

Fictitious-Positive Decision Dispute Resolution at PTUN For the Achieving Unity of Proceedings and Legal Certainty

Weda Kupita^{1*}, Riris Ardhanariswari²

¹ Law Doctoral Program Student Jenderal Soedirman University, Purwokerto

² Jenderal Soedirman University, Purwokerto

***Email:** weda.kupita@unsoed.ac.id

Abstract.

Plaintiff (person or civil legal entity), before filing a lawsuit to the Administrative Court, it must first take an "Administrative Appeal", it is determined if the authorized official does not respond (acts in silence) to Administrative Appeal, then "Administrative Appeal are deemed granted". Then there will be a juridical problem: "whether the dispute will be tried by PTUN as "Ordinary State Administrative Dispute "or as" Fictitious-Positive Decision Dispute? ". The approach method used is Normative Juridical, qualitative normative analysis method, and grammatical and systematic interpretation method. Based on normative studies, it is not yet clear whether the legal event will become an "Ordinary TUN Dispute" or a "Fictitious-Positive Decision Dispute", because it cannot be classified into the two types of disputes. Certainty is needed, because the procedural law are very different between the two types of disputes. It is necessary to emphasize whether the case will be an "ordinary state administration case" or a "fictitious-positive decision case", this is intended to realize the unity of proceedings in court and the realization of legal certainty.

Keyword: Dispute Resolution, Fictitious-Positive Decision, PTUN, Unity of Proceedings and Legal Certainty

1. Introduction

The concept of a modern legal state (welfare state) places the government as the party responsible for realizing the *bestuurzorg* (general welfare) of its citizens. This is in line with the provisions of Article 33 and Article 34 of the 1945 Constitution which require the government to guarantee the prosperity of its people. [1]

One element of the rule of law is the legality principle, that all acts of state administration must have a legal basis. A country is referred to as a rule of law state (*rechstaat*) which is reflected in several things, which are commonly referred to as the characteristics of a rule of law state, namely: [2] .

1. There is recognition and protection of human rights;
2. The existence of a judiciary that is free from the influence of any other power or force and is impartial;
3. There is a legality principle in the sense that all actions of all citizens, both ordinary people and those in power, must be justified by law.

The concept of a rule of law (rechtstaat) as proposed by Friedrich Julius Stahl contains 4 (four) main elements, namely: [3]

1. Recognition and protection of human rights;
2. The state is based on trias political theory;
3. The government is run based on law (wetmatigbestuur);
4. 4. There is an administrative court in charge of handling cases of illegal acts by the government (onrechmatigeoverheidsdaad).

Administrative Courts in Indonesia are known as State Administrative Courts (abbreviated as PERATUN). Article 18 paragraph (2) of Law Number 48 of 2009 concerning Judicial Power determines that the State Administrative Court is one of the judicial environments in judicial power in Indonesia.

In accordance with Freidrich Julius Stahl's opinion, in the concept of a state of law rechtstaat, PERATUN (administrative court) is the fourth element, whose task is to judge if there is a dispute between the people (individuals) and the Government (State Administration Officials). [4]

Within the State Administrative Court, the court institutions consist of the State Administrative Court (abbreviated as PTUN) and the High State Administrative Court (abbreviated as PT.TUN) as the Court of Appeal.

The State Administrative Court as a material law enforcement agency has the duty and authority to examine, decide and resolve State Administrative disputes, as a result of the issuance of a State Administrative Decree (KTUN). The issuance of a state administrative decisions (state administrative decisions) may be detrimental to the interests of private persons or legal entities. Individuals or civil legal entities who feel that their interests have been harmed by the state administrative decisions can file a lawsuit to the state administrative decisions so that the state administrative decisions are declared null and void.

Based on the matters that have been mentioned above, it can be described that in a State Administration dispute the following will be encountered:

- a. The PERATUN authority is to adjudicate state Administrative disputes;
- b. The plaintiff is a civil person or legal entity;
- c. The Defendants are State Administrative Bodies or Officials;
- d. The object of the dispute or the cause of the State Administration dispute is the issuance of a State Administrative Decree;
- e. The claim or petitem is the cancellation or invalidity of a State Administrative Decree.

