Siyasah Dusturiyah: Stete Law Review
Published by Yayasan Cerdas Pedia Indonesia
Volume xx Issue xx, 2025 ISSN (Online) *3109-9726*
Journal Homepage: **https://jurnal.cerdaspedia.com/index.php/SDLR**

English Title Maximum 12 Words, Bold, Georgia Font, 14 pt

Primary Author[1], Secondary Author[2]
[1]Author's Affiliation, Country
[2] Author's Affiliation, Country

Article Info

Corresponding Author:
Name Author
emailpenulis@gmail.com

History:
Submitted: xx-xx-xxxx
Revised: xx-xx-xxxx
Accepted: xx-xx-xxxx

Keyword:
[Written in English, Verdana 9, italic, consists of 3-5 keywords, separated by **semicolons (;)**, ending with dot punctuation (.), and arranged alphabetically.]

Kata Kunci:
[Ditulis dalam bahasa Indonesia, Verdana 9, terdiri dari 3-5 kata kunci, dipisahkan dengan **tanda titik koma (;)**, diakhiri dengan tanda baca titik (.), dan disusun secara alfabetis.]

Copyright © 2025 by Siayasah Dusturiyah: State Law Review.

Copyright: © 2025 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY SA).

Abstract

*[Write in English, Cambrian font 10, justify, 1 space, **consists of a maximum of 150 words**, contains the background of the problem, the urgency of writing/research, research methods, important research results, and conclusions]. For example, The commissioner of the general election administration was discharged through the decision of the General Election Administrator Honorary Council (DKPP). The decision is not final and binding at the executorial level, considering that the decision can be canceled by the Administrative Court. This study aims to define the authority of DKPP and PTUN in resolving ethical violations committed by election administrators and parse the implications and relationships of the decisions of the two institutions. This paper also proposes an ideal concept for the design of solving ethical violations of election administrators in the future. This study uses normative juridical methods. The results showed that the DKPP and PTUN have overlapping authority but with different decisions. DKPP purely adjudicates ethical issues, and the Administrative Court adjudicates the Presidential Decree, which is a follow-up to the DKPP decision. To avoid conflicting decisions on cases that intersect, violations of the code of ethics in the future must be resolved with a settlement mechanism by the judiciary.*

Abstrak

[Ditulis dalam bahasa Indonesia, Cambria font 10, *justify*, 1 spasi, terdiri dari **maksimal 150 kata**, memuat latar belakang masalah, urgensi penulisan/penelitian, metode penelitian, hasil-hasil penting penelitian dan simpulan]. Sebagai contoh, Pemberhentian komisioner penyelenggara Pemilu melalui putusan Dewan Kehormatan Penyelenggara Pemilu (DKPP) tidak bersifat final dan mengikat pada tataran eksekutorialnya mengingat putusan tersebut dapat dibatalkan oleh Pengadilan Tata Usaha Negara. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menguraikan kewenangan DKPP dan PTUN dalam penyelesaian pelanggaran etik yang dilakukan oleh penyelenggara Pemilu sekaligus mengurai implikasi dan relasi putusan dari kedua lembaga tersebut. Penelitian ini dilakukan dengan menggunakan jenis penelitian yuridis normatif. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa DKPP dan PTUN memiliki kewenangan yang saling beririsan namun dengan putusan yang berbeda. DKPP murni mengadili persoalan etik dan PTUN mengadili Keputusan Presiden yang merupakan tindak lanjut dari putusan DKPP. Dalam rangka untuk menghindari konflik putusan atas kasus yang beririsan maka atas pelanggaran kode etik dimasa mendatang harus diselesaikan dengan mekanisme penyelesaian oleh lembaga yudikatif.

A. INTRODUCTION

1. Background

The background section elaborates on the reasons why it is considered important to conduct research, analysis/review of decisions of the Constitutional Court or other relevant judicial institutions, theoretical studies, literature studies or conceptual critical ideas that will be presented.

This section should also outline previous research and the differences between the analysis and the article being written as well as the novelty of the research.

At the end of the background, the author should conclude with a brief explanation of the findings of the research conducted.

The background is written with Cambria 12 writing style, justify, 1.5 spaces, the first paragraph indented, writing sentences between paragraphs with no spaces (no before and after spaces).

