


Procedural Legitimacy in Electoral Dispute Resolution: The Role of the Constitutional Court in Safeguarding Democratic Integrity

Muhammad Asmawi  

Universitas Banten Jaya

 muhammadasmawi@unbaja.ac.id

Abstract

Procedural legitimacy in the resolution of electoral disputes constitutes a critical element in maintaining democratic integrity. This study examines the role of the Constitutional Court in ensuring compliance with legal norms, protecting citizens' constitutional rights, and fostering public acceptance of electoral outcomes. Employing a qualitative method with a normative juridical approach, this research analyzes constitutional provisions, electoral laws, and the adjudicative practices of the Constitutional Court. The findings indicate that the Court has consistently applied principles of transparency, impartiality, participation, and accountability throughout its proceedings, thereby upholding normative legitimacy. However, a gap persists between normative and empirical legitimacy, particularly in relation to public perceptions of the complexity of judicial decisions and the potential for political bias. This study underscores that the effectiveness of procedural legitimacy is determined not only by legal compliance but also by the Court's capacity to bridge public perception. Such capacity is essential to sustaining democratic integrity, ensuring the credibility of electoral outcomes, and preserving political stability.

Keywords

Procedural legitimacy, Constitutional Court, electoral disputes, democratic integrity, constitutional law.

Introduction

Elections constitute the primary instrument in a constitutional democratic system, functioning both as a mechanism for the articulation of popular sovereignty and as a means of legitimizing political power.¹ In a democratic rule-of-law state, elections are not merely understood as periodic procedures for selecting leaders, but also as institutional processes that determine the substantive quality of democracy. Accordingly, electoral integrity becomes a crucial element, assessed not only by final outcomes but also by the entirety of the processes that accompany them, including the mechanisms for resolving disputes arising at each stage of the electoral cycle.²

In the practice of electoral governance in Indonesia, electoral disputes are an inevitable phenomenon. Such disputes may take the form of administrative violations, electoral crimes, and disputes over election results, which often represent the apex of political conflict.³ This complexity illustrates that elections are not only arenas of political competition but also sites of legal contestation that require dispute resolution mechanisms characterized by fairness, transparency, and accountability. Within this context, the Constitutional Court assumes a

¹ Beata Stepien dkk., *The Constitutional Principles of the State's Political System as Determining the Foundations of Electoral Law*, 2024, <https://www.cceol.com/search/article-detail?id=1252967>.

² Pippa Norris, "Challenges in Electoral Integrity," dalam *Routledge Handbook of Election Law* (Routledge, 2022).

³ Eny Kusdarini dkk., *Roles of Justice Courts: Settlement of General Election Administrative Disputes in Indonesia*, 2022, [https://www.cell.com/heliyon/abstract/S2405-8440\(22\)03220-0](https://www.cell.com/heliyon/abstract/S2405-8440(22)03220-0).

strategic role as the institution vested with constitutional authority to adjudicate electoral result disputes.⁴

As a constitutional adjudicatory body, the Constitutional Court performs not only a narrowly defined judicial function but also bears a broader responsibility as the guardian of the constitution and the custodian of democracy. Its decisions in electoral disputes are final and binding, carrying significant legal and political consequences. Such rulings not only determine the ultimate outcome of electoral contests but also shape public trust in the democratic system. Under ideal conditions, decisions rendered by the Constitutional Court should provide legal certainty while simultaneously reinforcing democratic legitimacy.⁵

However, empirical realities demonstrate that not all decisions in electoral disputes achieve optimal acceptance among the parties involved or the broader public. In certain instances, rulings of the Constitutional Court have generated debate, dissatisfaction, and even delegitimization of electoral outcomes. This phenomenon suggests that the legitimacy of a judicial decision is not solely determined by its juridical authority, but also by the manner in which the adjudicative process is conducted. In other words, legitimacy in this context is not merely substantive but also procedural.⁶

⁴ Arga Mahawira Pradipta, "The Position of Election Law in Ensuring Regional Political Justice and Stability," *Journal of Law and Humanity Studies* 2, no. 1 (2025): 15–22, <https://doi.org/10.59613/vfzg8f05>.

⁵ Fabrizio Cafaggi dan Paola Iamiceli, "Uncertainty, Administrative Decision-Making and Judicial Review: The Courts' Perspectives | European Journal of Risk Regulation," *Cambridge Core*, advance online publication, 2021, <https://doi.org/10.1017/err.2021.47>.