The aforementioned State Administrative Disputes are also known as “Ordinary” State Administration disputes, namely disputes between private persons or legal entities and state administrative bodies or officials as a result of the issuance of a State Administrative Decree. Such disputes are handled by ordinary procedural procedures, as stipulated in the Procedural Law for State Administrative Courts

In 2014, the Government enacted Law Number 30 of 2014 concerning Government Administration (abbreviated as UU-AP), which in several provisions of the article affects the absolute competence of PERATUN, especially in the provisions concerning:

1. Requirement to take Administrative Efforts first before filing a lawsuit with the State Administrative Court (Supreme Court Regulation Number 6 of 2018 concerning Guidelines for Government Administration Dispute Resolution After Taking Administrative Efforts).
2. The authority of the State Administrative Court to adjudicate government administrative disputes with the object of the dispute is Fictitious-Positive Government Decisions and / or Actions. (Article 53 UU-AP. Jo. Supreme Court Regulation Number 8 of 2017 (also known as the Supreme Court Regulation on Procedure Guidelines whose object of dispute is Fictitious-Positive Decisions / Actions).

The Supreme Court Regulation Number 6 of 2018 stipulates: "The court has the authority to accept, examine, decide, resolve government administrative disputes after taking administrative efforts".

Before submitting a lawsuit to the Court, they must first take administrative measures. The definition of administrative effort is the settlement of government administrative disputes carried out within the executive (government). Under the UU-AP, administrative measures consist of "objections" and "administrative appeals". An objection is if the objection is submitted to the official issuing the decision, whereas an administrative appeal is if the one who resolves the dispute is the superior of the official who issued the decision.

Furthermore, the provisions that will become a problem are the provisions in Article 77 paragraph (5) UU-AP reads: "In the event that Government Agencies and / or Officials do not resolve the objection within the period referred to in paragraph (4), the objection is deemed granted." And Article 78 paragraph (5) UU-AP stipulates: "In the event that Government Agencies and / or Officials do not complete the appeal within the period referred to in paragraph (4), the objection is considered granted".

A juridical issue will arise, if the official responding to administrative objections and appeals is silent and does not respond to administrative objections and appeals, whether the government administration dispute will become an ordinary state administration dispute or a fictitious-positive decision dispute. The meaning of a Fictitious-Positive Decision is that if the State Administration Officer is obliged to issue a decision requested by the community, but remains silent and does not issue a decision, then the application is considered legally granted. Based on Article 53 UU-AP, the aggrieved person can submit a petition (a kind of lawsuit) to the PTUN so that the court orders the Respondent (State Administration Officer) to issue the decision requested by the Petitioner.

The juridical issue regarding whether the government administration dispute will become an "ordinary state administrative dispute" or a "fictitious-positive decision dispute", in practice in the Administrative Court causes differences in attitudes among the courts, thus potentially leading to dishonesty in proceedings and creating legal uncertainty.

2. Problems

1. Can the Respondent's silence not responding to administrative objections and appeals in the Administrative Efforts be categorized as a Fictitious-Positive Decision?
2. What legal remedies can be taken to resolve fictitious-positive decision disputes originating from Administrative Efforts in the Administrative Court for the realization of legal unity and legal certainty?

3. Research Methods

This scientific article is a research result using normative juridical research methods. The method used in conducting this research is a normative juridical approach which focuses on research on library data or what is called secondary data. The research approach used is a statutory approach, a conceptual, and an analytical approach. The data analysis technique applied normative qualitative methods of content analysis and comparative analysis models

4. Discussion

4.1. Ordinary State Administrative Disputes

PTUN authority: The court has the duty and authority to examine, decide and resolve state administrative disputes. Definition of "State Administrative Dispute". Determined in Article 1 number 10 of Law Number 51 of 2009, namely as a dispute arising in the field of State Administration, between a person or civil legal entity and a State Administration Agency or Officer, both at the central and regional levels, as a result of the issuance of a State Administrative Decree, including employment disputes based on the prevailing laws and regulations.

