

Legal Implications Of Delayed Industrial Relations Court (Phi) Decisions: Violation Of The 50-Working-Day Deadline In Law No. 2 Of 2004

I Made Adiwidya Yowana¹, Titin Apriani², Ni Luh Ariningsih Sari³

¹Faculty of Law, STISPOL Wira Bhakti Denpasar

^{2,3}Faculty of Law, Universitas 45 Mataram

adiwidayayowana@gmail.com¹, titinapriani91@gmail.com², liliksari72@gmail.com³

Article Info

Received: 2026-05-10

Revised: 2026-10-16

Accepted: 2026-10-21

Keywords:

Industrial Relations Court;
Article 103; 50-Working-Day
Deadline; Legal Validity; Legal
Effectiveness; Judicial
Compliance.

Abstract

This study examines the legal implications of non-compliance with the 50-working-day deadline for rendering decisions by the Industrial Relations Court (PHI) under Article 103 of Law Number 2 of 2004 concerning the Settlement of Industrial Relations Disputes. The principal legal problem arises from the absence of an explicit statutory consequence for decisions rendered beyond this deadline, creating a normative gap between the mandatory wording of Article 103 and its judicial implementation. This study employs normative legal research using a statute approach and qualitative analysis of primary and secondary legal materials, including relevant legislation, legal doctrines, and judicial decisions. The findings indicate that Article 103 remains legally valid as a binding procedural norm, notwithstanding repeated instances of non-compliance. However, its effectiveness is weakened when the prescribed deadline is not observed in judicial practice. Legal validity, legal effectiveness, and judicial compliance must therefore be distinguished: the validity of Article 103 derives from its status within the legal system; its effectiveness concerns the extent to which the deadline achieves the intended objective of expeditious dispute resolution; and judicial compliance concerns whether the court adheres to the statutory obligation. Accordingly, a decision rendered after the prescribed period cannot automatically be declared null and void solely because of the delay, particularly in the absence of an express statutory provision establishing such a consequence. The principal normative finding is that Article 103 constitutes a binding obligation but lacks an explicit legal mechanism addressing violations of the deadline. This study proposes legislative clarification of the legal consequences of non-compliance, including an appropriate accountability mechanism and judicial case-management measures to strengthen adherence to the statutory deadline without undermining legal certainty or the validity of judicial decisions. These measures are intended to reinforce procedural discipline, protect workers as a comparatively weaker party in industrial relations disputes, and promote the principle of expeditious, simple, and low-cost justice.

I. Introduction

The resolution of industrial relations disputes should be settled as much as possible through negotiation or deliberation. If negotiations fail, the resolution of the industrial relations dispute is then settled through the Industrial Relations Court, which must be completed no later than 50 (fifty) working days from the first hearing. This is as regulated in Article 103 of Law Number 2 of 2004 concerning the Settlement of Industrial Relations Disputes (hereinafter referred to as the Industrial Relations Dispute Settlement Law) which states that "the panel of judges is obliged to issue a decision on the settlement of industrial relations disputes no later than 50 (fifty) working days from the first hearing."

The panel of judges in the industrial relations court is led by a career judge. In addition to performing their duties as judges in the industrial relations court, career judges also have the responsibility of examining and adjudicating civil and criminal cases in general (H. Hono Sejati, 2018). Thus, for the career judges involved, they must really manage their time well so that the 50 working days deadline can be met. Juristically, Article 103 of the Industrial Relations Dispute Settlement Law (UU PPHI) is an incomplete provision because there are no legal consequences if the decision on the resolution of industrial relations disputes exceeds the specified time. As a result, the panel of judges may issue a decision beyond the 50-day limit. This will also extend the time for resolving the dispute. Timely resolution of industrial relations disputes is essential not merely as a procedural requirement, but also as a fundamental component of legal certainty, access to justice, and the effective protection of the rights and interests of both workers and employers. Legal certainty requires that parties be able to anticipate the duration of judicial proceedings and obtain a decision within a reasonable and legally prescribed period. When the statutory deadline is repeatedly

