



Court Decision Publication and Judicial Reform Based on Electronic Court and Its Implication to Public Trust in Indonesia

Amran Suadi

Chairperson of the Indonesian Supreme Court for Religious Chamber, Indonesia

Abstract

This paper is motivated by the spirit of judicial reform in Indonesia in the reformation era. The right to access information on judicial institutions is an integral part of the constitutional rights that guaranteed by the Indonesian Constitution and must be fulfilled. The question proposed in this paper is how far the court decisions publication and judicial reform based on electronic courts implicated to increase public trust to judicial institutions in Indonesia? On the one hand, public information disclosure is a demand for democracy, transparency, and accountability of judicial institutions to gain the public trust. On the other hand, the level of public trust to the judicial institution is still low. The research objective is to provide a general description the judicial information system services based on electronic court through the Supreme Court Decisions Directory and its implication to increase the public trust to the judicial institutions in Indonesia. The results of this study indicate that the public can now easily access all court information ranging from case administration service procedures to issuing court decisions, which also has implications to increase the public trust to the judicial institutions itself. The evidence can be seen in the decision-making filing program in the last ten years, in which the Indonesian Supreme Court has also succeeded in publishing 4,661,021 court decisions, consisting of 4,403,428 at first-level court decisions, 123,995 at appellate court decisions, 100,863 at verdict decisions, and 32,735 at reconsideration decisions.

Keywords: Public information disclosure; Judicial reform; Electronic court; Court decision publication; Public trust.



CC BY: [Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

1. Introduction

The political system and state power changes after the reformation era have implicated positively to the development of democracy in Indonesia. Reformation is a process that must always be carried out in stages, dynamically, and systematically, so that it can lead to better change. After the reformation era, a collective spirit has emerged to carry out various checks and balances between government and state institutions, especially in relation to the demand for public information disclosure.

One of the crucial issues in the spotlight of the public sphere right now is the transparency of judicial information. Judicial information disclosure here is mean that how the public can easily access all case files and decisions that have been considered taboo to be accessed in public consumption. Lindsey (2017), said that the easy of accessing the justice information system is a constitutional right for every citizen because all people are equal before the law and also entitled to access to justice.

According to Suadi (2011), as an independent branch of state power, the judicial institution has a major role in the development of law or public policy, recognition and protection of rights, as well as controlling other branches of state power. Ramadhan (2014) explains that the public, both journalists (press) or non-governmental organizations (NGOs), can utilize the judicial information disclosure to assess judicial performance through reporting, access to legal services, and also publication of decisions, as well as being a form of control over justice accountability itself.

In the last few decades, the Indonesian Supreme Court has made the concrete efforts to initiate new regulation on judicial information disclosure, precisely one year before the enactment of the Law of Public Information Disclosure Number 14 of 2008. The regulation was improved by the Decree of the Indonesian Supreme Court Number: 1144/KMA/SK/1/2011 on Judicial Information Services Guidelines (ISC, 2014).

In fact, the implementation of public information disclosure at the first-level court is seemed so far from perfect. For example, Transparency International (2013) has given low ratings for judicial institutions in Indonesia. The Global Corruption Barometer also gave a score of 4.4 with a scale of 5 as the worst value given to judicial institutions based on surveys of corruption cases in Indonesia. Based on the agency survey results, there showed that 66% of respondents claimed to have bribed court officials. This certainly gives a negative view to the Indonesian judicial institution image, which it should be ideally become one of the clean state institutions from all forms of fraud.

Referring to a survey conducted by MaPPI (2014), there was found that the judicial institution tends to be closed to provide information for the public. They show that 26 of 33 first-level courts in Indonesia are not willing to provide the number of information requested by surveyors. Based on the research results, the degree of public information disclosure to the public was only 21.21%. Other community surveys were also conducted by Center for Legal Studies, Advocacy, and Policy or PSHK (2013). They show that public satisfaction with information acquisition in judicial institution was not perfect. According to the baseline of PSHK survey, there is noted that only 37% of the relevant respondents were satisfied with court information services.

Based on the survey results above, this object is an interesting phenomenon to be studied further based on three arguments such as: first, the judicial information disclosure is the constitutional right of every citizen that must be guaranteed by the Indonesian constitution and regulation; second, judicial information disclosure today will increase the accountability of the judicial institution performance as a clean and fully authoritative; and third, the judicial information disclosure is also part of the reformation mandates that must be implemented entirely in order to increase public trust to the judicial institution itself. Therefore, the research question proposed here is how far the court decisions publication and judicial reform based on electronic courts implicate to increase the public trust to the judicial institutions in Indonesia?

2. Research Objective

The research objective is to provide a general description the judicial information system services based on electronic court through the Supreme Court Decisions Directory and its implication to increase the public trust to the judicial institutions in Indonesia. In this paper, I will explain briefly the focus of the research regarding on three aspects, such as: first, judicial information disclosure preferences in Indonesia, second, judicial reform policy and its relation to public trust in Indonesia, and third, court decision publication, public trust, and its relation to judicial institutions in Indonesia. Through this research I hope that I can be obtained the research results about the implication of electronic court services to public trust to the judicial institution in Indonesia.