The elements of the state administration dispute: [5]

1. Disputes that arise in the field of State Administration
2. Between a person or a civil law entity with a state administration agency or official;
3. As a result of the issuance of state administrative decisions, including personnel disputes, based on the prevailing laws and regulations.

The State Administrative Dispute arises from the existence or issuance of a State Administrative Decree (KTUN), therefore the State Administrative Decree becomes the basis for the birth of a State Administrative Dispute.

The definition of state administrative decisions is defined in:

- 1) Definition of state administrative decisions in the Law on State Administrative Courts : "State Administrative Court is a written stipulation issued by a State Administration Agency or Official, which contains legal actions for State Administration, which are based on the prevailing laws and regulations, which are concrete, individual, and final in nature. which gives rise to legal consequences for a person or a civil legal entity.
- 2) The definition of state administrative decisions in the Law on Government Administration : State administrative decisions are "written decisions issued by Government Agencies and / or Officials in government administration."

Furthermore, Persons or Civil Legal Entities (BHP) who feel that their interests have been harmed by a State Administrative Court, can file a written lawsuit to the competent Court, which contains demands that the State Administrative Court the dispute is declared null and void, with or without a claim for compensation and / or rehabilitation.

The procedural law procedure in further ordinary state administrative disputes, the Plaintiff filed a lawsuit at the Administrative Court, with the following stages: ^[6]

1. Preliminary Examination, which consists of:
 - a. Deliberative Meeting or dismissal procedure (Article 62 of Law Number 5 Year 1986)
 - b. Preparatory Examination (Article 63 Law Number 5 Year 1986).
2. Examination before the Trial, which consists of:
 - a. Lawsuit Reading
 - b. Readout of Claims Answers
 - c. Replik
 - d. Duplicate
 - e. Proof
 - f. Conclusion
 - g. Reading of Court Decisions

The time required from filing a lawsuit to reading the court's decision is around 5 (five) or 6 (six) months.

Parties who are not satisfied with the decision of the PTUN (court of first instance) can file a legal remedy in the form of an appeal to the State Administrative High Court (PT.TUN), the time required for the examination at the appeal level is around 5 or 6 months. Furthermore, parties who are not satisfied with PT TUN's Purutusan Appeal can file a legal remedy in the form of cassation to the Supreme Court. The time required for examination at the Cassation level can be more than 6 (six) months.

Thus in settling ordinary state administrative disputes, starting from registration to obtaining a final legally binding decision (inkraht), it may take up to more than 2 (two) years.

4.2. Fictitious-Positive Decision Dispute

Positive Fictitious Decision Dispute is regulated in UU-AP, which determines:

1. The time limit for the obligation to stipulate and / or take decisions and / or actions is in accordance with the provisions of the statutory regulations.
2. If the provisions of the statutory regulations do not determine the time limit for obligations, the Agency and / or Government Officials are obliged to determine and / or make Decisions and / or Actions within a maximum period of 10 (ten) working days. after the complete application is received by the Agency and / or Government Officials.

3. If within the time limit, Government Agencies and / or Officials do not determine and / or make Decisions and / or Actions, then the application is considered legally granted.
4. The applicant submits an application to the Court to obtain a decision on acceptance of the application.
5. The court is obliged to decide the application, not later than 21 (twenty one) working days from the time the application is submitted.
6. Agencies and / or Government Officials are obliged to stipulate a Decision to implement the Court's decision, within 5 (five) working days after the Court decision is stipulated. The provisions contained in UU-AP are known as Fictitious-Positive Decisions:

Fictitious means (in terms of decisions) intangible as a "written / black and white determination", (in the case of action) means intangible as an act of factual / real. Or in other words, fictitious means "the Agency and / or Government Officials should issue a decision and / or take action, but remain silent, even though it is their obligation. Because he was silent, then no decision and / or action requested by the Petitioner (individual or civil legal entity) did not come out / appear / publish / occur.

Positive means "considered granted" legally, that is, if the agency or Government Official is silent / does not issue and / or take the decision and / or action requested, then the request is considered legally granted.

