

Corrective Justice in the Administrative Review of the Appointment of Papua DPRP Members by the Jayapura Administrative Court)

Yustus Pondayar¹, Eren Arif Budiman², Galang Taufani³, Muhamad Sofian⁴

^{1,2,3,4} Faculty of Law, Cenderawasih University, Jl. Kampwolker, Waena, Jayapura

¹yuspon@gmail.com, ²erenbdmn@gmail.com, ³taufanigalang@gmail.com.

⁴msofian@fh.uncen.ac.id

Article Info

Received: 2026-05-10

Revised: 2026-10-16

Accepted: 2026-10-21

Keywords:

administrative decision;
corrective justice; DPRP
papua; PTUN jayapura;
special autonomy.

Abstract

This article examines corrective justice in the administrative review of the appointment process for members of the Papuan People's Representative Council through the Special Autonomy mechanism. The study focuses on Decision Number 12/G/2025/PTUN.JPR, registered at the Jayapura Administrative Court, concerning a dispute over the announcement and work of the Provincial Selection Committee. The central issue is whether a selection committee announcement may be treated as an administrative decision or action that produces legal consequences and can therefore be reviewed by the Administrative Court. This research uses normative legal research with statutory, conceptual, and case approaches. The study argues that political affirmation for Indigenous Papuans represents distributive justice, while judicial review by PTUN Jayapura represents corrective justice when the selection process allegedly violates legality, transparency, impartiality, and good governance principles. The article concludes that PTUN Jayapura does not replace the technical discretion of the selection committee but ensures that administrative authority is exercised lawfully, fairly, transparently, and accountably. Corrective justice in this context restores legal order, protects participants' rights, and strengthens the legitimacy of affirmative representation under Papua's Special Autonomy framework

I. Introduction

The law mandates that the exercise of authority in all government actions—and the execution of administrative power—must align with statutory regulations that embody the principles of legality, accountability, and transparency in governance, while ensuring full protection of citizens' rights (Safiudin, 2022). This oversight function operates within the Indonesian legal system, wherein the State Administrative Court (PTUN) assesses whether an administrative action or decision is legally consistent with statutory regulations and the General Principles of Good Governance (AUPB). Thus, the PTUN not only serves as a forum for resolving administrative disputes but also balances the state's exercise of authority with the protection of citizens (P. M. Hadjon, 2002).

In a welfare state—where government protection extends deeply into various spheres of public life the necessity of this oversight function becomes glaringly apparent. The expansion of power also increases the risk of abuse of authority, procedural violations, and hasty or arbitrary administrative actions. From a modern administrative law perspective, legality entails more than mere compliance with written norms; it also requires respect for the values of fairness, proportionality, and openness to safeguard the public's right to protection.

However, even when a policy is affirmative in nature, the government remains obligated to conduct the entire administrative process in a lawful, objective, transparent, and accountable manner. Given that significant political rights are at stake, the process for selecting members of the DPRP must meet high legal standards. Any procedural error, lack of clarity regarding assessment criteria, or action contrary to the General Principles of Good Governance (AUPB) could disadvantage selection candidates and undermine the validity of the affirmative policy itself.

This issue arose in a dispute concerning the filling of DPRP (Papua People's

Representative Council) seats via an appointment mechanism, which was adjudicated by the Jayapura State Administrative Court (PTUN) in Case Number 12/G/2025/PTUN.JPR. The dispute stemmed from objections to the Papua Province Selection Committee Announcement Number 07/PANSEL-PP/PU/I/2025, specifically regarding the selection process for DPRP members representing Indigenous Papuans (OAP). The case not only challenged the selection results but also raised critical questions regarding the status of the said Announcement as the object of an administrative law dispute and the limits of the Jayapura PTUN's authority when reviewing administrative actions arising from the filling of political offices through affirmative mechanisms.