3. Literature Review

3.1. Public Information Disclosure

According to Terry (1977), information is an important data that provides useful knowledge for the recipient. In this, Davis (1974) describes information as data that has been processed into an important form for the recipient and also has a real value that can be felt in the present or future decision. McLeod (2008), also explains that information is data that has been processed into a form, has meaning and benefit, and useful to the recipient in making decisions for the present or the future.

Referring to the provisions in Article 1 of Public Information Disclosure Law Number 14 of 2008 stated that information defined as information, statements, ideas and signs that contain values, meanings and messages, both fact data and explanations that can be seen, heard and read that can be seen, presented in various packaging and formats in accordance with the development of electronic and non-electronic information, and also communication technology. Public information is information that is produced, stored, managed, sent, and/or received by a public agency relating to the official and administration of the state and/or other organizers, and operations of the public agency in accordance with this law and other relevant information in the public interest (BPHN, 2008).

Nurdiansyah (2016), says that in the current globalization era, information is quickly spreading and very important. Besides that, the public can also easily access all forms of information and even all information from abroad can be obtained so easily. In accordance with the principle of public disclosure in a democratic country, state organizers are required to open themselves to the right of people to obtain trust, honest, and non-discriminatory information about state administration. In Government Regulation Number 61 of 2009 on Information Disclosure, it is also regulated that the rights, responsibilities, and obligations of the public and state administrators must be carried out in a balanced manner. The main purpose of the regulation, the public can get a legal protection and be able to use their rights to obtain and convey information about state administrators (BPHN, 2009).

Indah and dan Hariyanti (2018), explain that public information disclosure is one of the democracy pillars and the freedom of expression, transparency, clean and good governance. It is also confirmed by Sedarmayanti (2004) says that the realization of government openness principle is one of the characteristics of clean and good governance. According to Setiaman *et al.* (2013), a government can be said implementing the principles of clean and good governance if the practical administration of the government is a clean, accountable, and transparent in line with the concept of democracy.

In connection with the description above, Santosa (2008) explains that clean and good governance is an effective management of all kinds of public affairs through the making of legislation and/or legitimate policies in order to promote social values. In other words, public information disclosure is an effort to optimize public oversight of the administration of the state and other public bodies and everything that impacts to the public interest.

3.2. Judicial Reform

Judicial institution is part of the law enforcement system and attempts to obtain legal certainty. As the last bastion, the judicial institution is a place for those who justice seekers to get justice even though it is not entirely fair. To provide satisfaction for justice seekers, of course a clean justice system is needed and able to guarantee the justice and legal certainty (Yusup, 2019). But the reality shows that as a judicial institution, justice enforcer, and an important pillar of the state, the judicial institution seems to have experienced a crisis of public distrust.

The Constitution regulates Judicial Power in Chapter IX Article 24 Paragraphs (1) and (2) of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, which has determined that judicial power in Indonesia is an independent power to administer justice and to uphold law and justice. According to Yusup *et al.* (2016), judicial power in Indonesia is exercised by a Supreme Court and subordinate judiciary within the general court, religious court, military court, state administrative court, and constitutional court.

The purpose of the aforementioned provisions is the constitution mandates and guarantees independence for judges in upholding the law and justice to justice seekers. If court decision is not satisfied, they are given the

opportunity for ordinary and extraordinary legal efforts from starting court decisions, appeals in high courts, and cassation and legal remedies in the supreme courts. But it is not valid in the constitutional court, because the nature of the decision is legality final and binding, which there are no other legal remedies.

According to [Suadi \(2011\)](#), the position of the Supreme Court as the highest peak of legal remedies as provided by Article 24A of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, which determines the Supreme Court has the authority to adjudicate at the cassation level, examine the statutory provisions under the law, and have other authorities granted by law. The derivative regulations regulated in Law Number 15 of 1985 are amended by Law Number 5 of 2004 and finally amended again by Law Number 3 of 2009 on the Supreme Court.

In addition, judicial power is also regulated in the Law Number 4 of 2004 that amended with the Law Number 48 of 2009 on Judicial Power. In this law stated that judicial power is an independent state power to establish justice in order to uphold law and justice based on Pancasila and the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, and including to implement the rule of law in Republic of Indonesia. According to Pancasila, the 1945 Constitution, and the Law Number 48 of 2009, the main purpose of judicial authority in Indonesia is to implement state power based on law and not based on power.

In contrast, [Suadi \(2018\)](#) says that the existence of the constitutional court has the authority to adjudicate various cases on election disputes at the first and last level, whose decisions are final and binding to examine the Law on the Constitution, decide upon disputes over the authority of the state institutions whose this authority is granted by the Constitution, decide upon the dissolution of political parties, and decide on disputes about the results of general elections and additions from the overflow of the Indonesian Supreme Court, namely disputes over the results of regional head elections. There is a derivative provision, namely the Law Number 8 of 2011 on Amendments to the Law Number 24 of 2003 on the Constitutional Court as one of the perpetrators of judicial power in Indonesia.