⁶ Thomas Riesthuis, "The Legitimacy of Judicial Decision-Making: Towards Empirical Scrutiny of Theories of Adjudication," *Utrecht Law Review* 19, no. 2 (2023): 75–86, <https://doi.org/10.36633/ulr.877>.

From the perspective of modern legal theory, procedural legitimacy positions the process as a key determinant of acceptance toward judicial decisions. The theory of procedural justice emphasizes that individuals are more likely to accept decisions even those that are unfavorable when they perceive the process as fair, transparent, impartial, and inclusive, providing equal opportunities to be heard. Therefore, the quality of adjudicative procedures becomes a critical determinant in building public trust in judicial institutions, including in the resolution of electoral disputes by the Constitutional Court.⁷

The relevance of procedural legitimacy becomes increasingly pronounced when linked to the concept of democratic integrity. Democratic integrity is not solely concerned with compliance with formal rules, but also reflects the quality of democratic processes that uphold principles of fairness, transparency, and accountability. In this context, the Constitutional Court functions not merely as a forum for dispute resolution, but also as an institution that shapes public perceptions of justice and the credibility of the electoral system. Accordingly, the Court's effectiveness in safeguarding democratic integrity is highly dependent on the extent to which its adjudicative processes adhere to the principles of procedural legitimacy.

Despite the strategic role of the Constitutional Court in resolving electoral disputes, much of the existing scholarship has primarily focused on normative aspects and the substantive analysis of judicial decisions, including legal interpretation, consistency of jurisprudence, and their juridical implications. Such approaches tend to emphasize

⁷ Tom R. Tyler dan Avital Mentovich, "Mechanisms of legal effect: Procedural justice theory," *Center for Public Health Law Research* 1 (2023): 1–21.

legitimacy in terms of outcomes (output legitimacy), while paying limited attention to the dimension of process (process legitimacy). As a result, studies that comprehensively explain the relationship between adjudicative procedures and levels of public acceptance of judicial decisions remain relatively scarce.

Moreover, there is a prevailing tendency within electoral law scholarship to adopt a normative-dogmatic approach, emphasizing statutory analysis without adequately integrating empirical and theoretical perspectives from the social sciences, particularly those related to legitimacy and public trust. In fact, electoral dispute resolution constitutes a multidimensional phenomenon that encompasses not only legal norms, but also perceptions of fairness, the participation of disputing parties, and the broader socio-political dynamics in which such disputes are embedded. The absence of an integrative approach has limited the capacity of existing analyses to fully capture the complexity of legitimacy issues in practice.⁸

Furthermore, research specifically examining the adjudicative practices of electoral dispute resolution in the Constitutional Court from the perspective of procedural legitimacy remains limited. Few studies have provided in-depth analyses of how principles such as transparency, impartiality, access to justice, and party participation are operationalized in judicial proceedings, and how these factors influence

⁸ Richard M. Crossley dkk., “Sustainability and Legitimacy Theory: The Case of Sustainable Social and Environmental Practices of Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises,” *Business Strategy and the Environment* 30, no. 8 (2021): 3740–62, <https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.2837>.

public trust in the resulting decisions. This empirical gap highlights the need for more contextual and practice-oriented analyses.⁹

In light of these observations, several significant research gaps can be identified. First, there exists a conceptual gap, reflected in the limited adoption of procedural legitimacy frameworks within electoral law studies. Second, an approach-related gap persists due to the dominance of normative methodologies that insufficiently incorporate empirical and perceptual dimensions. Third, an empirical gap is evident in the scarcity of studies examining actual adjudicative practices in electoral disputes from a procedural legitimacy perspective. Fourth, an integrative gap remains, as there is a lack of synthesis between theories of legitimacy, democratic theory, and the practice of constitutional adjudication within a unified analytical framework.¹⁰

Building upon these gaps, this study seeks to comprehensively examine procedural legitimacy in the resolution of electoral disputes by the Constitutional Court, while analyzing its role in safeguarding democratic integrity. The study does not merely focus on normative dimensions, but also integrates conceptual and contextual approaches to provide a deeper understanding of the relationship between judicial processes and democratic legitimacy. In doing so, it aims to make a significant contribution to the development of electoral law scholarship, particularly in strengthening public trust in electoral dispute resolution mechanisms in Indonesia.

