object of review for violating the principles of transparency and public interest (Sumantri et al., 2025).

The legal protection framework for construction service providers must also cover risk mitigation against extraordinary events or *force majeure*. A comprehensive legal reasoning pattern is required to review officials' decisions in determining *force majeure* status. This is often a matter of debate in procurement within electricity SOEs. Triwijaya et al. (2025) noted that dispute-resolution mechanisms for *force majeure* clauses must balance legal protection. Compliance with administrative procedures for establishing *force majeure* status is a key indicator of the legality of officials' actions and provides legal certainty (Wisnuaji et al., 2025).

The interaction between non-litigation channels and PTUN judicial supervision creates a layered legal protection system. The utilization of the Standing Dispute Board (SDB) at the Asahan 3 Hydroelectric Power Plant (HEPP) Project proves that construction disputes require in-depth technical assessment. Indahwati et al. (2025) and Wisatrioda et al. (2025) argued that the technical examination results from such institutions can be positioned as legal facts in PTUN judges' reasoning. The integration between SDB technical recommendations, EIA negotiation results (Sebastian et al., 2025), and legality review by PTUN forms a coherent legal protection framework.

Theoretically and practically, PTUN's legal reasoning pattern is a crystallization of the judicial control function over *freies ermessen* or officials' discretion. The ideal legal protection framework must integrate certainty in licensing procedures (Junaedi et al., 2025; Rahmiko et al., 2025) and accountability for change order instructions (Setiyawan et al., 2025). By rigorously applying legal syllogism to the instruments of the General Principles of Good Administration, PTUN serves as the vanguard in maintaining the balance between public authority and service-provider rights. This synthesis ensures that every administrative

action in electricity infrastructure development is not only formally valid but also substantially fair.

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

Based on the analysis and discussion outlined, the first conclusion of this research is that PTUN's absolute competence is rigidly determined by the source of authority and the nature of the government's legal action. The determining factor for the authority to adjudicate lies in the distinction between government actions as a private legal subject and actions originating in the exercise of public authority. PTUN possesses absolute authority to review the legality of officials' actions in the energy construction ecosystem if such actions constitute a manifestation of a unilateral government function. The sovereignty of administrative jurisdiction remains intact so long as the dispute concerns state administrative accountability, transcending purely contractual relationships.

The second conclusion affirms that the juridical characteristics of administrative dispute objects have undergone a fundamental expansion following the expansion of KTUN's meaning. The dispute objects are now no longer limited to formalistic written determinations. The scope now extends to the spectrum of factual actions, officials' negligence, and administrative decisions in the licensing process. Specific characteristics of substation construction projects make instruments such as change order instructions and blacklist sanctions concrete objects whose legality can be reviewed. All these objects share the same characteristic: the existence of concrete legal consequences arising from the abuse of discretionary authority, hindering the sustainability of national strategic projects.

The third conclusion states that PTUN's legal reasoning must emphasize substance review under the General Principles of Good Administration to ensure legal certainty for service providers. Effective legal protection is manifested through the utilization of the decision implementation suspension instrument as an emergency operational safeguard for business actors. The ideal judicial review pattern must integrate administrative care with the technical realities of the field. This is crucial, particularly in handling operational cost claims and *force majeure* risks in procurement within SOEs. By integrating layered protection between administrative remedies and judicial supervision, PTUN serves as the protector of electricity construction service providers' subjective rights.

As a recommendation, stricter regulatory synchronization is required between the construction service law and government administration law to minimize absolute competence uncertainty. The government is advised to formulate clear technical guidelines for classifying government actions in construction contracts to prevent overlapping authorities. Furthermore, the optimization of the use of administrative remedies needs to be encouraged as the primary legal consideration for judges in

deciding complex construction disputes. Finally, for construction service business actors, capacity strengthening in understanding state administrative law aspects is necessary to mitigate dispute risks and ensure maximum legal protection in national electricity infrastructure development.