Based on the explanation above, I can say that the spirit of justice reform in Indonesia is aimed to ensure the courts can spearhead as the actors of justice power for justice seekers and to ensure the implementation of justice and legal certainty although in practice justice seekers are still find any difficulties in obtaining adequate public services, especially for those who related to the power and authority possessed by the court decision handed down that sometimes causes injustice for justice seekers themselves.

3.3. Court Decision Publication

The judge's decision is commonly referred to the term of court decision. It is very desirable or eagerly awaited by the parties who are litigant in order to resolve disputes among them as well as possible. Because of the judge's decision, according to [Makarao \(2004\)](#), the dispute parties expect to legal certainty and justice, where the judge's decision can only be obtained through the court.

If it returned to its essence, the court decision is a statement by the judge as a state official who is authorized to do so and said in a hearing that is open to the public with the aim of settling a lawsuit or dispute between the parties that litigate (contentious). The determination is almost the same with the definition above, unless for the case that is settled is a petition or without dispute between the parties (*voluntary*). Moreover, the deed of peace is a deed made by a judge, which contains the results of deliberations among the parties to end the dispute and act as a decision ([Yusup, 2016](#)).

In order to be able and to give a ruling that truly creates legal certainty and reflects justice, [Syahrani \(1998\)](#) explains that the position of a judge as a state apparatus for carrying out duties in court must really know the actual case sitting, as well as the legal regulations governing it to be applied, both legal regulations written in the laws and regulations and unwritten laws such as customary law.

[Mertokusumo \(1981\)](#), provides a definition of a judge's decision as a statement by the judge, as an official judiciary who was given the authority to pronounce at the hearing and aimed at ending or resolving a case or a dispute among the parties. He emphasized that the judge's decision as a statement made before the trial. Relating to this, [Rasaid \(2003\)](#), explains that a court ruling is also seen as a highly desired by parties who are litigating to settle the case as well as possible. In this context, the court's decision is commonly implicated to the parties in expecting legal certainty and justice for the case they were facing in the court system.

In accordance with the spirit of justice reform in Indonesia and also to respond to demands from the wider community regarding on the availability of public information disclosure and transparent access from the judicial institution, the Indonesian Supreme Court has opened access to the public who expect to obtain the judicial information. The website of the decision directory is expected to support the transparency of judicial information program, and at the same time, it is also part of the implementation of the Law Number 14 of 2008 on Public Information Disclosure and the Indonesian Supreme Court Decree Number: 1-144/ KMA/SK/I/2011 on Guidelines for Information Services in the Court, specifically all information about the judicial process, schedule of hearings, publication of decisions, facilities and infrastructure as well as other information needed by the parties or other justice seekers.

3.4. Public Trust

[Yousafzai \(2009\)](#), explains that trust is the foundation of a relationship. The relationship between two or more parties will be well established if everyone trusts to another. According to [Tranter and Krbis \(2009\)](#), this trust cannot be easily recognized by other parties, but it must be built from scratch and can be proven. For example, in the economic field, trust has been considered as a catalyst in various transactions between sellers and buyers so that customer's satisfaction can be realized as expected.

Deutsch in [Yilmaz and Atalay \(2009\)](#) explains that trust is the behavior of individuals, who expect someone can provide positive benefits. Someone can be trusted by others if he can be trusted and can provide benefits to others as expected. So that trust becomes the basis for collaborating with each other. [Fukuyama \(1997\)](#), defines trust as an expectation arising from society, where all members must act within the limits of the norm, with regularity, honesty, and cooperation. In this regard, [Twyman et al. \(2008\)](#) defines trust as an attitude that assumes all individuals or groups mean well, justly, and in accordance with ethical norms.

[Mayer et al. \(1995\)](#), defines trust as one's willingness to be sensitive to the other actions based on the expectation that they will take certain actions to be trusted by them, without depending on their ability to supervise and control them. [Job \(2005\)](#), has also explained the concept of people who are believed to have the will and sensitivity to the other hopes who believe that their actions play a very important role for themselves and others.

Referring to the description above, it can be formulated that public trust will be formed through a series of behaviors between the person who giving the trust and the person who given the trust. In other words, public trust will only arise from the experience of two parties who previously worked together or collaborated in an activity or organization. This experience will generally give a positive impression for both parties to trust each other, commit each other, and not betray each other. The essence of public trust is basically placed the individual's belief in the goodness of other individuals or groups in carrying out their duties and obligations for the common good.

4. Method

This research uses a descriptive-analytical method and is also supported by a qualitative approach to describe briefly about the court decisions publication and judicial reform based on electronic justice and its implications to public trust. Primary and secondary data sources come from the number of literatures that are closely related to the research objectives. The techniques of data collection were obtained from book reviews, documentation, observations, and interviews with informants about the main topic of this study. The techniques of data analysis consist of compilation, classification, and data analysis which is carried out through a combination between deductive and inductive approaches until the conclusion formulation.

