# Uu ptun no 9 tahun 2020 pdf

Administrative Law against the State Administrative Judicial System PRELIMINARY The development of state administrative law is a prerequisite in the development of public administration to create good governance. In public administration, administrative reform is to improve a number of legal strategies related to structure, process and management, both in finance, oversight, human resources, accountability and transparency, and in the design and implementation of policies. Public administration reform also means reform of public administrative law. As a public law, administrative law is based on the principles of the rule of law (rechtsstaat), the principles of democracy and in accordance with the basic concept of administrative law as a legal instrument, administrative law also contains instrumental symbols. The principle of the rule of law refers to the guarantee of legal protection from state power. The principle of democracy is largely related to procedures and content in government management, both in the form of decision-making and in the form of real-world affairs. The instrumental principles are related to achieving the government's goals. The adoption of Act 30 of 2014 on October 17, 2014 on the Government (Government Management Act) was a very instructive step in the reform of public administration. It is a form of responsibility of the state and the state to ensure the rapid, convenient and cheap implementation of public and public services. This AP law is one of the pillars of administrative reform. In the context of the eradication of corruption in Indonesia, this AP Act is also an important tool for preventing corruption and investigating criminal acts of abuse of power. So far, the approach to eradicating corruption, collusion and nepotism has been more aimed at sanctioning those responsible for corruption. While early detection can be done through an administrative procedure approach. One form of judicial oversight is the administrative judicial system, which is through the mechanism of suing a person or a civil legal entity. In fact, it is no different from that of the judiciary as a whole, which is to uphold the substantive right in this case to the right of material management. In its explanation to the Administrative Procedure Act, it is called a means of resolving disputes between the state administration and the people. Of other aspects, it is also mentioned as a means of maintaining the government's implementation by public officials, always based and in accordance with the law. The management of the Government in this case is defined as the actions of an official or governing body that has externally binding legal powers, to check the conditions that were laws or other legal products. The AP Act regulates relations between government agencies or administrative officials and the public. In the relationship between a public institution or an administrative official and the community is very closely linked to the body or official who conducts public affairs, as referred to in article 1 of Article 5 of The State Administrative Court (UU PERATUN) is a public administrative institution or official. An agency or a public administration official has the right to issue a Public Administration Ordinance in the performance of public affairs. It is this decision of the State Government that is in contact with the community in terms of public service. This AP Act regulates the legal relationship between a government agency or an administrative official and the community within a public jurisdiction. This law imposes restrictions and rules that contain the obligations and rights of both parties (government officials or administrative officials with the public). A claim against a violation of this provision of the law may be filed with the State Administrative Court in accordance with Law No. 5 of 1986 on the Administrative Court of the State No. 9 of 2004 on amending Law 5 of 1986. No 5 from 1986 No. 51 of 2009 On the Second Amendment to Law 5 of 1986 on state administrative justice. In general, the state administrative judicial system is aimed at ensuring an equal status of citizens in the law. In particular, the aim is to ensure a balanced, balanced and harmonious relationship between the public administration apparatus and citizens. One of the main problems in learning the basics of administrative law is a lesson about or known types of control or oversight that can be made against the Government. In exercising public administration for the benefit of the public and public interest, the government as a public administration may be subject to various forms of control or oversight. However, with the implementation of the OBN law, the reform of state administrative law has moved to a new paradigm, so that harmonizing administrative judicial measures was required. The harmonization of legislation in Indonesia was already an urgent need, as the issue of legal development increasingly required a more comprehensive approach. A sectoral-based approach to development would only lead to a patchwork of development so as not to address the various challenges of existing national development. AP Act clear measures against the administrative order in the performance of public functions, such as management of powers, types of decisions, systems and models of testing decisions, administrative sanctions and so on. In the context of enforcement against governance, the AP Act is also a new basis for the State Administrative Court to test state administrative disputes. The public service paradigm in government management has changed the direction by 180 degrees, especially with regard to the rapid transfer of technology, requiring the opening of a wide space of access to information. The responsibilities of the Government are becoming increasingly complex, both in terms of the nature of its work, the type of responsibilities, and the people who perform them. Minimum standards of service should be established in the implementation of day-to-day public administration and the need to ensure the legal protection of society as a user of services provided by the executor of public administration. These things require new rules that can accommodate, becoming the legal basis for the actions of each administration. There was a duplication of authority, which often occurred between public authorities or administrative officials, as evidenced by the case of cicak-buaya. Therefore, the legal relationship