disregarded, the predictability of the dispute resolution process is undermined, potentially weakening public confidence in the Industrial Relations Court. Timely adjudication also constitutes an important dimension of access to justice because the formal availability of a judicial remedy does not necessarily guarantee effective justice if the proceedings are excessively prolonged. For workers, particularly those facing termination of employment or unpaid wages, delays may intensify economic insecurity and impede the realization of their employment rights. For employers, prolonged proceedings may create uncertainty regarding employment obligations, increase litigation costs, and divert managerial attention and resources from business operations. Accordingly, the 50-working-day deadline prescribed by Article 103 of Law Number 2 of 2004 should be understood as an instrument for promoting procedural efficiency, balancing the interests of the parties, and ensuring that judicial protection is both legally certain and practically effective.

For example, in 2016, the Supreme Court (MA) issued Decision Number: No. 782 K/Pdt.Sus-PHI/2016 which resolved the dispute between PT. DBI Consulting Group and Erika Sefiani. In its decision, the Supreme Court stated that the resolution of an industrial relations case in the industrial relations court that was decided after 50 (fifty) working days cannot be used as a reason to declare the industrial relations court's decision void. A decision that does not meet formal requirements can be declared null and void by law. The declaration of null and void is carried out by a higher court institution. This opinion is based on the doctrine that the nature of being null and void (*van rechtsweenietig*) or null and void is not absolute and unconditional. Even though the law stipulates something as null and void, the state of nullity does not occur by itself; therefore, there must be an official declaration from a higher authority. That is in line with

the principle of *res judicata pro veritate habetur* (a judge's decision must be considered correct until overturned by a higher court).

The legal consideration (*ratio decidendi*) of the Supreme Court in decision Number: 782 K/Pdt.Sus-PHI/2016 shows that one of the characteristics of procedural law is that interpretation of incomplete norms is not permitted. This can be seen in the sentence "...does not result in the annulment of the decision according to the nature of procedural law because it is not regulated, thus the decision cannot be interpreted as annulled." In procedural law, the principles of *lex scripta* (must be written), *lex stricta* (cannot be interpreted), and *lex certa* (must be clear) are recognized (Eddy O.S. Hiariej, 2019). This legal consideration aligns with the principle of *lex stricta*, which must be interpreted strictly, including the prohibition of analogical interpretation (Jan Remmelink in Prianter Jaya Hairi, 2016). Analogy is a method of interpretation that expands the meaning when there is a gap in the law or the law is incomplete (Suherman Toha, et al., 2010).

The Supreme Court's decision reaffirms that the provisions of Article 103 of the PPHI Law are incomplete because violations of that article have no legal consequences, thereby causing legal uncertainty. The issue of the time taken to resolve industrial relations disputes is indeed important to consider, because the Industrial Relations Dispute Settlement Law (UU PPHI) essentially mandates that industrial relations disputes be resolved in a short period, thereby ensuring legal protection for workers during the dispute resolution process.

Sociologically, many industrial relations court decisions still exceed the 50 working days deadline. This can be seen from several Industrial Relations Court decisions, namely Decision Number: 25/PHI.G/2013/PN.JKT.PST decided in 91 working days, Decision Number: 36/Pdt.Sus-PHI/2017/PN.Smg decided in 114

working days, and Decision Number: 5/Pdt.Sus-PHI/2018/PN.SBY decided in 95 working days.

Article 57 of the Industrial Relations Court Law states that "the procedural law applicable in the Industrial Relations Court is the procedural law applicable in the general courts, unless specifically regulated by this law." This means that the court agenda in the Industrial Relations Court starts with the reading of the lawsuit, the answer, the reply, the rejoinder, the evidence presentation, the conclusion, and the verdict, as in general civil procedural law. The resolution of such disputes can take a long time and seem tedious, which is one of the reasons why Article 103 of the Industrial Relations Court Law (UU PPHI) cannot be implemented effectively.