Furthermore, if the Petitioner does not accept it or feels aggrieved by the silence of government bodies or officials, the Petitioner has the right to submit an "application to the Court to obtain a decision on acceptance of the application".

The procedural law required in resolving fictitious-positive decision disputes is a special event law, different from the procedural law in ordinary state administrative disputes. Its specificity can be seen from:

1. The completion time, only takes 21 (twenty one) working days, starting from the registration of the application to the reading of the court's decision.
2. The Court's decision is final and binding, or there are no more legal remedies, either appeal or cassation;
3. Not going through a preliminary examination (not through the "Consultative Meeting" and "Preparatory Examination), direct case examination for examination before the trial takes the form of reading the petition.

4.3. Respondent's silent stance in Administrative Efforts

The definition of Administrative Efforts (UA) is a dispute resolution process carried out within the Government Administration environment as a result of the issuance of decisions and / or detrimental actions. (Article 1 number 16 UU-AP)

At the core of administrative efforts, namely a procedure that can be taken by a person or a Civil Legal Entity if he is not satisfied with a decision or action of a State Administrative body or official. The procedure is carried out within the Government (executive) itself.

Administrative efforts can take two forms, namely:

1. OBJECTION, that is, in the case of a State Administration dispute settlement, it is submitted to and resolved by the State Administration Agency or Official who issued the Decree.
2. ADMINISTRATIVE APPEAL, that is, in the case of a State Administration dispute settlement submitted to and resolved by a superior official or other agency of the official issuing the decision.

Provisions related to administrative efforts, namely:

1. Article 48 of Law Number 5 Year 1986 determines: (1) In the event that a State Administration Agency or Official is authorized by or based on statutory regulations to administer certain TUN disputes, the TUN dispute must be resolved through available Administrative Efforts; (2) The new court has the authority to examine, decide, and

resolve state administration disputes as referred to in Paragraph (1), if all the Administrative Efforts concerned have been used.

2. Law Number 30 of 2014 concerning Government Administration (UU-AP).

Article 1 number 16: "Administrative Efforts are the process of dispute resolution carried out within the Government Administration as a result of the issuance of decisions and / or actions that are detrimental".

With the enactment of Law Number 30 of 2014 concerning AP, all claims arising from Administrative Efforts (both objection procedures and administrative appeals) are the authority of the First Level Administrative Court.

What is meant by Court, according to article 1 point 18 of the Government Administration Law is the State Administrative Court.

Furthermore, to follow up the provisions against Administrative Efforts, the Supreme Court Regulation Number 6 of 2018 concerning Guidelines for Government Administration Dispute Resolution After Taking Administrative Efforts was issued. Based on Article 2 paragraph (1) it is determined that before filing a lawsuit at the State Administration Court, administrative measures must first be taken.

Administrative Efforts provisions are regulated in UU-AP, as follows:

1. General provisions regarding Administrative Efforts :
 - 1) Citizens who have suffered losses due to Decisions and / or Actions may submit Administrative Efforts to Government Officials or Supervisory Officers who determine and / or make decisions and / or actions.
 - 2) Administrative measures as referred to in paragraph (1) consist of: objection; and appeal.
2. Administrative efforts and the authority of PTUN:

Government Agencies and / or Officials have the authority to resolve objections to Decisions and / or Actions that are determined and / or carried out by the Community. In the event that the Community Citizen does not accept the resolution of objections by the Agency and / or Government Officials, the Community Citizen can file an appeal to the Supervisory Officer. In the event that the Community Citizen does not accept the settlement of the appeal by the Superior Officer, the Community Citizen can file a lawsuit at the Court.
3. Provisions regarding "Objections"

An objection may be submitted to a decision within a maximum period of 21 (twenty one) working days from the announcement of the Decree by the Agency and / or Government Official. Objections are submitted in writing to the Agency and / or Government Officials that stipulate the Decree. In the case of objections, Government Agencies and / or Officials are required to stipulate a decision according to the objection request. Government Agencies and / or Officials resolve objections within 10 (ten) working days. In the event that the Agency and / or Government Officials do not resolve the objection within that period, the objection shall be deemed granted. Objections that are deemed granted shall be followed up with a decision in accordance with the application for objection by the Agency and / or Government Official. Government Agencies and / or Officials are obliged to make a Decree in accordance with the application no later than 5 (five) working days after the expiration of said grace period.
4. Provisions regarding "Administrative Appeal":