5. Result and Discussion

5.1. Judicial Information Disclosure Preferences in Indonesia

According to [Suadi \(2017\)](#), the low quality of court services in terms of public information disclosure resulted three consequences, including: first, the decline of public trust in the integrity of judicial administrators; secondly, the weak position of the judiciary as an institution that is supposed to side with the fulfillment of legal and justice rights for the community; and third, the non-fulfillment of the rights of Indonesian citizens to access justice information, the weakening of democracy, and the rule of law.

Literature and empirical searches show that the coalition of civil society has made various efforts to monitor, support, and encourage the implementation of judicial information disclosure in a comprehensive and continuous manner. The efforts to monitor and report on the implementation of judicial information disclosure are aimed to encourage and strengthen justice reform in the field of public information disclosure. According to [Yusup et al. \(2019\)](#), these efforts were realized by encouraging the Indonesian Supreme Court to make policies that oriented to the public information disclosure in the judicial institution.

One of the policies to implement the Law Number 14 of 2008 on Public Information Disclosure is the Indonesian Supreme Court issued the Decree of the Indonesian Supreme Court Number: 1-144/KMA/SK/I/2011 which stipulates sufficient detail regarding on the public information disclosure in judicial institution. [Ramadhan \(2014\)](#), says that in response this policy, MaPPI FHUI conducted a research on public information availability in the judicial institution. They found that the practice of this policy had not been fully implemented effectively in all judicial bodies.

Moreover, they also try to measure the public information disclosure in court bodies by conducting surveys in 27 courts in 9 provinces throughout Indonesia. Using the purposive sampling method, the survey was conducted from 5 to 24 October 2014 in the courts sample area. This survey is conducted by submitting requests for information to access information that must be made available periodically and information that must be announced at any time by the court. Requests for information are submitted using 2 (two) different form models, namely forms for the availability of public information and the availability of information for researchers. The survey was directed in three factors related to information services in court, namely: (1) availability of information in court; (2) information service facilities in court; and (3) bailiff's response.

In general, the level of information availability needed by non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and the general public (combined information) is 64% in the judiciary. The Religious Courts (PA) has the highest degree of information availability (combined) with 74%, and then followed by the State Administrative Court (PTUN) 67%, and the District Court (PN) 63%. Religious Court in Ambon has 90% as the highest level of information availability, while Palu District Court has 39% as the lowest level of information availability.

For information needed by the public, the highest average availability of information is the Religious Court (PA) 71%, followed by the state administrative court (PTUN) 70%, and finally the general court (PN) 59%. Religious Court in Ambon has the highest level of public information availability 91%, Palu District Court and Bandung State Administrative Court have the lowest level of information availability 13%. For the availability of information needed by NGOs only, PA has the highest level of information availability 76%, followed by PN 67%, and finally

PTUN 65%. PA Palu has the highest level of information availability (NGO) 96% and PTUN Padang has the lowest degree of information availability (NGO) 40%.

The average availability of information on the websites in all the courts surveyed was 48%. The average PA can provide the most information on its website 59%, followed by PTUN 46%, and PN 38%. In contrast, PA Banjarmasin and PA Pekanbaru have the highest degree of information availability (website) 88% and PA Bandung has the lowest degree of information availability (website) 0%.

The results of interviews with court officials showed that the implementation of public information disclosure in the court has not yet optimal due to several issues, including: (1) understanding, (2) socialization, (3) human resources, and (4) public information disclosure facilities. The problem of understanding is related to the lack of public understanding of the importance and availability of information disclosure. Based on the results of the interviews conducted by MaPPI, there is no court to disseminate information to the public. The court gives understanding only to the internal circles of the court, or to parties who are currently litigants. Finally, the public has not been fully educated about the importance of public information disclosure in court.

There are several problems related to human resources in judicial reform such as the lack of quantity and quality of human resources to manage public information disclosure, lack of budget to add human resources to manage public information disclosure, and inaccurate targets for public information disclosure training conducted by the Indonesian Supreme Court. Referring to the many problems, the aspects of facilities and budget constraints are the two main factors that cause the court to experience a lack of supporting facilities to support the public information disclosure.

5.2. Judicial Reform and Public Trust

The focus of justice reform ideally should no longer focus on the independence of judicial power, but relating to restore public trust to the judiciary, because the principle of independence never stands alone. This is relevant to the adage which states that where there is independence, there is public accountability must be fought. However, the expected of the court independence is to create a justice system that is dignified, regal, and clean with the support of public accountability.

Wajdi (2018), Chairperson of the Relationship between Institutions and Information Services of the Judicial Commission (KY) at the Public Lecture Accountability and Draft Judicial Offices Draft at State Islamic University (UIN) Ar-Raniry Banda Aceh on December 13, 2018, emphasized that the judge's behavior now must be considered the reports submitted by the public for promoting or transferring the judges, and should be an inseparable part of the assessment of the institution.

The public's report should be able to be a reference before carrying out the promotion and transfer process of judges, because so far it has tended to be only due to suitability and suitability. In its pact, there are certainly many shortcomings in the process of managing a judicial institution. However, this should not reduce our commitment to prioritize the integrity of judges and judicial institutions. Moreover, the Judicial Law Draft has included accountability from the judge selection process by involving other institutions regarding on the integrity checks and selection committee. For example, if there is a transfer or promotion of a judge, the judge integrity aspect is also considered as one of the considerations in the assessment process.