Citation is done in the form of footnotes/footnotes with the Chicago Manual of Style 17th edition format (full note) using Mendeley's Reference Manager. An example of citation with footnotes can be seen as follows[1]

2. Research Questions

Writing on the formulation of the problem uses Cambria Font 12, justify, 1.5 spaces, the first paragraph protrudes 1 cm, writing sentences between paragraphs with no spaces (no before and after space). This section contains the formulation of the problem in the form of questions or paragraphs. The formulation of this problem then becomes the line of thought that will be discussed in the next section.

3. Research Methods

This method is written in a descriptive style and should provide a statement regarding the methodology of the research. This method is used as much as possible to give the reader an idea of the methods used. **This method is optional, only for original research articles**.

B. DISCUSSION/ ANALYSIS

Writing the discussion using Cambria 12 font, justify, 1.5 spaces, the first paragraph protrudes 1 cm, writing sentences between paragraphs with no spaces (no

[1] Pan Mohamad Faiz, "Perlindungan Terhadap Lingkungan Dalam Perspektif Konstitusi," *Jurnal Konstitusi* 13, no. 4 (December 20, 2016): 766, https://doi.org/10.31078/jk1344.

before and after space). This section describes the research results and discussion based on the analysis method used. The description of the discussion must be adjusted to the sequence of legal issues that are the main elements in the study. Theories included in the theoretical framework must be cited in this chapter.

The writing of the results and discussion may be supplemented with supporting graphs, tables or figures. The systematization of the results and discussion must refer to the formulation of the research problem.

Tables must be clearly readable and have at least 300 DPI (Dots Per Inch) resolution for good printing quality. Tables are made with an open model (without vertical lines). An example of a table can be seen below:

Table 1. Number of Constitutional Court Decisions

Column heading	Column A (t)	Column B (T)
	1	2
	3	4
	5	6

Source: ……

Quotations/citations were made as footnotes in the ***Chicago Manual of Style 17th edition*** **(full note)** Application **Mendeley Reference Manager**. Writing is made in the format of subtitles based on the issues discussed

1. Sub-heading of the discussion

The following main headings should be provided in the manuscript while preparing. The separation between main headings, sub-headings and sub-sub headings should be numbered in the manuscript with the following example:

a. Sub-sub heading

1. Sub Sub Sub heading

2. Sub heading of the discussion

3. Sub heading of the discussion

C. CONCLUSIONS

The conclusion contains a description that should answer the objectives of the research. Provide a clear and concise conclusion. Do not repeat the abstract or simply describe the results of the research. Give a clear explanation regarding the possible application and/or suggestions related to the research findings. Write the conclusion in paragraph form with a maximum length of 4 sentences.

REFERENCES

The Bibliography was compiled using the Mendeley reference application in the ***Chicago Manual of Style 17th edition*** **(full note)** and arranged alphabetically by author's name.

Balkin, Jack M. "*Bush v. Gore* and the Boundary between Law and Politics." *Yale Law Journal* Volume 110, Nomor 8 (2001): 1407-1458.

Barak, Aharon. "The Supreme Court 2001 Term – Foreword: A Judge on Judging: The Role of a Supreme Court in a Democracy." *Harvard Law Review* Volume 116, Nomor 1 (2002): 16-162.

Bodenheimer, Edgar. *Jurisprudence: The Philosophy and Method of the Law*. Cambridge-Massachusetts, Harvard University Press, 1981.

Bruggink, J.J.H. *Refleksi tentang Hukum*. Bandung: Penerbit PT. Citra Aditya Bakti, 1999.

Dahl, Robert A. "Decision-Making in a Democracy: The Supreme Court as a National Policy-Maker." *Journal of Public Law* Volume 6, Nomor 2 (1957): 279-295.

Feteris, Eveline T. *Fundamentals of Legal Argumentation: A Survey of Theories on the Justification of Judicial Decisions*. Dordrecht: Springer, 1999.

Friedrich, Carl J. *The Philosophy of Law in Historical Perspective*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1969.

Fuller, Lon L. "American Legal Realism." *University of Pennsylvania Law Review* Volume 82, Nomor 5 (1934): 429-462.

Golding, Martin P. "Discovery and Justification in Science and Law" dalam Aleksander Peczenik, et.al. (editors), *Theory of Legal Science*. Dordrecht: D. Reidel Publishing Company, 1983.