REFERENCES

- Colonial Regulations, *Staatsblad* Number 23 of 1847 on the *Burgerlijk Wetboek voor Indonesie*/the Civil Code. <https://jdih.mahkamahagung.go.id/legal-product/kitab-undang-undang-hukum-perdata/detail>
- Dani, U. (2018). Memahami Kedudukan Pengadilan Tata Usaha Negara di Indonesia: Sistem Unity of Jurisdiction atau Duality of Jurisdiction? Sebuah Studi tentang Struktur dan Karakteristiknya. *Jurnal Hukum dan Peradilan*, 7(3), 405-424. <https://doi.org/10.25216/jhp.7.3.2018.405-424>
- Government Regulation in Lieu of Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 2 of 2022 on Job Creation (State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia of 2022 Number 238, Supplement to the State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia Number 6841). <https://peraturan.go.id/id/perppu-no-2-tahun-2022>
- Indahwati, A. N., Sami'an, S., & Hardjomuljadi, S. (2025). Arbitration in Resolving Construction Cost Claim Disputes Due to Time Extensions: A Study of Contract Law in Indonesia. *SIGN Jurnal Hukum*, 6(2), 263-281. <https://doi.org/10.37276/sjh.v6i2.388>
- Irwansyah. (2020). *Penelitian Hukum: Pilihan Metode & Praktik Penulisan Artikel*. Mirra Buana Media.
- Junaedi, J., Saputro, A., & Sami'an, S. (2025). Challenges in Electrical Infrastructure Permitting: A Case Study of Substation Development in South Sumatra. *SIGN Jurnal Hukum*, 6(2), 313-327. <https://doi.org/10.37276/sjh.v6i2.393>
- Lature, K. E. (2018). Analisis Penyelesaian Sengketa Konstruksi di Indonesia. *Jurnal Legislasi Indonesia*, 15(3), 211-222. <https://doi.org/10.54629/jli.v15i3.218>
- Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 5 of 1986 on the State Administrative Justice (State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia of 1986 Number 77, Supplement to the State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia Number 3344). <https://www.dpr.go.id/dokumen/jdih/undang-undang/detail/689>
- Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 9 of 2004 on Amendment to Law Number 5 of 1986 on the State Administrative Justice (State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia of 2004 Number 35, Supplement to the State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia Number 4380). <https://www.dpr.go.id/dokumen/jdih/undang-undang/detail/9>
- Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 30 of 2009 on Electricity (State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia of 2009 Number 133, Supplement to the State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia Number 5052). <https://www.dpr.go.id/dokumen/jdih/undang-undang/detail/559>

- Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 51 of 2009 on the Second Amendment to Law Number 5 of 1986 on the State Administrative Justice (State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia of 2009 Number 160, Supplement to the State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia Number 5079). <https://www.dpr.go.id/dokumen/jdih/undang-undang/detail/588>
- Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 30 of 2014 on Government Administration (State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia of 2014 Number 292, Supplement to the State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia Number 5601). <https://www.dpr.go.id/dokumen/jdih/undang-undang/detail/1612>
- Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 2 of 2017 on Construction Service (State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia of 2017 Number 11, Supplement to the State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia Number 6018). <https://www.dpr.go.id/dokumen/jdih/undang-undang/detail/1687>
- Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 6 of 2023 on Enactment of Government Regulation in Lieu of Law Number 2 of 2022 on Job Creation Into Law (State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia of 2023 Number 41, Supplement to the State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia Number 6856). <https://www.dpr.go.id/dokumen/jdih/undang-undang/detail/1825>
- Lo, A., Lee, E. P., Chen, N. E., Baretta, N., Nugraha, D. P., & Tanaya, V. (2025). Legal Implications of Government Default in the Ranggulalo Market Construction Contract: An Analysis of Decision Number 28/Pdt.G/2021/PN Dgl. *SIGn Jurnal Hukum*, 7(1), 70-91. <https://doi.org/10.37276/sjh.v7i1.416>
- Ningrum, I. S. W. (2016). Penyelesaian Sengketa Administrasi dalam Pengadaan Barang/Jasa Pemerintah di Kota Batam. *Journal of Law and Policy Transformation*, 1(2), 49-78. Retrieved from <https://journal.uib.ac.id/index.php/jlpt/article/view/63>
- Presidential Regulation of the Republic of Indonesia Number 16 of 2018 on Public Procurement of Goods/Services (State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia of 2018 Number 33). <https://peraturan.go.id/id/perpres-no-16-tahun-2018>
- Presidential Regulation of the Republic of Indonesia Number 12 of 2021 on Amendment to Presidential Regulation Number 16 of 2018 on Public Procurement of Goods/Services (State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia of 2021 Number 63). <https://peraturan.go.id/id/perpres-no-12-tahun-2021>
- Presidential Regulation of the Republic of Indonesia Number 46 of 2025 on the Second Amendment to Presidential Regulation Number 16 of 2018 on Public Procurement of Goods/Services (State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia of 2025 Number 67). <https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/Details/318647/perpres-no-46-tahun-2025>
- Priyambodo, M. A. (2021). Mekanisme Penyelesaian Sengketa Konstruksi Menurut Undang-Undang Nomor 2 Tahun 2017 tentang Jasa Konstruksi. *Iblam Law Review*, 1(3), 173-177. <https://doi.org/10.52249/ilr.v1i3.32>