Previous research has addressed Papua's Special Autonomy, affirmative politics for Indigenous Papuans, and developments in state administrative law (H.R, 2018). However, few studies have linked the concept of corrective justice to the role of the State Administrative Court in disputes over DPRP member appointments. Yet, this concept is crucial for explaining how the court can rectify administrative actions that appear to violate legality and the General Principles of Good Governance (AUPB) without infringing upon the technical discretion of the selection organizers (Weinrib, 2013).

Addressing this gap, this article offers three novel contributions: first, utilizing corrective justice as a framework to analyze the function of the State Administrative Court; second, reconstructing the relationship between distributive justice—which underpins the affirmative policy—and corrective justice—which serves as a mechanism for judicial oversight; Third, it establishes the limits of the Administrative Court's intervention regarding the administrative discretion exercised by the Selection Committee. This study aims to analyze the legal status of the Selection Committee's announcement as a subject of administrative law disputes, the application of

corrective justice in disputes concerning the appointment of Papua People's Representative Council (DPRP) members, and the role of the Jayapura Administrative Court in ensuring legal protection based on the principle of legality and the General Principles of Good Governance (AUPB).

2. Research Method

This study is a normative legal research project examining norms, principles, doctrines, and court rulings. It aims to analyze the judicial review of administrative actions regarding the appointment of members to the Papuan People's Representative Council (DPRP) under the Special Autonomy mechanism. The study employs a statutory approach to examine the alignment of norms across the 1945 Constitution, Law No. 21/2001 (in conjunction with Law No. 2/2021), Law No. 48/2009, Government Regulation No. 106/2021 (in conjunction with Government Regulation No. 46/2025), and Minister of Home Affairs Regulation No. 2/2024. A conceptual approach is used to establish a theoretical framework based on Aristotle's concept of corrective justice and its subsequent development by Weinrib and Coleman. This framework encompasses theories regarding administrative authority, the principle of legality, administrative discretion, and the General Principles of Good Governance (AUPB).

Additionally, the study utilizes a case-based approach, focusing on the Jayapura Administrative Court (PTUN) Decision Number 12/G/2025/PTUN.JPR. The analysis covers various aspects, including legal facts, the object of the dispute, arguments from both parties, the judge's reasoning, and the ruling's impact on the scope of justiciable objects in administrative law. The legal materials employed comprise primary, secondary, and tertiary sources. Data were gathered through literature and document reviews, referencing relevant regulations, court rulings, official documents, books, journals, and scholarly works.

All legal materials underwent detailed analysis using a prescriptive-analytical approach. This process involved gathering norms, structuring and categorizing them, interpreting their meanings, reconciling conflicting norms, and formulating legal arguments. The findings of this analysis were then compared against the concept of corrective justice. The objective is to evaluate the role of the Jayapura Administrative Court in reviewing administrative actions taken by the Selection Committee. Furthermore, it aims to examine how this role contributes to protecting citizens' rights and supporting good governance.

3. Results and Discussion

A. Appointment of Papuan DPRP Members as Distributive Justice in Special Autonomy

The appointment of members to the Papuan People's Representative Council (DPRP) via the Special Autonomy mechanism constitutes a form of affirmative action constitutionally intended to guarantee the political representation of Indigenous Papuans (OAP) in regional governance. Unlike general election mechanisms based on the principle of electoral competition, the appointment mechanism is grounded in the state's recognition of the historical, social, cultural, and political circumstances of indigenous Papuan communities—circumstances requiring special treatment to achieve substantive equality (Rawls, 1971). Consequently, the appointment of DPRP members cannot be understood merely as an administrative procedure; rather, it serves as an instrument of constitutional engineering designed to rectify long-standing imbalances in political representation.

Theoretically, this policy aligns with the concept of distributive justice articulated by Aristotle in **Nicomachean Ethics**. Aristotle distinguished between two primary forms of justice: distributive justice and corrective justice. Distributive justice concerns the proportional allocation of rights, offices, honors, and public benefits

based on specific characteristics, whereas corrective justice aims to restore legal balance following deviations or losses caused by the actions of individuals or institutions. Viewed from this perspective, the appointment of DPRD members represents a manifestation of distributive justice, as the state consciously accords differential treatment to Indigenous Papuans—a group granted constitutional protection under the Special Autonomy regime.