The legal implications if the decision of the industrial relations court judges does not comply with the provisions of Article 103 of the PPHI Law are interesting to examine. The definition of implication is the effect caused in the future. Implication can also be understood as involvement, correlation, or the state of being involved. Therefore, legal implication means the correlation or effect caused on the law in the future. It has been previously answered that industrial relations court decisions that exceed the 50 working days deadline cannot be declared null and void or legally valid. Therefore, this research will analyze the legal implications of the validity of industrial relations court decisions even if they exceed the 50 working days limit from the first hearing as mandated by Article 103 of the Industrial Relations Court Law (UU PPHI). The discussion will be divided into two parts: normative implications and implementational implications. Both aspects will be related to industrial relations court decisions that exceed the 50 working days limit from the first hearing. The normative implications will discuss the legal substance, while the implementational

implications will discuss the legal culture.

2. Research Method

This study employs normative legal research, which examines legal norms, statutory provisions, legal principles, and judicial decisions relevant to the resolution of industrial relations disputes. The research is exclusively normative and does not employ an empirical or socio-legal approach. Accordingly, the term “legal materials” is used instead of “data” to describe the sources examined in this study. References to court decisions and cases are intended to support the normative analysis of the applicable legal framework and its judicial interpretation, rather than to constitute empirical data obtained through interviews, observations, surveys, or field research.

This study applies a statute approach and a case approach. The statute approach examines the relevant statutory provisions, particularly Law Number 2 of 2004 concerning the Settlement of Industrial Relations Disputes, with specific emphasis on Article 103, which requires the panel of judges to issue a decision no later than 50 working days from the first hearing. Article 57 of the same law is also examined to clarify the procedural framework applicable to the Industrial Relations Court. In addition, Article 13 of Law Number 48 of 2009 concerning Judicial Power is considered in relation to the legal consequences expressly prescribed for certain procedural violations. These provisions are analyzed systematically to assess the legal status, enforceability, and effectiveness of the statutory deadline under Article 103.

The case approach is used to examine judicial decisions relevant to the legal issue, particularly Supreme Court Decision Number 782 K/Pdt.Sus-PHI/2016, which addresses the legal consequences of an Industrial Relations Court decision issued beyond the prescribed 50-working-day period. Other Industrial Relations Court decisions discussed in this article, namely Decision Number 25/PHI.G/2013/PN.JKT.PST, Decision Number 36/Pdt.Sus-PHI/2017/PN.Smg, and

Decision Number 5/Pdt.Sus-PHI/2018/PN.SBY, are considered in the context of the discussion of compliance with the statutory deadline. These decisions are examined as judicial legal materials to understand the interpretation and application of Article 103 in the adjudication of industrial relations disputes.

The legal materials consist of primary and secondary legal materials. Primary legal materials include the relevant statutory provisions and judicial decisions identified above. Secondary legal materials include legal books, scholarly journal articles, and other academic publications addressing normative legal theory, the validity and effectiveness of legal norms, industrial relations dispute resolution, and the principles of speedy, simple, and low-cost justice. These materials are selected based on their relevance to the research questions and their contribution to interpreting the applicable legal framework.

The collected legal materials are analyzed qualitatively through systematic legal interpretation and legal reasoning. The analysis begins by identifying the applicable statutory provisions and examining their relationship to the judicial decisions under consideration. It then evaluates whether the absence of an expressly prescribed legal consequence for violating Article 103 affects the legal validity of decisions delivered beyond the statutory deadline and the effectiveness of the provision in practice. Finally, the analysis considers the normative and implementation-related implications of such non-compliance, particularly in relation to legal certainty, the protection of workers and employers, and the legal culture of industrial relations dispute resolution. Conclusions are formulated through legal argumentation based on the applicable legislation, judicial decisions, legal principles, and relevant scholarly literature.