⁹ Misnah Irvita dan Asriani Asriani, “Transparency and Accountability in the Justice System: Building Public Trust and Justice,” *Privet Social Sciences Journal* 5, no. 4 (2025): 26–40, <https://doi.org/10.55942/pssj.v5i4.367>.

¹⁰ Mila Versteeg, “Empirical constitutional studies: The state of the field,” *International Journal of Constitutional Law*, 28 April 2026, moag027, <https://doi.org/10.1093/icon/moag027>.

Method

This study adopts a normative juridical approach, enriched with conceptual analysis and qualitative methods, to examine procedural legitimacy in electoral dispute resolution. The choice of this approach is grounded in the need to move beyond a purely textual reading of legal norms and to explore how these norms are applied and interpreted in judicial practice. In this regard, the Constitutional Court is positioned as the central object of analysis, given its constitutional authority to adjudicate disputes over electoral results. The study therefore combines the statute approach, case approach, and conceptual approach to develop a more comprehensive and context-sensitive analysis.¹¹

The research draws upon three categories of legal materials: primary, secondary, and tertiary sources. Primary materials include the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, statutory regulations governing elections, and Constitutional Court decisions concerning electoral disputes. Secondary materials consist of academic literature, such as books and peer-reviewed journal articles at both national and international levels, particularly those addressing procedural legitimacy, procedural justice, and electoral law, as well as relevant prior studies. Tertiary materials are used to clarify key concepts and terminology that support the overall analysis.¹²

Legal materials are collected through a systematic library-based method, using academic databases such as Google Scholar, internationally indexed journals, and legal repositories. The search

¹¹ Iman Jalaludin Rifa'i dkk., *Metodologi Penelitian Hukum* (Sada Kurnia Pustaka, 2023).

¹² Satish Prakash Chand, "Methods of Data Collection in Qualitative Research: Interviews, Focus Groups, Observations, and Document Analysis," *Advances in Educational Research and Evaluation* 6, no. 1 (2025): 303–17, <https://doi.org/10.25082/AERE.2025.01.001>.

process relies on carefully selected keywords, including “procedural legitimacy,” “electoral dispute resolution,” and “constitutional court,” to ensure both relevance and academic rigor. In addition, the study identifies and selects a number of Constitutional Court decisions that are considered representative, especially those that have significantly influenced the development of electoral dispute resolution practices in Indonesia.

The analysis is conducted qualitatively using a descriptive and analytical approach. It begins with the identification and classification of legal materials, followed by the interpretation of legal norms and judicial decisions through grammatical, systematic, and teleological reasoning. This is complemented by conceptual analysis to assess whether existing adjudicative practices align with the core principles of procedural legitimacy. In this context, indicators such as transparency, impartiality, participation, and accountability serve as the main analytical framework for evaluating the Court’s proceedings.

To deepen the analysis, this study also applies an integrative perspective that links procedural legitimacy theory with the practice of constitutional adjudication within a democratic setting. This perspective makes it possible to examine not only whether procedures conform to legal standards, but also how they influence public trust and perceptions of democratic integrity. Through this approach, the study seeks to produce findings that are not only normatively grounded but also conceptually meaningful and practically relevant, particularly in strengthening the legitimacy of electoral dispute resolution in Indonesia.

Result And Discussion

1. The Concept of Procedural Legitimacy in Legal and Democratic Perspectives

Procedural legitimacy is a central concept for

understanding how a legal decision can be not only normatively valid but also socially accepted. In legal terms, legitimacy generally refers to the justification underlying the validity of a decision or legal action. However, legitimacy is not determined solely by conformity with legal norms. It is equally shaped by how the decision-making process is carried out. This is where procedural legitimacy becomes essential, as it emphasizes a process-oriented understanding of justice rather than one focused purely on outcomes.

Within modern legal theory, procedural legitimacy is closely linked to the principle of due process of law, which requires that all legal decision-making be conducted in a fair, transparent, and non-arbitrary manner. This principle reflects the broader idea of the rule of law, where state power is constrained by legal norms and exercised through procedures that safeguard individual rights. In this sense, procedural legitimacy carries a strong normative dimension, functioning as a mechanism to ensure that judicial authority is exercised lawfully and justly.

From a democratic perspective, procedural legitimacy takes on a broader meaning, as it directly relates to public acceptance of both the process and its outcomes. Democracy requires more than representative mechanisms; it also depends on fair procedures at every stage of decision-making, including the resolution of electoral disputes. Procedural legitimacy therefore acts as a bridge between law and democracy, linking adherence to legal norms with public trust in state institutions.