This approach aligns with the evolution of modern theories of justice. John Rawls explains that justice is not always synonymous with identical treatment (formal equality); rather, it can entail differential treatment, provided the aim is to improve the standing of groups that are socially or politically disadvantaged. The "difference principle" provides philosophical legitimacy for affirmative policies, as the unequal distribution of rights and opportunities is intended to achieve a more substantive form of justice. Consequently, the policy of appointing members to the Papuan People's Representative Council (DPRP) does not constitute a form of positive discrimination that conflicts with the principle of equality before the law; instead, it embodies the principle of substantive justice and has secured constitutional legitimacy.

In the context of national law, political affirmation for Indigenous Papuans is a logical consequence of the state's recognition of Papua's special status, as stipulated in Law Number 21 of 2001 concerning Special Autonomy for Papua Province—a status subsequently reinforced by the second amendment via Law Number 2 of 2021. These regulations position the political representation of Indigenous Papuans as a cornerstone of the Special Autonomy framework. Furthermore, Government Regulation Number 106 of 2021—along with amendments introduced by Government Regulation Number 46 of 2025—details the mechanisms for filling DPRD seats through appointment, covering everything from the formation of the Selection Committee and administrative verification stages to the selection process and the final

determination of results. This normative framework demonstrates that political affirmation is not merely an administrative policy of the government but a direct mandate of the national legal system.

Research by Firman and Sofian reinforces the premise that Papua's Special Autonomy represents a form of asymmetric decentralization intertwined with affirmative politics for Indigenous Papuans. Thus, the process of filling DPRP seats through appointment cannot be viewed merely as a routine administrative procedure; rather, it is an integral component of a specialized representation design within a unitary state (Sofian, 2025).

However, this affirmative nature does not preclude legal oversight. On the contrary, the stronger the affirmative element of a policy, the greater the need to ensure that its implementation procedures are transparent, accountable, and non-discriminatory. Affirmative measures carried out without proper governance can undermine the legitimacy of both the Selection Committee and the DPRP body formed through that mechanism.

Table 1. Main Data of Case Number 12/G/2025/PTUN.JPR

Data Element	Information
Case number	12/G/2025/PTUN.JPR
Court	Jayapura Administrative Court
Registration date	January 30, 2025
Date of judgment	June 24, 2025
Upload date	June 30, 2025
Plaintiff	Roberth Senggi
Defendant	Papua Province Selection Committee
Intervening party	Musa Yosep Sombuk; Lidya Astrid Stephanie Meset; Emma Yesephina Ludia Duwiri; Yotam Bilasi; Erick Ohee; Cesilia Novani Mehue
Subject matter of the dispute	Selection Committee Announcement Number 07/PANSEL-PP/PU/I/2025 dated January 11, 2025

Source: Supreme Court Judgment Directory and legal news reports regarding the dispute over the Papua DPRP Selection Committee.

The analysis demonstrates that distributive justice and corrective justice are not mutually exclusive concepts but rather complementary instruments. Distributive justice provides the normative basis for the state to implement affirmative policies, while corrective justice ensures that the execution of such policies does not deviate from the principles of the rule of law. In other words, without distributive justice, affirmative policy loses its philosophical foundation; conversely, without corrective justice, affirmative policy risks losing its legal legitimacy due to the absence of mechanisms to rectify administrative irregularities occurring during the selection process. Based on this analysis, the author argues that disputes regarding the appointment of DPRP members under the Special Autonomy mechanism should not be reduced to mere administrative disputes. Such disputes actually lie at the intersection of administrative law, constitutional law, the protection of indigenous peoples' constitutional rights, and theories of justice (Indroharto, 2005). Therefore, judicial review by the Administrative Court (PTUN) should not be viewed as an interference with affirmative policy, but rather as a constitutional mechanism to ensure that affirmative policy is implemented in accordance with the principle of legality, General Principles of Good Governance (AUPB), and the values of a democratic state governed by the rule of law. Indeed, it is through this mechanism of judicial oversight that the objectives of affirmative policy gain stronger legitimacy, as they are realized through an administrative process that is lawful, transparent, objective, and accountable.