3. Results and Discussion

A. Normative Implications of PHI Decisions That Do Not Comply with Article 103 of the PPHI Law

Lawrence M. Friedman stated that the effectiveness and success of law enforcement depend on three elements of the legal system, namely the substance of the law, the structure of the law, and the culture of the law. The substance of the law includes legislative instruments, the structure of the law involves law enforcement officials, and the culture of the law refers to people's attitudes toward the law. From the perspective of its substance, the legal system is directed toward the understanding of provisions that regulate human behavior, namely rules, norms, and patterns of societal behavior within a system. The substance of law essentially encompasses all legal regulations, both written and unwritten, jurisprudence, substantive law, procedural law, and customary law. The substance of law is also defined as the rules and provisions regarding how legal institutions should behave (Lawrence M. Friedman, 2017). The substance of law is organized hierarchically and interrelatedly, and it is expected to realize the ideals of law in achieving its legal objectives.

In order for the substance of the law to be valid, that substance must be accepted by society. Likewise, in reverse, in order for a legal norm to be applicable to society, it must be a valid or legitimate law. From that valid legal norm, concepts of commands, prohibitions, authority, coercion, rights, and obligations arise (Munir Fuady, 2013). However, a valid legal norm is not necessarily an effective norm. In this case, the validity of a norm falls into the realm of *das sollen*, while the effectiveness of a norm pertains to something in reality or *das sein*.

Hans Kelsen requires a reciprocal relationship between the elements of validity and effectiveness of a legal norm. According to him, before it becomes effective, a legal norm must first be valid, because if a legal rule is not valid, then a judge, for example, will not apply that law, so the legal rule will never be effectively enforced. But conversely, it is also true that effectiveness is an absolute requirement for a valid legal norm. Therefore, if at some point due to societal changes, a legal rule that was

originally valid and effective becomes ineffective, then that legal rule also becomes invalid. In order for a legal norm to be effective, it must meet two main requirements, namely (1) the legal norm must be applicable and (2) the legal norm must be accepted by society.

According to Hans Kelsen, a legal rule must first be in a valid state before it can be determined whether the rule can be effective. If after being applied, the regulation that was initially valid is no longer applicable or accepted by society widely and continuously, then the legal provision loses its element of validity, thus changing its nature from a valid rule to an invalid rule.

Law Number 2 of 2004 on the Settlement of Industrial Relations Disputes (Industrial Relations Court Law) is one of the regulations that governs procedural law, both in and out of court. As a formal law, the Industrial Relations Court Law regulates the procedures for enforcing substantive law, which involves stakeholders such as workers, employers, legal representatives, mediators, conciliators, arbitrators, and the panel of judges in the industrial relations court. Each stakeholder must adhere to the applicable procedural law mechanisms.

Article 103 of the Industrial Relations Dispute Settlement Law (UU PPHI) is one of the provisions that regulates the formal requirements of procedural law in industrial relations courts. Article 103 of the UU PPHI states, "the panel of judges is obliged to render a decision on the resolution of industrial relations disputes no later than 50 (fifty) working days from the first hearing." This provision clearly stipulates that the panel of judges, as one of the stakeholders, has the obligation to issue a decision no later than 50 working days from the first hearing. The parties involved in the case should also understand this. However, in reality, many industrial relations court decisions exceed the time limit mandated by Article 103 of the PPHI Law.

The factor causing many judges' decisions to exceed the 50 working days deadline

is the absence of legal consequences for deviations from Article 103 of the PPHI Law. This means that the provision is a *lex imperfecta*. A *lex imperfecta* is a legal rule that does not carry a sanction if not implemented. Thus, the panel of judges is not burdened by these provisions, which ultimately can make the issuance of decisions take longer.

The issuance of an industrial relations court decision that exceeds the 50 working days deadline cannot automatically be declared null and void by law. This is because it is not regulated in the Industrial Relations Court Law (UU PPHI). Unlike the formal requirements of a decision regulated in Law Number 48 of 2009 concerning Judicial Power. For example, it can be seen in Article 13, which explicitly states that if a court decision is not pronounced in an open court session, the court decision is declared null and void by law.

When viewed from the aspect of validity and effectiveness of a regulation, Article 103 of the PPHI Law can be considered a valid provision, but less effective. The theory of validity or legitimacy of law (legal validity) is a theory that teaches how and what the conditions are for a legal norm to become legitimate and valid in its application, so that it can be enforced upon society, if necessary with coercive measures, namely a legal norm that meets the following requirements.