The concept can be further explained through the

framework of procedural justice, which suggests that individuals are more likely to accept decisions when they perceive the process as fair. Key indicators typically include transparency, participation, impartiality, and accountability. Transparency refers to openness and access to information, participation ensures that all parties have an equal opportunity to be heard, impartiality demands neutrality and independence from decision-makers, and accountability requires that decisions be supported by clear and rational reasoning.

From the perspective of constitutional law, procedural legitimacy is also closely related to the principle of constitutionalism, which emphasizes the limitation of power through constitutional arrangements. In Indonesia's constitutional system, the Constitution mandates the Constitutional Court to adjudicate disputes over electoral results. This authority is not merely technical in nature but carries significant legitimacy implications, as the Court ultimately determines the validity of electoral outcomes that serve as the primary source of political authority. For this reason, the Court's proceedings must meet a high standard of procedural legitimacy.

Procedural legitimacy can also be understood through two main dimensions: normative legitimacy and empirical legitimacy. Normative legitimacy concerns whether procedures comply with applicable legal rules, while empirical legitimacy relates to public perception and acceptance of those procedures. In practice, these two dimensions do not

always align. A process may be legally valid yet still perceived as unfair by the public. Such divergence often becomes a source of delegitimization that can undermine democratic stability.

In the context of electoral dispute resolution, procedural legitimacy becomes even more complex due to the high political stakes involved. Electoral disputes are not only legal matters but also concern the distribution of political power. As a result, the standards of procedural legitimacy in this context must be more rigorous than in ordinary cases. Even minor perceptions of unfairness can easily be interpreted as bias, ultimately eroding public trust in judicial institutions.

From a legal analytical standpoint, procedural legitimacy is also closely tied to the protection of constitutional rights, particularly the right to a fair trial. This includes the right to be heard, the right to an independent and impartial tribunal, and the right to receive decisions based on clear and reasoned arguments. Failure to meet these standards can be seen as a violation of fundamental rule-of-law principles.

In sum, procedural legitimacy is not only a normative concept but also an important analytical tool for assessing the quality of judicial processes, especially in electoral dispute resolution. In relation to the role of the Constitutional Court, it serves as a key benchmark for evaluating whether adjudicative processes produce decisions that are not only legally valid but also broadly accepted by society. Strengthening procedural legitimacy is therefore essential for

maintaining democratic integrity and ensuring that electoral outcomes rest on a solid foundation of both legal and social legitimacy.

2. The Legal Framework for Electoral Dispute Resolution in Indonesia

The resolution of electoral disputes in Indonesia is grounded in a constitutional and statutory framework that regulates rights, obligations, and procedures for resolving disputes over electoral outcomes. The primary foundation of this framework is the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, which affirms the principles of popular sovereignty and constitutional supremacy. Article 22E of the Constitution stipulates that elections must be conducted in a direct, general, free, secret, honest, and fair manner, while also ensuring the availability of legal mechanisms to resolve disputes arising from electoral results. Within this framework, the authority to adjudicate electoral result disputes is vested in the Constitutional Court as a constitutional adjudicatory body whose decisions are final and binding.

At the statutory level, the legal framework is primarily regulated by Law Number 7 of 2017 on General Elections and Law Number 24 of 2003 on the Constitutional Court. These laws provide the juridical basis for the Court to receive, examine, and decide electoral disputes. They govern various types of disputes, including administrative disputes related to candidate nomination processes, disputes over vote tabulation at both national and regional levels, and alleged electoral violations that may affect the outcome of elections. The framework is designed to ensure that

disputes are resolved through clear, transparent, and accountable legal procedures.

In addition to statutory provisions, the Constitutional Court has developed a body of jurisprudence that serves as an important reference in adjudicating electoral disputes. Decisions rendered in high-profile cases, including disputes over the presidential elections of 2014 and 2019, have established precedents that reinforce principles such as judicial independence, transparency, and openness of proceedings. This jurisprudence not only affirms the authority of the Court but also functions as a supplementary normative instrument that shapes procedural standards in electoral dispute resolution. In practice, these decisions contribute to legal consistency and certainty, while also serving as benchmarks for evaluating whether adjudicative processes meet the requirements of procedural legitimacy.