B. Application of General Principles of Proper Governance (AUPB) Standards to Correct the Status of Selection Committee Announcements as Objects of

Administrative Disputes

The key issue here is whether the circular issued by the committee qualifies as a state decision subject to challenge under administrative procedural law. According to the classic definition found in the Law on Administrative Courts, a decision or ruling by a state administrative authority must satisfy all of the following criteria: it must be issued in writing; it must be issued by a state administrative body or official; it must embody an individual administrative law action governed by legislation; it must be concrete (rather than merely abstract); it must be individual in nature (i.e., addressed to a specific person); it must be final (unambiguous); and it must possess binding legal force, resulting in legal consequences for a specific individual or private legal entity (Rawlings, 2021).

Since the implementation of the Law on Government Administration, the scope of administrative disputes has expanded. Article 87 of the Law on Government Administration broadens the definition of an administrative decision, ensuring it is not strictly confined to rigid formal constructs. This expansion is highly significant because, in current practice, numerous administrative actions manifest as announcements, procedural stages, lists of results, meeting minutes, and recommendations—or as governmental activities that may ultimately be implemented through plans directly affecting the legal status of citizens (Siswanto, 2023).

The DPRP selection process—and the announcements made by the Selection Committee—involve matters that go far beyond routine information. If an announcement is merely a general notice that does not determine a participant's rights or status, the grounds for lodging an objection or challenge are weak. However, if the announcement specifies who has been eliminated, who remains a candidate (e.g., by establishing a ranking), or who has lost the opportunity to be nominated, it directly

affects the legal rights and obligations of the individual participants. In such cases, the announcement can be challenged as an institutional decision or administrative action.

Regarding the DPRP selection process, not all announcements by the Selection Committee are treated as ordinary news. Announcements that are vague and fail to define the rights or status of participants raise questions regarding their validity. Conversely, announcements specifying who has been eliminated, who remains in contention, the ranking order, or who has lost the right to nomination entail direct legal consequences for the participants. It is at this point that the announcement becomes subject to legal challenge, as it is deemed to constitute an administrative decision or action.

However, it must be understood that "finality" can signify the conclusion of the entire process or refer to a decisive point within a specific stage. In a multi-stage selection process, an announcement may be deemed official at a particular stage, even if it does not yet constitute a formal decision by the regional head or the Minister. If such an announcement terminates a participant's right to proceed with the process, it carries legal consequences. Therefore, the subject of the dispute regarding the DPRP Selection Committee must be viewed in terms of the actual impact on the selection participants, rather than merely the formal sequence of administrative stages.

Presidential Regulation Number 106 of 2021 stipulates that the selection of DPRP members must be conducted through an appointment mechanism that is open, effective, and efficient, while adhering to principles of representation, fairness, and democracy. The regulation also outlines the procedures for notification and the drafting of candidate proposals, as well as the processes of verification, screening, selection, and final appointment. Consequently, the Selection Committee is obligated to ensure that the selection process is not merely administrative in nature but also substantively meets standards of fairness and accountability.

In the dispute regarding the DPRP Selection Committee, allegations of a lack of transparency, bias, or unclear assessment criteria must be viewed through the lens of the General Principles of Good Governance (AUPB). The principle of openness requires the provision of sufficient information regarding the steps, requirements, assessment methods, and results of the selection process. The principle of prudence demands that the Selection Committee perform verification and validation with due diligence. The principle of impartiality means that every candidate is assessed against the same standards. The principle of legal certainty requires participants to understand the legal consequences associated with each stage of the selection process.