The legal norms must be formulated into various forms of formal rules, such as in the form of articles of the Constitution, laws, and various other forms of regulations, international rules such as in the form of treaties, conventions, or at least in the form of customary practices.

1. Those formal rules must be made legally, for example, if in the form of laws, they must be made by the parliament together with the government.
2. Legally, that legal rule cannot be annulled.
3. Regarding the formal rule, there are no other legal defects. For example, it does not conflict with higher regulations.

4. The legal rule must be enforceable by law enforcement agencies, such as courts, police, and prosecutors.
5. The legal rule must be accepted and obeyed by the community.
6. The legal rule must align with the spirit of the nation in question. (Munir Fuadi in Nazaruddin Lathif, 2017)

From these requirements, it can be asserted that Article 103 of the PPHI Law is a provision that holds validity. The 50 working days deadline from the first hearing is a sufficient timeframe for the panel of judges to render a decision. This is because in resolving disputes in the industrial relations court, reconciliation efforts are not mandatory. Even if reconciliation efforts are made, they can be conducted simultaneously with the examination of the main case, but under different conditions and times. In addition, industrial relations disputes are limited to disputes over rights, interest disputes, termination disputes, and disputes between labor unions within a single company. The panel of judges should be able to focus on examining the case without considering other legal events outside of industrial relations disputes.

The effectiveness of the law is the ability of the law to create and bring about the conditions or situations desired or expected by the law (W. Yudho and H. Tjandasari in Ria Ayu Novita et al., 2017). A legal product is said to be effective when it has been implemented and practiced in reality. From that perspective, Article 103 of the PPHI Law is considered less effective because there are still many decisions by the industrial relations court judges that violate this article. The validity of the industrial relations court's decisions, even if they do not comply with the provisions of Article 103 of the PPHI Law, can render Article 103 of the PPHI Law invalid and ineffective. That is because the article no longer serves as a guideline in the issuance of decisions, thereby impacting the effectiveness of the article in the future. If deviations are frequently and continuously committed, then Article 103 of the Industrial Relations Court Law, which was initially a

valid provision, will change into an invalid provision. An invalid provision is certainly ineffective.

Based on the aforementioned explanation, it can be concluded that the normative implication if the industrial relations court decision exceeds the 50-day period since the first hearing is that Article 103 of the PPHI Law will become an invalid and ineffective provision. Therefore, serious attention needs to be given to this matter, considering that the resolution of industrial relations disputes adheres to the principle of expediency.

B. The Implementative Implications of PHI Decisions That Do Not Comply with Article 103 of the PPHI Law

The implementational implications are the effects caused by the deviation of Article 103 of the PPHI Law on the application or implementation of that article in the future. Continuous legal implementation will shape a legal culture (Lawrence M. Friedman, 2017). Legal culture is an element of attitudes and social values. Legal culture is more directed toward the attitudes of society, the beliefs of society, the values upheld by society, and their expectations of the law. In this case, legal culture is a reflection of attitudes and behaviors toward the law, as well as all the factors that determine how the legal system finds its appropriate and acceptable place within the framework of societal culture. The higher the legal awareness of the community, the greater the creation of a good legal culture.

Legal culture is the foundation for the implementation or non-implementation of positive law in society, because the enforcement of positive law is largely determined by the attitudes, views, and values that are internalized. Therefore, the legal culture for modern societies with an open system will differ from the legal culture of traditional societies with a closed nature (Satjipto Rahardjo, 1980). Meanwhile, for societies that are experiencing development, he refers to it as personal legal culture, which embodies the tendency to treat the law and its institutions in a straightforward manner and according to personal

desires. Legal culture or legal culture is one of the components for understanding the functioning of the legal system as a process, where legal culture serves as the fuel for the engine of justice. Thus, without being supported by a conducive legal culture, a regulation or law cannot be realized as expected by both the lawmaker and the society as the target of the law.