Judicial reform is a new spirit in the context of building public trust. In this context, Wajdi also quoted Professor Paulus E. Lotulung who said that there is no power or authority in this world unlimited or without limits. The independence of judicial power must be essentially bound and limited by certain signs. In this context, the freedom and independence of the judicial institution should be bound by transparency and accountability such as two sides of a coin.

The efforts to increase public trust in the implementation of judicial reforms have been ongoing since the early 2000s until now. But these are still considered weak. There are still many court decisions considered a strange and suspicion in the community, so that public support for judicial reform becomes weak. After implementing judicial reform more than 12 years, public trust to the judicial institution seems still weak, although it is better than the old and new order.

According to Saleh (2013), ex a former Indonesian Attorney General, in a public discussion themed "Reflections and Direction of Indonesian Judicial Reform" in Jakarta on March 25, 2013, said that there were a variety of strange decisions which could be seen as raising suspicion of a motive for corruption behind the conviction. The Indonesian Supreme Court should immediately address this issue by optimizing the oversight and guidance function. He also added that decisions handed down because of corrupt motives must be dismantled and acted firmly with the entire network. Thus, the strange decisions caused by lack of mastery of the legal substance must be resolved with a variety of intensive training or courses.

He also added that the still weak public support for judicial institutions is not the only decisive aspect of the mission of judicial reform to create more professional, honest, and impartial justice. Because, the public is not homogeneous or uniform that has many other interests. However, the existence of public support will certainly make it easier for judicial reform in Indonesia. In this, all components of society expect that the role of the mass media continues to encourage, safeguard, and oversee judicial reform, even though we are also aware of the existence of the media sometimes fragmented in certain political colors.

In this regard, the Indonesian Supreme Court also continues to open itself to various inputs and suggestions to strengthen its transparency and accountability. On several occasions the Indonesian Supreme Court has involved itself in a variety of large-scale, massive, and national-scale discussions in order to encourage justice reform to create a clean, honest, fair and authoritative court, especially through landmark decisions or important decisions.

This certainly requires hard work and strong determination to establish the justice institutions will be better and trusted by the public in the future.

Tumpa (2013), ex former Chairman of the Indonesian Supreme Court, said that public support for the justice reform must be championed by all judicial apparatus themselves. Public support cannot come alone without the efforts of the judges themselves. To gain this public support, the first thing that must be done is the judges must maintain their integrity and behavior which is manifested in a clean, honest, fair, and professional manner. However, the clean and honest attitudes are still a rare item in the judiciary. Judge independence is also considered not yet fully realized because there are still judges who still accept bribes related to the case being handled. If this attitude can be carried out by all judicial officials, public support and trust will come itself naturally.

He recounted while still serving as Chief Justice of the Indonesian Supreme Court, there were reports from the public protesting a review decision (PK) that was granted. He said that in the decision, there is no legal consideration at all, the reason why the decision was granted. Based on this fact it is very difficult for the judiciary to gain public support and trust. He gave another examples, he had also tried to enforce the chamber system in the Indonesian Supreme Court to avoid inconsistencies in rendering decisions. The reason is he saw that all cases entered to the Indonesian Supreme Court had to be handled by the Chief Justice who was an expert in his field, so that the case handlers could be finished by the Chief Justice more professionally. Shortly, all efforts to judicial reform in the future must be returned to the will and commitment of all these judicial apparatus themselves.

Meanwhile, Dutch justice observer, Pompe (2017) sees the condition of judicial reform in Indonesia today is better than 10 years ago. For instance, he had been previously observed that court decisions in several decades ago had not been made public and judicial information was also very difficult to access for the public. And now, there have been many very significant advances, where the court decisions publication and the various services of the judicial information system are very easily to be accessed by the public. This should be appreciated as an extraordinary achievement, where the Indonesian Supreme Court is on the right track in line with the blueprint for judicial reform.

5.3. Court Decision Publication and Public Trust to Judicial Institutions

Chief the Indonesian Supreme Court, Ali (2015), said that the number of cases had been reduced and sent to the court of appeal in 2018 were 18,881 cases. If it compared with the number of cases received as many as 17,156 cases, the case settlement ratio or clearance rate reaches 110.05%. The number of cases sent to the court filed an increase of 14.90% compared to 2017 which has sent as many as 16,433 cases. In the opinion of the Chief Justice, the number of filing process and court decision copies in 2018 were the highest in the history of the Indonesian Supreme Court.

He mentioned that until December 31, 2018, the Indonesian Supreme Court Decision Directory contained a collection of copies of electronic court decisions that could be accessed by the public through online of 3,106,702 decisions. The number of decisions published throughout 2018 was 595,637 decisions. This number increased by 32.28% from 2017 which published 450,275 decisions. Specifically for the publication of the Supreme Court's decisions, it was recorded that as of December 31, 2018, there were 117,326 electronic copies of the decision available. The number of Supreme Court decisions published in 2018 was 16,797. This number increased by 19.07% compared to 2017 publications which amounted to 14,107 decisions.