The decision can be appealed within 10 (ten) working days after the decision on the objection is received. Appeals are submitted in writing to the superior officers who make decisions. In the event that the appeal is granted, the Agency and / or Government Official shall stipulate a decision in accordance with the appeal request. Government Agencies and / or Officials resolve the appeal no later than 10 (ten) working days. In the event that the Agency and / or Government Officials do not complete the appeal within a

predetermined period of time, the objection is deemed granted. Government Agencies and / or Officials are obliged to stipulate Decisions in accordance with the application no later than 5 (five) working days after the expiration of the predetermined grace period.

Based on the provisions of the aforementioned statutory regulations, in the case of the flow / path of a case at the administrative office, in relation to the existence of provisions regarding Administrative Efforts, the following can be concluded:

1. The flow of cases in Peratun after the publication of Perma No. 6 of 2018, namely:
 - 1) First: take all available administrative measures (in the form of Objections and Appeals) first;
 - 2) Second: Only then filed a lawsuit at the State Administrative Court (PTUN) as the first level court.
 - 3) Third: If not satisfied with the PTUN decision, the Plaintiff can file an appeal to the High State Administrative Court (PT.TUN)
 - 4) Fourth: If not satisfied with the decision on appeal of PT.TUN, the Plaintiff can file an appeal to the Supreme Court.
2. If in the trial it is proven that the Plaintiff has not taken all available Administrative Efforts, but has already filed a lawsuit at the Administrative Court, then the lawsuit will be declared not accepted (NO / Niet Onvankelijkewerklaar).
3. In the provisions of the statutory regulations which form the basis for the issuance of KTUN regulating administrative efforts, these provisions are used as rules in the settlement of administrative efforts.
4. In the provisions of the statutory regulations which form the basis for the issuance of state administrative decisions, the Court uses the provisions stipulated in Law Number 30 of 2014 concerning Government Administration.
5. The deadline for filing a lawsuit is calculated as 90 (ninety) days from the time the decision on administrative efforts is received by the community members or since it is announced by the government administrative body or official in charge of the settlement of administrative efforts.

Furthermore, the third party who is not addressed by the decision resulting from the follow-up of administrative efforts, the grace period for filing a lawsuit to the Court, is calculated from the time the person concerned first became aware of a State Administration decision that was detrimental to his interests.
6. In the event that the Agency and / or Government Official does not resolve the objection within 10 (ten) working days, the objection is deemed granted. Objections that are deemed granted shall be followed up with a decision in accordance with the objection request by the Agency and / or Government Official. Government Agencies and / or Officials are obliged to stipulate a Decree in accordance with the application no later than 5 (five) working days after the 10 working day grace period ends.

The Objection Applicant has the right to submit an application to the PTUN in order to obtain a decision from the agency or State Administration Officer. (The legal remedies taken by the Petitioner are called "Application", and submitted to the PTUN, the content of the petition is that the Court obliges the Respondent to determine a decision which is considered granted.) The question is whether this dispute can be categorized as a Fictitious-Positive dispute. Fictitious means that the State Administration Officer is silent and does not answer the objection request, while positive means that the objection request is considered granted.
7. In the event that the Agency and / or Government Officials do not complete the Appeal within 10 (ten) working days, the objection is deemed granted. Objections that are deemed granted shall be followed up with a decision in accordance with the application.

Government Agencies and / or Officials are obliged to stipulate a Decree in accordance with the application no later than 5 (five) working days after the 10 working day grace period ends.

The appeal applicant has the right to submit an application to the PTUN in order to obtain a decision from the agency or State Administrative Official. (The legal remedies taken by the Petitioner are called "Application", and submitted to the PTUN, the content of the petition is that the Court obliges the Respondent to make a decision in accordance with the petition which is deemed granted.) The question is whether this dispute can be categorized as a Fictitious-Positive dispute. Fictitious means that the State Administration Officer is silent and does not answer the request for appeal, while positive means that the application is considered granted.