AUPB also serves as an evidentiary instrument in State Administrative Court (PTUN) proceedings. Chandra emphasizes that violations of AUPB in administrative law disputes must be demonstrated by establishing a link between the administrative action taken, the governance standards applied, and the legal consequences experienced by the aggrieved party. In a selection process, evidence can be established by examining stage-specific documents, official records, assessment forms, ranking criteria, records of objections, and the consistency of treatment across all participants (Chandra, 2025).

Nusantara regards AUPB as a crucial element in enhancing the effectiveness of State Administrative Court rulings. If a ruling identifies an AUPB violation, the implementation of that ruling is not merely a formal obligation but also a means to improve the quality of government administration. In the context of the Papua DPRP, the implementation of judicial corrections must rectify the selection process to ensure that political affirmative action retains its legitimacy in the eyes of the public (Nusantara, 2022).

C. Corrective Justice in the Administrative Dispute Regarding the Appointment of Papua DPRP Members

Corrective justice comes into play when an imbalance arises from the actions of an individual or institution that cause harm to another party. In administrative law, such an imbalance occurs when a government body or official issues a decision or takes an action that is flawed regarding authority, procedure, or substance, or that contravenes the General Principles of Good Governance (AUPB). Corrective justice demands redress to restore the imbalanced legal relationship to a lawful state.

The distinction between distributive justice and corrective justice is crucial for understanding this case. The appointment of DPRP members from the Indigenous Papuan (OAP) demographic represents distributive justice, as the state provides a special allocation for representation. However, when the affirmative selection process allegedly causes individual harm due to procedural flaws or unequal treatment, corrective justice applies. The court intervenes not to nullify the objective of the affirmative action, but to rectify the process so that it complies with the law.

Within the framework of Indonesian administrative law, corrective justice can be linked to the function of providing legal protection for the public against government actions. Hadjon identifies legal protection as a foundational element of administrative law, while Ridwan HR emphasizes the importance of legality, authority, and oversight regarding administrative actions. Tjandra further notes that administrative law governs how the government carries out its public functions in a lawful and accountable manner (Tjandra, 2021).

Corrective justice in cases concerning the DPRP selection process cannot be understood as a means to automatically appoint the plaintiff as a member of the DPRP. Judicial correction must be directed at rectifying the process—for instance, by annulling a flawed decision, ordering a re-verification, mandating the proportionate disclosure of assessment criteria, or ordering the issuance of a new decision in accordance with the law. Thus, such correction does not usurp the technical domain

of the Selection Committee but ensures that this domain is not exercised arbitrarily (Pasalli, 2023).

Table 2. The Relationship between Distributive Justice and Corrective Justice in the Selection of the Papua DPRP

Aspect	Distributive Justice	Corrective Justice
Orientation	Allocation of political representation space for Indigenous Papuans (OAP)	Rectification of irregularities resulting from administrative flaws
Instrument	Special Autonomy and the appointment of DPRP/DPRK members	Legality review by the Administrative Court
Key actor	The State, the government, the Selection Committee, and indigenous communities	Administrative Court, plaintiff, defendant, intervening party
Assessment standard	Representation, affirmative action, and the genuine needs of Indigenous Papuans	Legality, procedure, substance, General Principles of Proper Governance (AUPB)
Ultimate goal	Special representation within regional political institutions	Restoring the process to ensure it is lawful, fair, and accountable

Source: Compiled by the author based on Aristotle's theoretical framework of justice and the Indonesian administrative law regime.

D. The Role of the Administrative Court as a Corrective Institution in Decision Number 12/G/2025/PTUN.JPR Regarding Appointments in the Context of Achieving Distributive Justice

The role of the Jayapura Administrative Court (PTUN Jayapura) in Case Number 12/G/2025/PTUN.JPR can be understood across three levels. First, the Court acts to verify the legal validity of the Selection Committee's administrative actions. This

legality review encompasses aspects of authority, procedural conduct, substance, and adherence to the General Principles of Good Governance (AUPB). During the selection process, the court must examine whether the Committee performed its duties in accordance with applicable law, followed all prescribed procedural stages, employed clear and accountable assessment criteria, and accorded equal treatment to all participants.