During its development, the number of decisions published throughout 2018, both the first-court or appeal court level decisions and the Supreme Court decisions, was the highest achievement since the Indonesian Supreme Court issued an electronic decision in 2007. The number of filing and the publication of the Supreme Court's decisions were significantly increased and became the highest achievement as long as the history of the Supreme Court. According to the Chief of the Indonesian Supreme Court, it was triggered by the policy of simplification of the decisions format as stipulated in the Supreme Court Regulation Number 9 of 2017. In addition, the simplification of the format of the Supreme Court's decision could also encourage an increase in the quality of legal considerations of the Supreme Court's in cassation and reconsideration.

According to Ali (2018), the one day minute program is still difficult to implement in the Indonesian Supreme Court, because the number of cassation cases and reconsideration are reached thousands, and it is really different with the cases received in the first-level court. Moreover, the Supreme Court's decision needs to be re-typed and corrected by its assembly, so it takes a long time. In the Supreme Court it is not possible with thousands of cases if it compared with the Constitutional Court which is only a few hundred cases.

He also further emphasized that the decision-making filing process in one day was still constrained by Article 197 of the Criminal Procedure Code which contained matters that had to be contained in the decision such as the identities of the parties, indictments and demands. If it is not fulfilled, the verdict will be null and void. This makes the operator have to retype the contents of the decision, especially with thousands of cases. If Article 197 of the Criminal Procedure Code is amended, which does not have to contain indictments, demands and sufficient legal considerations, the filing process can be fast.

Based on the reason, the Indonesian Supreme Court still maintains the enactment of the Supreme Court Number 214 of 2014 on Case Handling in the Supreme Court, which determines the maximum period of case handling in 8 months or 250 days. The filing process specifically takes in 3 months from being decided. However, he has asked to the Supreme Court Supervisory Agency to tighten supervision of the substitute clerks and interpreter operators when they are conducting the filing process. If it turns out, there is a passing of 3 months, he will ask to be called and examined.

During its development, the Indonesian Supreme Court also developed regulations relating to the sending of electronic documents from the court of appeal, these policies and regulations were made with the aim of optimizing the decision-making process at all levels and chambers of the judiciary. However, this electronic document came from a district court, not from the prosecutor who made the indictment and the demand. Moreover, if the electronic documents have indictments and charges are interrupted, this makes it difficult for the assembly.

In this regard, the Chief of the Indonesian Supreme Court for Legal and Public Relations Bureau, [Mansyur \(2016\)](#), acknowledged that there are only a few first-level courts that can implement one day minutes as those of PTUN Serang and PN Sleman. He said that when the court's decision is read out, at the same day a copy of the decision can be directly accessed by the public after the copy of the decision is handed over to the parties. Although in reality, the case at PTUN is not as much as in the general court.

Furthermore, in general courts, for specific cases that attract public attention, such as corruption are expected to be able to implement one day minutes. This is still a process. There are also quite a lot of cases in court. The application of one day minutes has been ordered through the Decree of the Director General of the General Judiciary focused on certain cases that attract public attention. The Director General has asked the courts to implement one day minutes and one day publish.

According to [Pudjoharsoyo \(2019\)](#), Secretary of the Supreme Court, various achievements that have been achieved by judicial institutions in Indonesia today are quite encouraging. The next most important task of the judiciary is to regain public trust to the judicial institution itself. Therefore, these achievements must be oriented to provide the best service to the community, especially for justice seekers. Through gaining public trust in the judiciary, there will be no more people who will 'whisper' again in demanding their rights and obtaining justice.

To gain public trust, he offers at least two main strategies, namely improving service quality and shifting the mindset of the court apparatus. According to [Noor \(2019\)](#), various breakthroughs appear to have been carried out by the Supreme Court and the lower judicial body, such as (1) Quality Assurance Accreditation that has been achieved by almost all court work units, the development of One Stop Integrated Services; and (2) based on electronic courts, which are intended as concrete steps to improve service quality and not to obtain certificates or recognition only. The result is the Indonesian Supreme Court obtained an A (Excellent) accreditation certificate in terms of public services, and then, the Indonesian Supreme Court has also received 7 (seven) Bureaucratic Reform Ambassadors with the title Free Corruption Region.

The breakthroughs mentioned above are a means to provide services to the community. The purpose of bureaucratic reform in the judiciary is essentially to provide excellent public services. Referring to the results of the public satisfaction survey in the International Framework for Court Excellence document, it is stated that research consistently shows that public perceptions of court service users are more influenced by how far they are treated and whether the process looks fair, rather than whether they accept preferred results or not.

The positive implications of the above strategy also produced positive results, in which the electronic court (e-court), judicial information system service, and the publication of judges' decisions through the Decision Directory of the Indonesian Supreme Court were the two main aspects of increasing public trust to the judicial institution. Therefore, the public today can easily access all court information ranging from case administration service procedures to publishing decisions. However, this is the evidence resulted by the decision-making filing program in the last ten years, in which the Indonesian Supreme Court has succeeded in publishing 4,661,021 decisions consisting of 4,403,428 first-level court decisions, 123,995 appellate court decisions, 100,863 verdict decisions, and 32,735 reconsideration decisions.