4.4. Settlement of fictitious-positive decision disputes originating from Administrative Efforts in the Administrative Court for the realization of unity of procedure and legal certainty.

The main thing that becomes the focus of attention is if in an administrative effort, a Government Administration Agency or Officer is silent and does not respond to administrative objections and / or appeals, the legal problem is whether the problem will become an ordinary state administrative dispute or will it become a fictitious-positive decision dispute? [7]

It turns out that there are difficulties regarding the categorization of the two things, namely:

1. Cannot be categorized as an ordinary state administrative dispute, for the reasons, namely:
 - a. In accordance with the provisions of UU-AP, the object of the dispute is the "silence" of Government Administration Officials who are not willing to issue the decision requested by the applicant, then this should be a fictitious positive decision dispute.
 - b. The dispute is about legal opinion (legal fiction) which states that the petitioner's request for the respondent to issue a decision is considered legally granted. Because the object is intangible as a decision in the form of writing (real), it cannot be categorized as an ordinary dispute.
2. It cannot be categorized as a fictitious-positive decision dispute, for the reasons, namely:
 - a. Does not meet the criteria for fictitious-positive disputes as stipulated in Article 3 paragraph (2) letter c of the Supreme Court Regulation Number 8 of 2017 which stipulates: "An application for a decision that has never been determined by a government agency or official".
In relation to administrative efforts, before the Petitioner submitted an administrative effort, the Respondent had already issued a decision (decision), in which the Petitioner had objections so that the Petitioner submitted an administrative effort. Therefore, based on this argument, the dispute cannot be categorized as a fictitious-positive decision dispute. [8]
 - b. The dispute is not related to the provisions of Article 53 UU-AP, so it cannot be categorized as a fictitious-positive decision dispute. c. According to UU-AP provisions, there is no procedural law which indicates that the dispute is a fictitious-positive decision dispute.

The legal issue regarding whether the government administrative dispute will become an "ordinary state administrative dispute" or a "fictitious-positive decision dispute", in practice in the Administrative Court causes differences in attitudes among the courts, thus potentially creating unified proceedings and creating legal uncertainty.

Proceedings in court can be interpreted as an activity starting from making a lawsuit/application letter, then registration at the court clerk, then examination before the court which includes reading the lawsuit, reading the answer to the lawsuit, Reply by the plaintiff, Duplication by the defendant, proving procedures, the conclusion, the reading of the court's decision, then the appeal to the high court, cassation to the Supreme Court, until the decision of the inkraht court and the execution of the court's decision.

Unity of proceedings can be interpreted as the existence of a unified procedure for handling cases with the same character of the object of dispute, not to the object of dispute with the same

character and type of object of dispute but with different handling of cases. For example, in cases where the object of silence is that the state administration officials are not willing to respond to "objections" or "administrative appeals" in Administrative Efforts (fictitious-positive decisions in Administrative Efforts), but are resolved as ordinary state administration disputes.

The rule of law, both written and unwritten, contains general rules that serve as guidelines for individuals to behave in society and become limitations for society in burdening or taking action against individuals. The existence of such a rule and the implementation of these rules creates legal certainty. So it can be concluded that normative legal certainty is when a regulation is made and promulgated with certainty because it regulates clearly and logically, so that it does not cause doubt (multi-interpretation), is logical and has predictability. Legal certainty is a condition in which human behavior, whether individuals, groups, or organizations, is bound and within the corridors that have been outlined by the rule of law. The principle of legal certainty is needed in the creation of legislation because legal certainty is the main principle of various kinds of principles of the rule of law which according to M. Kordela (2008) "The legal certainty as the superior principle of the system of formal principles of the rule of law". law justifies the legal validity of a defined group of values". Then legal certainty according to Maxeiner has two functions, namely guiding the community to obey the law and protecting the community against arbitrary government actions that can use its power in making and enforcing the rule of law.