Second, the Court serves as a guardian of the boundary between sound technical decision-making and the improper exercise of authority. The Selection Committee indeed possesses technical latitude to evaluate candidates, formulate examination materials, conduct interviews, and determine the ranking of results. Government Regulation (PP) Number 106 of 2021 empowers the Committee to conduct the selection process following verification and validation, and to specify the written examination and/or interview materials utilized. However, the exercise of such technical discretion must not be used to deprive participants of a fair and impartial assessment.

Third, the State Administrative Court (PTUN) plays a role in restoring legal standing. If an announcement or decision by a Selection Committee (Pansel) results in legal consequences and an error is proven, the PTUN must mandate corrective measures to return the process to a state of legal compliance. This restoration may involve annulling a decision, revoking an erroneous announcement, ordering specific administrative actions, or requiring the issuance of a new decision. This constitutes the essence of corrective justice within the state administrative court system.

Case Number 12/G/2025/PTUN.JPR must also be understood within the context of broader disputes. The Supreme Court's Judgment Directory records several cases in 2025 involving DPRP/DPRK Selection Committees in the Papua region—such as cases against the Southwest Papua Province Selection Committee, the Yapen Islands

DPRK Selection Committee, and the Sorong Regency DPR Selection Committee. This phenomenon indicates that the affirmative selection system requires superior administrative standards.[29]

However, it is important to note that the PTUN's corrective function is not synonymous with usurping the Selection Committee's authority. The court must not substitute its own judgment for the technical assessment of candidates' quality, provided that such assessment is conducted correctly, fairly, and with clear documentation. Court intervention is warranted only in instances of flawed authority, procedural errors, misuse of authority, unclear grounds for assessment, unfair treatment, or violations of the General Principles of Good Governance (AUPB). Thus, the PTUN's role is to ensure that political affirmative action does not devolve into unlawful and arbitrary administration.

The first implication of this case is the importance of clearly defining the legal status of every document produced by the Selection Committee. Announcements of assessment results, lists of successful candidates, ranking lists, activity information, recommendations, and the final selection of candidates must be clearly distinguished from one another. This distinction is crucial so that participants understand when their rights may be affected, when they are entitled to lodge an objection, and when a dispute may be brought before the Administrative Court.

The second implication is the need for a robust administrative documentation system. The Selection Committee must retain all assessment documents, official records, score sheets, verification bases, interview results, and any objections filed by participants. Without adequate documentation, the Committee would struggle to demonstrate that the selection process was conducted fairly and impartially. Documentation also serves as a means to ensure accountability in the event of a disagreement.

The third implication is the necessity of a clear mechanism for filing administrative objections. Before an individual files a lawsuit in court, there must be a well-functioning, transparent, and expeditious avenue for lodging complaints. An objection mechanism does not restrict an individual's right to sue; rather, it offers the Selection Committee an opportunity to rectify errors at an early stage. This mechanism also aligns with the concept of corrective justice, as remedies can be implemented more swiftly without the need to await a court ruling.

A fourth implication concerns the strengthening of the Selection Committee's institutional capacity. The Committee requires not only representative legitimacy but also competence in administration, ethics, and legal matters. Affirmative selection processes are more susceptible to challenge if assessment indicators lack clarity, the screening team's composition is perceived as biased, or public communication is inadequate. Consequently, the Committee's technical regulations must encompass assessment standards, announcement procedures, a reasonable code of conduct, prohibitions against conflicts of interest, and protocols for addressing objections. A fifth implication highlights the importance of effective judgment implementation. Corrective justice does not conclude with a court ruling; if a judgment is not executed, judicial correction fails to restore the situation. While the Law on Judicial Power outlines the courts' duty to uphold law and justice, the Law on State Administrative Courts governs the implementation of court rulings. Therefore, local governments, the Selection Committee, and relevant officials should utilize State Administrative Court rulings as tools to enhance administrative quality, rather than viewing them merely as threats within civil litigation. Recent regulatory developments also warrant monitoring. Government Regulation No. 46 of 2025—which replaces Government Regulation No. 106 of 2021—demonstrates the continued operation and evolution of Papua's special autonomy institutional system. Further research must evaluate

whether these regulatory changes strengthen selection management, clarify grounds for dispute, and mitigate the likelihood of administrative disputes arising during the recruitment-based filling of DPRP/DPRK seats.