Therefore, in order to increase the public trust to the judicial institution in the future, it is necessary that the judiciary apparatus be able to answer questions about how to improve legal services to the public, how to ensure the process of resolving cases properly, correctly, transparently, and fairly, as well as how each decision the end guarantees and fulfills a sense of justice for all parties who are dealing with the law. In other words, increasing public trust can only be achieved by implementing an excellent service strategy and continuing to improve the quality of public services, which will automatically a mindset form of high public trust to the court apparatus and the judicial institution itself.

6. Conclusion

The judicial institution is an integral part of the law enforcement system which aimed to obtain legal certainty. As the last bastion, the judicial institution is also a place for justice seekers to get justice. To create a fair, honest, clean, transparent, accountable and authoritative judicial institution, it is clearly necessary to carry out judicial reform. Judicial reform includes all efforts related to the role of the judicial institution being able to improve legal services to the public, guaranteeing every case settlement process can be carried out properly, correctly, transparently, and fairly, and each court decision can fulfill the sense of justice for all parties dealing with the law. The main objective of judicial reform is the judicial institution need to gain a public trust. In this case, there are two strategies that have been carried out by the Indonesian Supreme Court to gain public trust, namely the accreditation of quality assurance and the service of judicial information system based on electronic court (e-court) in. As a result, the Indonesian Supreme Court today succeeded in obtaining accreditation certificate A (Excellent) in the public service aspect, received 7 (seven) Bureaucratic Reform Ambassadors with the title Free Corruption Region, and has published 4,661,021 court decisions which are fully accessible online by the public.

Acknowledgment

This paper was supported by the Indonesian Supreme Court and was presented at *Sharia and Law International Conference (SHALIC)* organized by the Faculty of Sharia and Law, UIN Sunan Gunung Djati on July 9-11, 2019 at the Ibis Style Braga Hotel, Bandung City, West Java, Indonesia, and funded by the Ministry of Religion's Budget of the 2019 Budget Year.

References

- Ali, M. H. (2015). Laporan tahunan mahkamah agung republik indonesia Tahun 2015. Available: <https://www.hukumonline.com/berita/baca/lt56d699271544a/ma-perketat-pengawasan-proses-minutasi-putusan>
- Ali, M. H. (2018). Sambutan ketua mahkamah agung dalam sidang pleno istimewa laporan tahunan mahkamah agung Tahun. Available: <https://kepaniteraan.mahkamahagung.go.id/index.php/kegiatan/1626-minutasi-dan-publikasi-putusan-tahun-2018-tertinggi-dalam-sejarah-mahkamah-agung>
- BPHN (2008). *The public information disclosure law number 14 of 2008*. BPHN: Jakarta.
- BPHN (2009). *The government regulation number 61 of 2009 on information disclosure*. BPHN: Jakarta.
- Davis, G. B. (1974). *Management information systems: Conceptual foundations, structure, and development*. University of Virginia: McGraw-Hill.
- Fukuyama, F. (1997). Trust: The social virtues and the creation of prosperity, reviewed by kenneth r. Gray. *International Journal on World Peace*, 14(1): 415-16.
- Indah, T. and dan Hariyanti, P. (2018). Implementasi kebijakan keterbukaan informasi publik pada dinas kominfo kota tasikmalaya. *Jurnal Komunikasi*, 12(2): 128-29.
- ISC (2014). *The decree of the Indonesian Supreme Court number: 1144/kma/sk/1/2011 on judicial information services guidelines*. Indonesian Supreme Court (ISC): Jakarta.
- Job, J. (2005). How is trust in government created? It begins at home, but ends in the parliament. *Australian Review of Public Affairs*, 6(1): 1-23.
- Lindsey, T. (2017). *Mahkamah agung and neraca reformasi*. 12th ednMajalah Peradilan Agama.
- Makarao, M. T. (2004). *Pokok-pokok hukum acara perdata*. Rineka Cipta: Jakarta: PT.
- Mansyur, R. (2016). Ma perketat pengawasan proses minutasi putusan. Available: <http://new.hukumonline.com/berita/baca/lt56d699271544a/ma-perketat-pengawasan-proses-minutasi-putusan>
- MaPPI, F. (2014). *Tinjauan terhadap implementasi keterbukaan informasi di pengadilan*. Unpublished Research Report, Depok: MaPPI FHUI.
- Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H. and Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. *Academy of Management Review*, 30(3): 709-10.
- McLeod, R. (2008). *Management information systems*. Prentice-Hall: Pearson Education.
- Mertokusumo, S. (1981). *Hukum acara perdata Indonesia*. Liberty: Yogyakarta.
- Noor, M. (2019). Mahkamah agung rebut kembali kepercayaan publik. Available: <https://mahkamahagung.go.id/id/berita/3374/sekretaris-mahkamah-agung-rebut-kembali-kepercayaan-masyarakat>
- Nurdiansyah, E. (2016). Keterbukaan informasi publik sebagai upaya mewujudkan transparansi bagi masyarakat. *Jurnal Bhinneka Tunggal Ika*, 3(2): 147-48.
- Pompe, S. (2017). *Mahkamah agung and neraca reformasi*. 12th ednMajalah Peradilan Agama.
- PSHK (2013). *Survey kepuasan pengadilan Tahun 2013*. PSHK: Jakarta.
- Pudjoharsoyo, A. S. (2019). Kata sambutan pembinaan terhadap pimpinan empat lingkungan peradilan di pengadilan tinggi agama (pta) bandung jawa barat tanggal 3 januari 2019. . Available: <https://mahkamahagung.go.id/id/berita/3374/sekretaris-mahkamah-agung-rebut-kembali-kepercayaan-masyarakat>
- Ramadhan, C. R. (2014). *Executive summary laporan penelitian keterbukaan informasi pengadilan Tahun 2014*. MaPPI FHUI: Depok.
- Rasaid, M. N. (2003). *Hukum acara perdata*. Sinar Grafika Offset: Jakarta.
- Saleh, A. R. (2013). Reflections and direction of Indonesian judicial reform. Available: https://www.komisiyudisial.go.id/frontend/news_detail/831/fokus-reformasi-peradilan-untuk-kembalikan-kepercayaan-publik
- Santosa, P. (2008). *Administrasi publik: Teori dan aplikasi good governance*. Refika Aditama: Bandung.
- Sedarmayanti (2004). *Good governance: Kepemerintahan yang baik*. Mandar Maju: Bandung.
- Setiawan, A., Sugiana, D. and Narotama, M. J. (2013). Implementasi kebijakan keterbukaan informasi publik (analisis kritis implementasi kebijakan keterbukaan informasi publik di pemerintahan kota Bandung kepada warga kota). *Jurnal Kajian Komunikasi*, 1(2): 196-205.
- Suadi, A. (2011). *Manajemen pengawasan badan peradilan di Indonesia*. Rejeki Agung: Jakarta.
- Suadi, A. (2017). *Mahkamah agung and neraca reformasi*. 12th ednMajalah Peradilan Agama.
- Suadi, A. (2018). *Sosiologi hukum; penegakkan, realitas and nilai moralitas hukum*. Kencana Prenada Media Group: Jakarta.
- Syahrani, R. (1998). *Hukum acara perdata di lingkungan peradilan umum*. Pustaka Kartini: Jakarta.
- Terry, G. R. (1977). *The principles of management*. Irwin: Homewood.