Based on the character of the TUN dispute caused by the silence of the TUN Official who is not willing to issue a decision on Administrative Objections and Appeals in Administrative Efforts, which cannot be categorized as a fictitious-positive decision dispute, the formulation of the provisions of Article 77 and Article 78 of Law Number 30 of 2014 concerning Government Administration (UU-AP), needs to be changed by adding the provisions in the next paragraph which stipulates: "if the applicant for an administrative objection or appeal wishes to submit to the Administrative Court, then the TUN dispute is resolved in the Ordinary Procedure or resolved as a fictitious-positive decision dispute". It is very important to emphasize in the provisions of the article in order to realize the unity of the proceedings and legal certainty. ^[9]

One of the obstacles in the execution of court decisions in cases of Fictitious Positive Decisions is the absence of laws and regulations governing the application of administrative sanctions and forced money, this results in difficulties when forcing Government Administrative Bodies or Officials to carry out the obligation to issue decisions as court orders. ^[10]

5. Conclusion

1. An ordinary state administrative dispute is a state administrative dispute caused by the issuance of a state administrative decision, the legal process of which is through the "Ordinary Procedure". A fictitious-positive decision dispute is a dispute that meets the criteria for the provisions of Article 53 of the Law on Government Administration, namely the occurrence of silence by the Government Administration Official not being willing to issue the requested decision, and the petition is not against the provisions that have been issued by the Respondent.
2. The silence of government administration officials is not willing to issue a decision requested in an administrative effort, if a dispute occurs it cannot be categorized as an ordinary state administrative dispute or a fictitious-positive decision dispute. Article 77 and Article 78 of the Law on Government Administration need to be amended, by adding the provisions in the next paragraph which stipulates: "if the applicant for an administrative objection or appeal wishes to submit to the Administrative Court, then the TUN dispute is resolved in the Ordinary Procedure or is resolved as a fictitious decision dispute. -positive". It is very important to emphasize in the provisions of the article in order to realize the unity of the proceedings and legal certainty.

References:

- [1] V.Hadiyono, Indonesia dalam Menjawab Konsep Negara Welfare State dan Tantangannya, *Jurnal Hukum Politik Dan Kekuasaan*, ISSN: 2722-970X | Vol. 1 | No. 1 | Agustus 2020.
- [2] Mahfud MD, Moh., (2001), *Dasar dan Struktur Administrasi Negara Indonesia*, Jakarta. Rineka Cipta.
- [3] HR., Ridwan, (2013), *Hukum Administrasi Negara*, 8th January 2013. Jakarta. Raja Grafindo Persada.
- [4] Zulkarnain Ridwan, *Negara Hukum Indonesia Kebalikannya Nachtwachaterstaat*, *Fiat Justitia Jurnal Ilmu Hukum* Volume 5 No. 2 Mei-Agustus 2012,
- [5] Wiyono, R., (2013), *Hukum Acara Peradilan Tata Usaha Negara*, Edisi Ketiga,. Jakarta. Sinar Grafika.
- [6] Indriharto, (1993), *Efforts to Restrain the Law on State Administrative Courts*, Book II, 4th edition. Jakarta. Pustaka Sinar Harapan,
- [7] Universitas Indonesia – Center for Study of Governance and Administrative Reform (UI-CSGAR). (2017) *Buku Anotasi UU Nomor 30 Tahun 2014 tentang Administrasi Pemerintahan*. Jakarta. Universitas Indonesia Press.
- [8] Ahmad. 2017. *Konsep Fiktif-Positif: Penerapannya di PTUN*. *Replik Legal Journal*. Vol. 5 No. 2.
- [9] Compare with Samudra Putra Indratanto, Nurainun, and Kristoforus Laga Kleden, “Asas Kepastian Hukum Dalam Implementasi Putusan Mahkamah Konstitusi Berbentuk Peraturan Lembaga Negara Dan Peraturan Pemerintah Pengganti Undang-Undang,” *Jurnal Ilmu Hukum* 16, no. 1 (2020).
- [10] Aschari, M. and Fransisca Romana Harjiyatni. 2017. *Review of Absolute Competence of State Administrative Courts in Resolving Fictional Positive Decision Disputes*. *Journal of Legal Studies*, Vol. 2, No. 1. Yogyakarta. Janabrada University.