From a constitutional law perspective, electoral dispute resolution is not solely concerned with compliance with legal rules, but also with the protection of citizens' constitutional rights. These rights include the right to vote, the right to be elected, and the right to legal protection in cases of electoral violations. The Constitutional Court therefore operates not only as a legal forum but also as a guardian of political rights and an institution responsible for safeguarding democratic integrity. This underscores that the legal framework for electoral dispute resolution in Indonesia integrates formal juridical elements with substantive principles of justice.

Furthermore, the framework establishes detailed procedural rules and time limits for filing and adjudicating disputes. These include pre-hearing stages, evidentiary

proceedings, the examination of witnesses and experts, and the delivery of judgments. Such procedural stages are designed to ensure legal certainty while providing equal opportunities for all parties to present their arguments. From the perspective of procedural legitimacy, these mechanisms serve as key instruments to ensure that judicial decisions are accepted both normatively and socially. However, despite the clarity of the legal framework, practical challenges remain, particularly in relation to procedural complexity, public perception, and the broader political dynamics that often influence the reception of Constitutional Court decisions.

In sum, the legal framework for electoral dispute resolution in Indonesia can be understood as an integrated system consisting of three core elements. The first is the constitutional foundation, which establishes the principles of popular sovereignty and the rule of law. The second is the statutory framework, which regulates the types of disputes, procedures, and the authority of the Constitutional Court. The third is the Court's jurisprudence, which strengthens procedural standards and develops precedents in practice. These elements are interrelated and collectively function as a normative framework to ensure procedural legitimacy in electoral dispute resolution, thereby supporting the broader goal of maintaining democratic integrity in Indonesia.

3. The Implementation of Procedural Legitimacy in Constitutional Court Proceedings

The implementation of procedural legitimacy in the resolution of electoral disputes by the Constitutional Court reflects the interplay between adherence to legal norms and the level of social acceptance of judicial processes. From a legal standpoint, the Court operates under the framework of Law Number 24 of 2003 on the Constitutional Court and Law Number 7 of 2017 on General Elections, which provide both constitutional and statutory authority for the Court to adjudicate electoral disputes with final and binding effect. This procedural framework aligns with the doctrines of due process of law and the rule of law, requiring that decisions be reached through fair, transparent, and accountable procedures.

In practice, transparency constitutes the first key indicator of procedural legitimacy. The Constitutional Court upholds openness through public hearings, the publication of petitions, evidence, and judicial reasoning, as well as the dissemination of decisions through digital platforms. Normatively, this ensures that judicial processes remain accessible to public scrutiny and consistent with the principle of public accountability. However, from an empirical perspective, substantive challenges remain, particularly due to the complexity of judicial reasoning and legal terminology, which may limit broader public understanding. As a result, while procedural transparency is formally achieved, its substantive perception by the public is not always fully realized. This highlights the distinction between formal procedural transparency and perceived transparency, both of which are essential dimensions of empirical legitimacy.

Impartiality and judicial independence form the second pillar. Legally, the Constitutional Court is guaranteed

independence from political interference, and its decisions are expected to be based solely on facts, legal norms, and principles of justice. While this formal independence is generally maintained, public perception can become more critical in cases involving prominent political actors or highly contested issues. Even in the absence of procedural violations or demonstrable bias, perceptions of partiality may arise due to the broader political context. This underscores the importance of what may be termed social impartiality, complementing formal legal impartiality, and reflecting the need to align institutional integrity with public confidence.

The participation of parties, particularly the right to be heard, represents another important indicator of procedural legitimacy. The Court provides opportunities for applicants, respondents, and related parties to present evidence, call witnesses or experts, and deliver legal arguments within a structured and balanced process. This participatory right reflects the principle of *audi alteram partem* and is recognized as a fundamental constitutional guarantee. Nevertheless, practical constraints such as limited hearing time, procedural complexity, and disparities in legal capacity among parties can affect the effectiveness of participation. Consequently, even when formal requirements are satisfied, perceptions of fairness may vary among participants.

Accountability and the rationality of judicial reasoning constitute the fourth indicator. The Constitutional Court is required to provide detailed and systematic legal reasoning in its decisions as a form of public accountability and a foundation for

legitimacy. The inclusion of dissenting opinions further enhances internal transparency and demonstrates the presence of independent judicial deliberation. At the same time, from an empirical perspective, differing opinions may also contribute to perceptions of legal uncertainty or raise questions about the consistency of judicial outcomes. This suggests that accountability extends beyond formal compliance and is closely linked to how the reasoning and coherence of decisions are understood by the public.