- Transparency International (2013). Global corruption barometer (Indonesia). Available: <http://www.transparency.org/gcb2013/country/?country=indonesia>
- Tranter, B. and Krbis, Z. (2009). Trust and confidence: A study of young queenslanders. *Australian Journal of Political Science*, 44(4): 659-78.
- Tumpa, H. (2013). Kepercayaan publik terhadap pengadilan masih lemah. Available: <https://www.hukumonline.com/berita/baca/lt51501b6f0b4f5/kepercayaan-publik-terhadap-pengadilan-masih-lemah/>
- Twyman, M., Harvey, N. and Harries, C. (2008). Trust in motives, trust in competence: Separate factors determining the effectiveness of risk communication. *Journal Judgment and Decision Making Department of Psychology University College London*, 1(1): 111-20.
- Wajdi, F. (2018). Fokus reformasi peradilan untuk kembalikan kepercayaan publik. Available: https://www.komisiyudisial.go.id/frontend/news_detail/831/fokus-reformasi-peradilan-untuk-kembalikan-kepercayaan-publik
- Yilmaz, A. and Atalay, C. G. (2009). A theoretical analyze on the concept of trust in organi-zational life. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 8(2): 127-28.
- Yousafzai, S. Y. (2009). Multidimensional role of trust in internet banking adoption. *Service Industries Journal*, 29(5): 591-605.
- Yusup, D. K. (2016). Peran notaris dalam praktik perjanjian bisnis di perbankan syariah (tinjauan dari perpektif hukum ekonomi syariah). *Jurnal Al-Adalah UIN Raden Intan Lampung*, 12(4): 712-13.
- Yusup, D. K. (2019). Model upaya hukum penyelesaian sengketa ekonomi syari'ah (analisis yuridis terhadap putusan mahkamah agung nomor: 56/pk/ag/2011), research report, bandung: Puslitpen lp2m uin sunan gunung djati bandung, 2019. Available: <http://digilib.uinsgd.ac.id/id/eprint/4619>
- Yusup, D. K., Fathonih, A. and Hamnach, B. (2016). Model pengem-bangan klinik bantuan hukum universitas. Research report, bandung: Puslitpen lp2m uin sunan gunung djati bandung, 2016. Available: <http://digilib.uinsgd.ac.id/id/eprint/19051>
- Yusup, D. K., Hamnach, B. and Sumner, C. (2019). The opportunities and challenges of student paralegal within the university legal clinic at ptkin. *Jurnal Al-Adalah UIN Raden Intan Lampung*, 16(2): 227-28.