4. Conclusion

The appointment of Papua DPRP members via the Special Autonomy mechanism represents a form of political recognition for Indigenous Papuans, demonstrating fairness in the allocation of opportunities and benefits. However, such political measures must still adhere to the principles of the rule of law—ensuring legality, transparency, objectivity, and accountability—as well as the general principles of good governance. Under Ruling No. 12/G/2025/PTUN.JPR, announcements or decisions issued by the selection committee are subject to legal challenge if they have a direct legal impact on the rights or interests of selection candidates. Consequently, the legal status of the selection committee's announcements must be assessed based on their substance and impact, rather than merely their formal documentary format.

In this instance, corrective justice serves as a means to rectify alleged errors within the recruitment process. The Jayapura Administrative Court (PTUN) acts as the remedial body, reviewing the selection committee's authority, procedures, substantive decisions, and adherence to the General Principles of Good Governance (AUPB). Its role is not to substitute the committee's technical judgment regarding candidates, but rather to ensure that such judgment is exercised lawfully, appropriately, transparently, fairly, and accountably. Moving forward, the management of the DPRP appointment-based selection process requires improvement through clarified document status, measurable assessment standards, comprehensive administrative documentation, mechanisms for lodging administrative objections, and the consistent implementation of court rulings as a tool

for legal redress and the upholding of affirmative political governance for Indigenous Papuans.

References

- Chandra, F. (2025). Pembuktian Pelanggaran Asas-Asas Umum Pemerintahan yang Baik dalam Sengketa Tata Usaha Negara. *Adagium: Jurnal Ilmiah Hukum*.
- H.R, R. (2018). *Hukum Administrasi Negara*. Jakarta: Rajawali Pers.
- Indroharto. (2005). *Usaha Memahami Undang-Undang tentang Peradilan Tata Usaha Negara*. Jakarta: Pustaka Sinar Harapan.
- Nusantara, M. Q. (2022). Peran Asas Umum Pemerintahan yang Baik dalam Eksekutorial Putusan PTUN. *Palar: Pakuan Law Review*,.
- P. M. Hadjon, d. (2002). *Pengantar Hukum Administrasi Indonesi*. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press.
- Pasalli, M. S. (2023). Kebijakan Afirmasi Politik Bagi Orang Asli Papua dalam Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat Daerah di Papua. *Jurnal Hukum, Politik dan Kekuasaan*, vol. 4, no. 1, 56-70.
- Rawlings, C. H. (2021). *Law and Administration, 4th ed*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rawls, J. (1971). *A Theory of Justice*. Cambridge: MA: Harvard University Press.
- Safiudin, J. (2022). Politik Hukum Pengangkatan Orang Asli Papua dalam Lembaga Perwakilan Rakyat Daerah di Papua. *Jurnal Poros Hukum Padjadjaran* vol. 4, no. 1, 129-148.
- Siswanto. (2023). Perluasan Objek Gugatan dan Perubahan Prosedur Beracara di Pengadilan Tata Usaha Negara Ditinjau dari Undang-Undang Nomor 30 Tahun 2014 tentang Administrasi Pemerintahan. *Lex Jurnalica*, vol. 20, no. 3.

- Sofian, F. a. (2025). Otonomi Khusus Papua dari Perspektif Politik Afirmasi Orang Asli Papua di Pemerintahan,. *Jurnal Pemerintahan dan Politik vol. 10, no. 3*, 522-540.
- Tjandra, W. R. (2021). *Hukum Administrasi Negara*. Jakarta: Sinar Grafika.
- Weinrib, E. J. (2013). *The Idea of Private Law; Aristoteles, Nicomachean Ethics*. United Kingdom: Oxsford University.