The issue of legal awareness development is closely related to various factors, particularly the attitudes of law enforcers, meaning that law enforcement officers play a significant role in fostering the growth of public awareness (Iman Pasu Marganda Hadiarto Purba, 2017). Legal awareness in this context means the awareness to act in accordance with legal provisions and serves as a bridge connecting legal regulations with the behavior of its community members. Speaking of legal development, it naturally stems from the existence of community life where the law applies and changes according to the dynamics occurring within societal life. Until now, there is still a gap between the law as it should be (*das sollen*) and the law as it is (*das sein*). This gap certainly occurs due to the disharmony between law in the books and law in action. In line with that, it is necessary to align positive law with its implementation, so that a legal culture in accordance with the ideals of the law can emerge.

As explained in the previous subsection, Article 103 of the Industrial Relations Court Law regulates the formal requirements for the time limit on the issuance of decisions in industrial relations courts. The existence of this time limit is because industrial relations disputes adhere to the principle of expediency. The principle of speed is intended to protect the workers who are parties in the dispute. With a quick resolution, the workers who are in a weaker position immediately obtain legal certainty. Thus, the regulation of the time limit for issuing decisions in the industrial relations dispute procedural law is already very appropriate.

Although Article 103 of the Industrial Relations Dispute Settlement Law (UU PPHI) has

explicitly regulated the deadline for judges to issue their decisions, in reality, this provision is not always adhered to. This can have wide-ranging implications for the legal culture of stakeholders involved in dispute resolution. The parties in the dispute will disregard Article 103 of the PPHI Law, because that provision is invalid. Such a situation will cause a shift in the nature of resolving industrial relations disputes that adhere to a summary procedure.

As an independent actor of the judicial power, judges must understand the scope, duties, and responsibilities as regulated by legislation (H. Margono, 2019). After understanding their duties and responsibilities, judges must strive professionally in handling and resolving the cases brought before them. In conducting the trial process, judges are not allowed to delay the hearings, and in cases of delaying the hearings, they are not allowed to always fulfill the requests of the parties involved. Therefore, it is necessary for judges to be firm in leading the trial proceedings, and judges are required to be active in overcoming obstacles and challenges to achieve the principle of simple, quick, and low-cost justice. Delaying court proceedings and prolonging the resolution of cases is akin to delaying justice, which will also diminish and undermine the authority of the court (justice delayed is justice denied) (Bambang Sutiyoso and Sri Hastuti Puspitasari, 2005). The panel of judges in the industrial relations court can indeed be at the forefront of upholding the validity and effectiveness of Article 103 of the PPHI Law. The panel of judges has the authority to manage the proceedings from the lawsuit agenda to the verdict, including scheduling the court sessions. That authority is actually sufficient to ensure that the issuance of a verdict does not exceed 50 working days from the first hearing. However, this cannot be accomplished by every panel of judges in the industrial relations court. It is proven that there are still many rulings that exceed the 50 working days limit since the first hearing.

Industrial relations court decisions that do not comply with Article 103 of the PPHI Law

will certainly foster a negative legal culture. The resolution of disputes will take longer. The impact is that the workers, as the weaker party, do not receive legal certainty, causing them to suffer both socially and economically. Meanwhile, for the employers, the prolonged resolution of disputes will technically disrupt their focus on business objectives, as they have to follow the dispute resolution process in court. This is certainly not in line with the purpose of the enactment of Law Number 2 of 2004. Previous studies have examined the effectiveness of industrial relations dispute resolution in Indonesia from several legal perspectives. Tobing (2018), in her study of the Industrial Relations Court within the framework of *ius constituendum*, identified structural, substantive, and legal-cultural weaknesses that hinder the realization of legal certainty and justice. Her analysis emphasized the need to improve the institutional and procedural framework of the Industrial Relations Court, including the establishment of clearer time limits throughout the process, from case administration to the implementation of decisions. Similarly, Putri, Karsona, and Inayatillah (2021) examined the reform of industrial relations dispute resolution in light of the principles of simple, speedy, and low-cost justice. Their findings highlighted prolonged proceedings, limitations in the existing legal framework, and institutional weaknesses that prevent the Industrial Relations Court from resolving disputes effectively. These studies establish the broader importance of procedural reform and timely adjudication, although their principal focus is the overall institutional and procedural framework rather than the specific legal consequences of violating the deadline under Article 103 of Law Number 2 of 2004.