Overall, the legal analysis indicates that the Constitutional Court has established a robust procedural framework in resolving electoral disputes, grounded in the principles of transparency, impartiality, participation, and accountability. However, a gap remains between normative and empirical legitimacy. While procedures largely conform to constitutional and legal standards, public perceptions of fairness, judicial neutrality, and the complexity of decisions do not always align with this formal compliance. This gap illustrates that the effectiveness of procedural legitimacy depends not only on adherence to legal norms but also on the Court's ability to bridge the divide between legal validity and social acceptance. Such alignment is essential for maintaining democratic integrity, strengthening public trust, and minimizing post electoral political conflict.

4. The Role of the Constitutional Court in Safeguarding Democratic Integrity through Procedural Legitimacy

The Constitutional Court plays a central role in safeguarding democratic integrity in Indonesia through the implementation of procedural legitimacy in the resolution of electoral disputes. Constitutionally, the Court's authority to

adjudicate electoral result disputes is final and binding, as stipulated in Article 24C of the 1945 Constitution, which affirms both constitutional supremacy and the principle of popular sovereignty. This mandate is further elaborated in Law Number 24 of 2003 on the Constitutional Court and Law Number 7 of 2017 on General Elections, which comprehensively regulate the types of disputes, procedural mechanisms, and adjudicative timelines. Within this legal framework, the Constitutional Court operates not only as a judicial body but also as an institution with a broader function in maintaining democratic stability.

From a legal perspective, the Court's role in advancing procedural legitimacy can be understood through several key mechanisms. First, it ensures compliance with legal norms by examining evidence, hearing witnesses and experts, and assessing legal arguments based on applicable laws and regulations. This process guarantees that disputes are resolved within the bounds of law, thereby preventing arbitrariness, electoral manipulation, and political interference that could undermine democratic processes. Second, the Court contributes to social acceptance by promoting transparency, enabling meaningful participation of the parties, and providing clear and reasoned legal justifications in its decisions. These elements strengthen public confidence, as the adjudicative process is seen to be grounded in fairness and objectivity rather than political interests.

The Constitutional Court also serves as a guardian of constitutional rights. Through the implementation of the principle of *audi alteram partem*, it ensures that all parties have a full opportunity to present evidence, call witnesses or experts, and

articulate their legal arguments. This not only secures procedural fairness for the disputing parties but also enhances empirical legitimacy, as the public can observe that political rights are protected through lawful mechanisms. In this respect, the Court's role functions as a preventive measure against post-electoral conflict, as disputes are channeled into a legitimate legal forum rather than expressed through extra-legal or confrontational means.

Furthermore, procedural legitimacy as practiced by the Constitutional Court operates as a stabilizing force within the democratic system. Decisions that are grounded in evidence, articulated through transparent procedures, and supported by accountable reasoning provide a basis for public acceptance of electoral outcomes. From a constitutional law perspective, democratic legitimacy depends not only on formal legal compliance but also on the extent to which both processes and outcomes are socially accepted. The higher the quality of transparency, participation, impartiality, and accountability, the stronger the Court's procedural legitimacy, which in turn reinforces political stability and the credibility of the democratic system.

At the same time, both legal and practical challenges remain evident. The complexity of judicial procedures, the use of technical legal language, and public perceptions of political bias can create a gap between normative legitimacy and empirical legitimacy. This indicates that procedural legitimacy cannot be reduced to formal compliance alone; it must also encompass public understanding and acceptance. Consequently, the Constitutional Court's role in safeguarding democratic integrity

extends beyond legal adherence to include the capacity to bridge public perception, foster trust through clear legal communication, and ensure that judicial processes remain accessible and comprehensible.

In sum, the Constitutional Court functions as a key institution in strengthening constitutional democracy. The procedural legitimacy it upholds not only ensures legal compliance and the protection of constitutional rights, but also contributes to conflict prevention, enhances public trust, and sustains the stability of the democratic system. Its success in maintaining procedural legitimacy ultimately forms the foundation for enduring democratic legitimacy in Indonesia, reinforcing its position as a guardian of democratic integrity through law.