- Qadri, Q., Sami'an, S., & Saputro, A. (2025). Requirements for Overhead Cost Claims and Construction Dispute Resolution Mechanisms in Indonesia: A Normative Study. *SIGn Jurnal Hukum*, 6(2), 433-451. <https://doi.org/10.37276/sjh.v6i2.404>
- Qamar, N., & Rezah, F. S. (2020). *Metode Penelitian Hukum: Doktrinal dan Non-Doktrinal*. CV. Social Politic Genius (SIGn). <https://books.google.co.id/books?id=TAQHEAAAQBAJ>
- Rahmiko, E., Saputro, A., & Sami'an, S. (2025). Legal Dynamics in the Permitting Process for Extra High Voltage Overhead Line Development in South Sumatra. *SIGn Jurnal Hukum*, 6(2), 328-342. <https://doi.org/10.37276/sjh.v6i2.394>
- Sahara, A., Helan, Y. G. T., & Yohanes, S. (2025). Penundaan Keputusan Tata Usaha Negara (Perlindungan Hukum bagi Penyedia dalam Sengketa Pengadaan Barang/Jasa). *Jurnal Inovasi dan Humaniora*, 2(3), 446-453. Retrieved from <https://www.jurnalmahasiswa.com/index.php/Jurikum/article/view/2207>
- Sampara, S., & Husen, L. O. (2016). *Metode Penelitian Hukum*. Kretakupa Print.
- Sebastian, R. R., Wisatrioda, B., Sami'an, S., & Hardjomuljadi, S. (2025). Resolving Construction Disputes through Negotiation: A Case Study of Amendments to the Environmental Impact Assessment for an Electricity Infrastructure Project. *SIGn Jurnal Hukum*, 6(2), 282-295. <https://doi.org/10.37276/sjh.v6i2.389>
- Setiyawan, I. A., Pasaribu, D. M., & Hikmahtiar, R. (2025). The Legal Force of Change Order Instruction for the Work in Construction Contracts: A Case Study of Substation Development in Central Sumatra. *SIGn Jurnal Hukum*, 6(2), 452-467. <https://doi.org/10.37276/sjh.v6i2.409>
- Sumantri, M. F. A., Sami'an, S., & Hardjomuljadi, S. (2025). Concurrent Delay and Price Adjustment in Multi-Year Contracts: An Indonesian Construction Law Perspective. *SIGn Jurnal Hukum*, 6(2), 343-367. <https://doi.org/10.37276/sjh.v6i2.399>
- Susanti, E. (2009). Pengadilan Tata Usaha Negara (PTUN) sebagai Media Pengawasan Masyarakat untuk Mewujudkan Pemerintahan yang Bersih dan Berwibawa. *Risalah Hukum*, 5(2), 46-53. Retrieved from <https://e-journal.fh.unmul.ac.id/index.php/risalah/article/view/240>
- Triwijaya, H. Y., Sami'an, S., & Hardjomuljadi, S. (2025). Dispute Resolution Mechanism Related to Force Majeure Clauses in Construction Contracts: A Case Study of Procurement Process at the State-Owned Enterprises. *SIGn Jurnal Hukum*, 6(2), 401-417. <https://doi.org/10.37276/sjh.v6i2.402>
- Wicaksono, D. A., Kurniawan, D., & Hantoro, B. F. (2020). Diskursus Kompetensi Absolut Pengadilan Tata Usaha Negara dalam Mengadili Perbuatan Pemerintah dalam Pengadaan Barang/Jasa. *Jurnal Rechts Vinding: Media Pembinaan Hukum Nasional*, 9(3), 367-386. <https://doi.org/10.33331/rechtsvinding.v9i3.512>

- Wiraantaka, J. A., Sami'an, S., & Hardjomuljadi, S. (2025). Implementation of Legal Principles in Construction Service Agreements: A Normative Study. *SIGn Jurnal Hukum*, 6(2), 386-400. <https://doi.org/10.37276/sjh.v6i2.401>
- Wisatrioda, B., Sebastian, R. R., Sami'an, S., & Hardjomuljadi, S. (2025). Resolving Hydropower Plant Construction Disputes through a Standing Dispute Board: A Case Study of Asahan 3 HEPP. *SIGn Jurnal Hukum*, 6(2), 296-312. <https://doi.org/10.37276/sjh.v6i2.392>
- Wisnuaji, H., Sami'an, S., & Hardjomuljadi, S. (2025). Interpretation of Schedule When Changes in Conditions: A Case Study of Price Adjustment in the Lampung Extra High Voltage Overhead Line Construction Contract. *SIGn Jurnal Hukum*, 6(2), 368-385. <https://doi.org/10.37276/sjh.v6i2.400>
- Yanuar, R., Saputro, A., & Sami'an, S. (2025). Sustainability of Infrastructure Development in Indonesia: A Legal Analysis of Price Adjustments in Construction Contracts. *SIGn Jurnal Hukum*, 6(2), 247-262. <https://doi.org/10.37276/sjh.v6i2.385>