More directly related to the statutory deadline, Iskandar and Nugroho (2018) examined the implementation of the obligation to resolve cases within 50 days at the Surabaya Industrial Relations Court. Their study addressed the practical implementation of the statutory time limit in a particular court setting. Subsequently, Yowana (2022), in a normative legal study entitled “Due to Legal Decisions of the Industrial Relations Court

that Exceed the Time Limitation of 50 Working Days Since the First Session,” specifically analyzed the legal consequences of decisions delivered after the prescribed period. Yowana concluded that exceeding the 50-working-day deadline does not automatically invalidate an Industrial Relations Court decision because Article 103 does not expressly prescribe nullity as a legal consequence. The study also proposed the establishment of administrative sanctions through a Supreme Court Regulation for judges who violate the deadline. This analysis provides a direct foundation for examining the relationship between compliance with procedural time limits and the legal validity of judicial decisions.

Taken together, these studies reveal two important strands of scholarship. The first concerns the structural and procedural weaknesses of the Industrial Relations Court and the broader need to realize speedy, affordable, and fair justice. The second focuses more specifically on the implementation of the 50-day deadline and the legal validity of decisions issued beyond that period. Although these strands provide important insights, the relationship between the absence of explicit legal consequences for violating Article 103, the continuing validity of late decisions, and the resulting implications for both the normative effectiveness of the provision and the legal culture of industrial relations dispute resolution requires further integrated examination. In particular, the implications of repeated non-compliance for legal certainty and the practical protection of workers and employers should be analyzed alongside the distinction between the validity of a judicial decision and the effectiveness of the procedural rule governing its issuance.

The public will actually view the resolution of industrial relations disputes as a lengthy process that takes a long time.

Despite the contributions of previous studies, a research gap remains in the integrated analysis of the legal consequences of non-compliance with Article 103 of Law Number 2 of 2004. While previous scholarship has discussed the general weaknesses of the Industrial

Relations Court and the legal validity of decisions delivered beyond the 50-working-day deadline, insufficient attention has been paid to the interrelationship between the normative incompleteness of Article 103, the continued legal validity of late decisions, and the practical consequences of repeated violations for the effectiveness of the provision. This article addresses that gap by examining the issue through two complementary dimensions: normative implications, concerning the legal status and effectiveness of Article 103 when its deadline is breached, and implementation-related implications, concerning the development of legal culture among judges and other stakeholders in industrial relations dispute resolution.

The novelty of this article lies in bringing these two dimensions together to explain why the absence of explicit legal consequences may weaken compliance with the statutory deadline and undermine the objective of timely justice. By connecting the interpretation of Article 103 with the practical consequences of delayed adjudication for legal certainty and the protection of workers and employers, this study provides an integrated normative analysis that extends the discussion beyond the validity of late decisions alone. Accordingly, this article seeks to answer two principal questions: first, what are the normative implications of Industrial Relations Court decisions that exceed the 50-working-day deadline under Article 103; and second, how does non-compliance affect the implementation and legal culture of industrial relations dispute resolution? Therefore, the legal awareness of the panel of judges in implementing Article 103 of the PPHI Law is very important to maintain the validity and effectiveness of the provision. So that the legal culture of the community/stakeholders does not deviate from the principle of speed, which is the foundation in resolving industrial relations disputes.

4. Conclusion

The validity or legitimacy of law (legal validity) is a theory that teaches how and what the conditions are for a legal norm to become legitimate and valid in its application. The effectiveness of the law is the ability of the law to create and bring about the conditions

or situations desired or expected by the law. Based on the theory of legal validity and effectiveness, the legal implications of an industrial relations court decision that exceeds the 50 working days deadline from the first hearing will render Article 103 of the PPHI Law an invalid and ineffective provision. An industrial relations court decision that does not comply with Article 103 of the PPHI Law will certainly foster a negative legal culture. The resolution of disputes will take longer. As a result, the workers, as the weaker party, do not receive legal certainty. Therefore, the legal awareness of the judges in implementing Article 103 of the PPHI Law is very important to maintain the validity and effectiveness of the provision. So that the legal culture of the community/stakeholders does not deviate from the principle of speed, which is the foundation in resolving industrial relations disputes.