Conclusion

Based on the analysis of procedural legitimacy, the legal framework for electoral dispute resolution, adjudicative practices, and the role of the Constitutional Court, this study concludes that procedural legitimacy constitutes a crucial legal instrument in safeguarding democratic integrity in Indonesia. It emphasizes the principles of transparency, impartiality, participation, and accountability as the foundation for achieving procedural justice and protecting citizens' constitutional rights. The existing legal framework, including the 1945 Constitution, Law Number 7 of 2017 on General Elections, and Law Number 24 of 2003 on the Constitutional Court, provides a strong normative basis for the Court to adjudicate disputes with final

and binding authority, while ensuring legal certainty and procedural consistency.

The implementation of procedural standards in practice indicates that the Constitutional Court has conducted proceedings in a manner that is open, participatory, and accountable. However, a gap remains between normative legitimacy and empirical legitimacy, particularly in relation to public perceptions of the complexity of judicial reasoning and the potential for political bias. This gap highlights the need to move beyond formal compliance toward a more inclusive understanding of legitimacy that incorporates public perception and trust.

The role of the Constitutional Court extends beyond the enforcement of legal norms. It also functions as a stabilizing institution that mitigates post electoral conflict and fosters public confidence in the democratic system. In this regard, procedural legitimacy should not be viewed merely as a legal formality, but as a strategic instrument that integrates legal compliance, the protection of constitutional rights, and public acceptance. Strengthening procedural mechanisms, simplifying the language of judicial decisions, and enhancing public legal education are therefore essential steps in reinforcing democratic integrity and ensuring the credibility of electoral outcomes in Indonesia.

References

- Cafaggi, Fabrizio, dan Paola Iamiceli. “Uncertainty, Administrative Decision-Making and Judicial Review: The Courts’ Perspectives | European Journal of Risk Regulation.” *Cambridge Core*, advance online publication, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1017/err.2021.47>.
- Chand, Satish Prakash. “Methods of Data Collection in Qualitative Research: Interviews, Focus Groups, Observations, and Document Analysis.” *Advances in Educational Research and Evaluation* 6, no. 1 (2025): 303–17. <https://doi.org/10.25082/AERE.2025.01.001>.
- Crossley, Richard M., Mohamed H. Elmagrhi, dan Collins G. Ntim. “Sustainability and Legitimacy Theory: The Case of Sustainable Social and Environmental Practices of Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises.” *Business Strategy and the Environment* 30, no. 8 (2021): 3740–62. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.2837>.
- Irvita, Misnah, dan Asriani Asriani. “Transparency and Accountability in the Justice System: Building Public Trust and Justice.” *Priviet Social Sciences Journal* 5, no. 4 (2025): 26–40. <https://doi.org/10.55942/pssj.v5i4.367>.
- Kusdarini, Eny, Anang Priyanto, Sri Hartini, dan Suripno Suripno. *Roles of Justice Courts: Settlement of General Election Administrative Disputes in Indonesia*. 2022. [https://www.cell.com/heliyon/abstract/S2405-8440\(22\)03220-0](https://www.cell.com/heliyon/abstract/S2405-8440(22)03220-0).
- Norris, Pippa. “Challenges in Electoral Integrity.” Dalam *Routledge Handbook of Election Law*. Routledge, 2022.
- 91 ■ Procedural Legitimacy in Electoral Dispute Resolution....

Pradipta, Arga Mahawira. "The Position of Election Law in Ensuring Regional Political Justice and Stability." *Journal of Law and Humanity Studies* 2, no. 1 (2025): 15–22. <https://doi.org/10.59613/vfzg8f05>.

Riesthuis, Thomas. "The Legitimacy of Judicial Decision-Making: Towards Empirical Scrutiny of Theories of Adjudication." *Utrecht Law Review* 19, no. 2 (2023): 75–86. <https://doi.org/10.36633/ulr.877>.

Rifa'i, Iman Jalaludin, Ady Purwoto, Marina Ramadhani, dkk. *Metodologi Penelitian Hukum*. Sada Kurnia Pustaka, 2023.

Stepień, Beata, Załucka Załucka, dan Joanna Uliasz. *The Constitutional Principles of the State's Political System as Determining the Foundations of Electoral Law*. 2024. <https://www.cceol.com/search/article-detail?id=1252967>.

Tyler, Tom R., dan Avital Mentovich. "Mechanisms of legal effect: Procedural justice theory." *Center for Public Health Law Research* 1 (2023): 1–21.

Versteeg, Mila. "Empirical constitutional studies: The state of the field." *International Journal of Constitutional Law*, 28 April 2026, moag027. <https://doi.org/10.1093/icon/moag027>.