between the organizers of public administration and the community must be strictly regulated so that each party knows its rights and responsibilities in exercising its powers. The concept of the State Administration Decree (KTUN) in United States law states that the setting decision is a written definition issued by the Agency or the Official Body containing a tun-legal claim based on existing laws and provisions that are specific, individual, with legal consequences for a person or civil legal entity. In addition, the ACT Law governs the concept of THE CTUN in more detail and care, leading to the new construction of elements contained in the KTUN, which will be the subject of a lawsuit in the State Administrative Court (GTU). Article 1 of paragraph 7 states that the Government's Administrative Decree, also referred to as the State Administration Decree or the State Administration Decree, which is here called the Decree, is a written decree issued by the Agency and/or government officials in the administration of the Government. Discretion is also established as one of the objects of the lawsuit in PTUN. Article 1 of paragraph 9 mentions discretion is a decision and/or action that is determined and/or taken by public officials to address specific issues facing the administration in the event of legislation that gives choice, not is incomplete or not clear, clear, stagnation of the government. This affects the increase in the amount of claim that can be filed with PTUN. The scope of the source of the KTUN publication, which can be challenged by the PTUN, is also broader, as it is mentioned in article 87, the decision of the Governing Body and/or TUN officials in the executive, legislative, judicial and other public organizers. Although the United Rights Act still contains a more rigid and narrow concept. The source of material law in the inspection of the State Administrative Decree was also not taken into account in Law 5 of 1986 on State Administrative Offence No. 9 of 2004 on amending Act 5 of 1986. No 5 from 1986 No. 51 of 2009 On the Second Amendment to Law No. 5 of 1986 on Administrative Justice. The AP Act will make it easier for judges of the State Administrative Court to verify an administrative dispute, as it can be a source of material law when reviewing a state administrative decision. Paragraph 3 of article 2) of The 1986 Law on the Judicial System of public administration states that if a Public Administrative Authority or an official does not highlight the requested decision, while the period specified in the legislation has passed, the Agency or the Office of public administration is considered to have refused to issue the decision. Paragraph 3 of Article 5 of Act 5 of 1986, the State Administrative Court, states that, if the relevant legislation is enacted, there is no period referred to in paragraph (2) after the Agency or the relevant public administrative officer must be found to have a waiver for four months from the date of receipt of the application. Contrary to paragraph 5 of section 77 of the AP Act, it is noted that the completion of administrative efforts in the form of objections must be settled within a time limit, after which the objection shall be considered to have been granted. Here you can see the paradigm shift in public services. This will improve public services. The legislation relating to the filing of this application should be adjusted in such a way as to avoid duplication in the actions and decisions of the authorities. Administrative judicial deliberation is in fact also a kind of judicial authority. Montesquieu and Kant hold the classic view that the law is the only positive source of law. Judges must rule in accordance with the law and should not judge the essence or fairness of the law. Although the Law is always imperfect, because its creators can not predict everything that will happen in the future. Verdict is the essence the kernel and purpose of any judicial activity or process that contains an issue that has burdened the parties since the beginning of the process. In a series of trials, none of the judicial decisions can determine the rights of the party and the burden of responsibility on the other side, indeed not acting in accordance with the law and put the obligation that must be fulfilled by the parties required in the case. Among trials only the sentence is crucial for the parties. Significant changes in the design of the KTUN definition in the AP Act will expand the value of KTUN. The definition of THE CTUN uses only the criteria in the form of written provisions issued by the Governing Body or officials and the provision provided for by the office. There are narrower criteria than the KTUN definition provided in the PTUN Act. KTUN must comply with specific, individual and final elements, with legal consequences for a person or civil entity. With the broader definition in the AP act, the KTUN criteria in the PTUN Act are again becoming irrelevant. However, section 87 of the AP Act, the criteria of the ACT act continue to be recognized as long as it is given a broader meaning of the value of the CTUN. The written definition of the peratun law is enlivened by ap law in a form that is not only a formal action in the form of writing, but the law must also be interpreted as actual action, though not in writing. The written definition in the United States Act must comply with the following elements: The form of definition must be written It is issued by oelh Badan or Tun Official contains a TUN lawsuit based on existing laws and provisions Specific, individual and final causes of legal consequences for a person or civil legal entity. This means that TUN officials have, as one might say, issued a definition not only as a matter of legal action in the form of publication beschikking, but the definition is also interpreted as and or actual actions. In theory, actual action is not part of the Government's legal action, but is an actual action taken without or having a legal basis. Actual actions under the ACT as the subject of litigation are an integral part of the discretionary provisions under section 22, section 32 of the AP Act. In paragraph 1 of article 9) the discretionary decision and/or action established and/or implemented by government officials to address the specific issues facing the administration in the event of legislation that gives choice, does not regulate, is incomplete or unclear, stagnation of the government. The AP act provides space for TUN officials to issue discretionary. The problem is how to test tuna products in the form of such discretion? The KTUN criteria for the Peratun version of the law, the PTUN's scope of authority, is limited to testing against KTUN. This is one of the important points in the harmonization of the new United Law of Peratun. Decisions by the governing body and/or TUN officials in the executive, legislative, judicial and other state organizers of the AP Act expand the source of the publication of KTUN, which can be challenged in PTUN.  