References

- Bambang Sutiyoso dan Sri Hastuti Puspitasari, 2005, *Aspek-Aspek Perkembangan Kekuasaan Kehakiman Di Indonesia*, UII Press, Yogyakarta.
- Eddy O.S. Hiariej, 2019, *Sengketa Pilpres, Keterangan Ahli*, Mahkamah Konstitusi, Jakarta.
- Margono, 2019, *Asas Keadilan, Kemanfaatan, & Kepastian Hukum Dalam Putusan Hakim*, Sinar Grafika, Jakarta.
- <https://www.hukumonline.com/klinik/detail/ulasan/lt5a84ed465a100/arti-putusan-pengadilan-batal-demi-hukum/>, diakses pada tanggal 28 Mei 2025, Pukul 22.08 WITA.
- <https://nasional.kompas.com/read/2013/04/25/10055438/Saling.Ngotot.Eksekusi.Susno.Potret.Carut.Marut.Hukum>, diakses pada tanggal 12 Juni 2025, Pukul 22.09 WITA.
- <https://www.pengertianmenurutparaahli.com/pengertian-implikasi/>, diakses pada tanggal 11 Juni 2025, Pukul 17.05 WITA.
- <https://kbbi.kemdikbud.go.id/entri/implikasi>, diakses pada tanggal 28 Juni 2025, Pukul 22.01 WITA.
- Hono Sejati, 2018, *Rekonstruksi Pemeriksaan Perkara di Pengadilan Hubungan Industrial Berbasis Nilai Cepat, Adil, dan, Murah (Studi Kasus di Pengadilan Hubungan Industrial Pada Pengadilan Negeri Yogyakarta)*, Citra Aditya Abadi, Bandung.
- Iman Pasu Marganda Hadiarto Purba, 2017, *Penguatan Budaya Hukum Masyarakat Untuk*

Mengasikkan Kewarganegaraan Transformatif, Jurnal Civics, Volume 14 Nomor 2.

Lawrence M. Friedman, 2017, *Sistem Hukum Perspektif Ilmu Sosial*, Cetakan ke VII, Nusa Media, Bandung.

Munir Fuady, 2013, *Teori-Teori Besar (Grand Theory) Dalam Hukum*, Prenadamedia Group, Jakarta

Nazaruddin Lathif, 2017, *Teori Hukum Sebagai Sarana/Alat Untuk Memperbaharui atau Merekayasa Masyarakat*, Jurnal Pakuan Law Review, Volume 3 Nomor 1.

Peter Mahmud Marzuki, 2016, *Penelitian Hukum Edisi Revisi*, Cetakan ke 12, Prenadamedia Group, Jakarta.

Prianter Jaya Hairi, 2016, *Sebagai Bagian Dari Asas Legalitas Hukum Pidana Indonesia*, Jurnal Negara Hukum, Vol. 7, No.1.

Ria Ayu Novita dkk., 2017, *Efektivitas Pelaksanaan Undang-Undang Nomor 2 Tahun 1960 tentang Perjanjian Bagi Hasil Tanah Pertanian (Tanah Kering) di Desa Beringin, Kecamatan Bayan, Kabupaten Purworejo*, Diponegro Law Journal, Volume 2 Nomor 6.

Satjipto Rahardjo, 1980, *Hukum dan Masyarakat*, Angkasa, Bandung.

Sudikno Mertokusumo, 2009, *Penemuan Hukum*, cetakan keenam, Liberty, Yogyakarta.

Suherman Toha, dkk, 2010, *Laporan Akhir Penelitian Hukum Tentang Penyelesaian Perselisihan Hubungan Industrial*, Badan Pembinaan Hukum Nasional Kementerian Hukum Dan HAM RI.