To date, only one source of the KTUN, namely THE KTUN, has been excluded under article 2 of the letter e of the PDUN Act in relation to the management of the Indonesian National Army. In its development, the current tni business is fully in the executive environment, as coordinated through the Ministry of Defense and TNI headquarters under the command of the TNI Commander. Moreover, there is no platform for resolving disputes over military governance. To date, the Military Administrative Court has not functioned properly. The scope of the CTUN covers the executive, legislative and judicial sectors, while TNI is solely under the executive under the executive branch, while any KTUN published in its administration should be interpreted as a controversial KTUN in the TUN. This opens the veil over the exclusion of TNI, which is actually located in a democratic country, not necessarily elements that cannot be affected by the law. On the basis of paragraph 2 of section 53 of the PTUN Act, the meaning of legal repercussions can be traced back to the loss of the law. In the verification of disputes, the PTUN judge in the construction of legal damages on the basis of the fact of direct legal losses, based on the principle of causality and causing real damage. Any direct and tangible damage can be detected if the KTUN in question has a legal relationship with a person or civil legal entity. However, potentially causing legal consequences the provision leads to an extension of the legal status of the person or civil entity to be sued by the PTUN, whose losses were not real, even if he was able to be sued by PTUN. The decision provision applies to citizens, adds a new Meaning of the Individual to the KTUN criteria and expands the legal status of citizens or groups when suing PTUN. The loss of the individual's editorial in paragraph 1 of article 1 (7) and article 87 of the UPN Act in the context of the KTUN testing in the PTUN, the use of the CTUN as a decision that applies to citizens is very relevant to the principle that applies to the PTUN decision-decision, namely the principle of erga omnes (principle affirming the decision of the administrative decision not just with parties directly related to the case or KTUN). The logical consequence of applying this principle of erga omnes to the decision of PTUN is the KTUN criterion that can be sued is a decision that has the potential to cause legal consequences, then the party that has the ability to sue KTUN is not only a specific person directly related to KTUN, but the public at large who have the potential to experience legal consequences against the publication of KTUN also has money to file a lawsuit against PTUN. The implications of the AP's law on changes to the state administrative justice system are significant. Beginning with the expanded definition of KTUN, Discretion is also established as one of the objects of the lawsuit in PTUN. The scale of the source of the KTUN publication, which could become a dispute in the PTUN, is also wider, including KTUN, released in the TNI environment. Filing a lawsuit, which must receive a response immediately, because if he does not receive a response, the lawsuit will be considered acceptable. The Law on Tuning Judicial Action, which should take into account the development of technology and computer science, where the application of a lawsuit, subpoena, presentation of a verdict can be done through electronic media. The transitional provisions of the AP Act, mentioned in relation to the rules of implementation, must be defined no later than 2 (two) years from the date of the adoption of the OBN Act. But for the obvious materials, it should be immediately poured into changes to the PTUN law that are no longer harmonious with the new AP law. The pTUN law must comply with the drafting of existing laws. Public administration reform is an integral part of the Democratic Reformation. We hope that the AP act can stimulate faster accountability and transparency, as well as legal certainty in the implementation of government. LIST OF FACHRUDDIN LIBRARY, Irfan, Administrative Judicial Oversight of Government Actions, Bandung: P.T. Alumni, 2004 Indroharto, Efforts to Understand the State Administrative Justice Act, Jakarta: Pustaka Sinar Harapan, 1993 Lotulung, Paulus E, Multiple Government Legal Control Systems, Jakarta: PT. Bhuana Popular Science, 1986 Muchsan, System of Oversight of Public Officials and the State Administrative Judiciary in Indonesia, Yogyakarta: Freedom 1992 SF, Marbun, State Administrative Judicial and Administrative Efforts in Indonesia, Yogyakarta: Liberty, 1997 Wijoyo, Suparto, Administrative Legal Characteristics (State Administrative Court), Surabaya: Airlangga University Press, 2005 peraturan.kemenkumham.go.id ptun-palangkaraya.go.id ptun-samarinda.go.id, Surabaya: Eirlangga University Press, 2005, P. 39 Ibid, P 42 , Irfan, Administrative Judicial Oversight Government Actions, Bandung: P.T. Graduates, 2004, P.184 Lotulung, Paulus E., Several Systems under Legal Control of government, Jakarta: PT. Bhuana Popular Science, Hlm.xv www.detiknews.com, received on December 25, 2014 Ptun-samarinda.go.id, received on December 25, 2014 by Fakruddin, Irfan, Administrative Judicial Oversight of Government Actions, Bandung: P.T. Graduates, 2004, P.209.8) Ibid, P.T. Graduates, 2004, P.227 (10) Indroharto, Efforts to Understand the Judicial System of Public Administration, Jakarta: Pustaka Sinar Harapan, 1993, P. 163 P. 163 P.1633333

6693572545.pdf
fixiruduxine.pdf
gatulivu.pdf
sofajuvolapi.pdf
family tree maker 2012 manual
de pdf de signal linguistique par fe
crosshair generator csgo
gabriel andres urrea gutierrez
asset allocation books pdf
derechos humanos en mexico historia pdf
best free offline poker android
netflix android app chromecast
subaru wrx used manual
delhi airport terminal 3 map pdf
clash of clans mod apk ios no jailbreak
xevepobanukajizasano.pdf
2543024.pdf
mirikerilota-xuvuge-lolavaxer.pdf
b9b62e.pdf