Siber Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary (SJAM)
E-ISSN: 2987-1069
P-ISSN: 2987-1018
+62 822 1012 3600 https://research.e-siber.org siberpublisher.info@gmail.com
DOI: https://doi.org/10.38035/sjam.

Objectivity in Law Enforcement by Indonesia's Civil Service Police Unit in Maintaining Public Order

Rio Winata[1], Dwi Afni Maileni[2], Rizki Tri Anugrah Bhakti[3*]
[1]Faculty of Law, Universitas Riau Kepulauan, Batam, Indonesia. Brorheyo24@gmail.com
[2]Faculty of Law, Universitas Riau Kepulauan, Batam, Indonesia dwi.afni.maileni@gmail.com
[3]Faculty of Law, Universitas Riau Kepulauan, Batam, Indonesia. rizki.tri.ab@gmail.com

[*]Corresponding Author: rizki.tri.ab@gmail.com[3]

Abstract: Selective public-order enforcement in Indonesia continues to erode public trust and generate recurrent allegations of discriminatory practice. This article clarifies the legal meaning of 'objectivity' in enforcement by the Civil Service Police Unit (Satuan Polisi Pamong Praja, Satpol PP) and proposes an operational framework for assessing whether non-judicial public-order measures comply with the requirements of administrative justice. Using doctrinal legal research and statutory and conceptual approaches, the study examines the normative framework governing Satpol PP's authority and standards of conduct. Particular attention is given to the multi-layered mandate derived from the 1945 Constitution, Law No. 23 of 2014, Government Regulation No. 16 of 2018, Law No. 30 of 2014 on Government Administration, and the General Principles of Good Governance (AUPB). The findings show that objectivity is not merely an ethical aspiration; it is a binding administrative standard that must be demonstrated through verifiable procedures and reasons. The study formulates eight interlocking parameters that translate this mandate into auditable practice: (1) a clear legal basis; (2) consistent enforcement criteria; (3) non-discrimination; (4) verified and documented facts; (5) proportional escalation; (6) minimum transparency through the provision of reasons; (7) traceable command accountability; and (8) accessible channels for objection and internal review. Together, these parameters provide a practical framework for designing, supervising, and auditing standard operating procedures and for distinguishing lawful, accountable enforcement from selective or abusive action, thereby strengthening the legitimacy of local public-order governance.

Keywords: Administrative Justice; AUPB; Non-discrimination; Public Order Enforcement; Satpol PP; Batam

INTRODUCTION

Indonesia defines itself as a state governed by law that guarantees equality before the law and rejects all forms of discriminatory treatment. This principle is embedded not only in constitutional norms but also in sector-specific regulations, including those governing public order and public tranquility at the regional level. In local public spaces, the Civil Service Police Unit (Satuan Polisi Pamong Praja, Satpol PP) serves as the visible face of the rule of law—

from managing street vendors and removing unauthorized structures to enforcing smoke-free zones and dispersing activities deemed to violate regional regulations. Whether Satpol PP exercises its authority objectively, professionally, and free from political interference ultimately determines whether public order is perceived as an expression of fair legal certainty or, conversely, as a selective and discriminatory exercise of power.

Normatively, the status and authority of Satpol PP are governed primarily by Law No. 23 of 2014 on Regional Government. Article 255(1) provides that Satpol PP is established to enforce Regional Regulations (Perda) and Regional Head Regulations (Perkada), maintain public order and public tranquility, and provide civil protection. Paragraph (2) affirms Satpol PP's authority to undertake non-judicial enforcement measures and administrative action against residents, government officials, or legal entities that violate Perda and/or Perkada. These provisions are elaborated in Government Regulation No. 16 of 2018 on the Civil Service Police Unit. Article 5 identifies three principal duties: (a) enforcing Perda and Perkada; (b) maintaining public order and public tranquility; and (c) providing civil protection. Article 21 further requires Satpol PP personnel to uphold human rights, comply with legislation and the code of ethics, act objectively and without discrimination, and undertake operational technical development.

The legal construction of Satpol PP's authority cannot be separated from the broader framework of administrative law. Law No. 30 of 2014 on Government Administration incorporates the General Principles of Good Governance (Asas-Asas Umum Pemerintahan yang Baik, AUPB) into positive law. Article 10(1) identifies legal certainty, utility, impartiality, due care, non-abuse of authority, openness, the public interest, and good service as components of the AUPB. The AUPB are defined as the principles that guide government officials in exercising authority when making decisions and/or taking action. Accordingly, every action taken by Satpol PP as a regional administrative authority must comply with legal certainty, impartiality, the prohibition on abuse of authority, and the public interest—principles that substantively rest on the ideas of objectivity and administrative justice.

Field practice, however, reveals a complex tension between this normative framework and the realities of public-order enforcement. Previous research portrays Satpol PP as facing a persistent dilemma: on the one hand, it must enforce Perda and/or Perkada whose formulation may not have adequately involved the institution; on the other, it must engage with communities that may not have received sufficient information about the applicable rules or that occupy socioeconomically vulnerable positions. Gunawan's study of Satpol PP's duties and functions in maintaining public order and tranquility in Aceh Province, for example, emphasizes the importance of institutional capacity and coordination while showing that implementation continues to encounter resistance and resource constraints. Similarly, Jumadil et al.'s study of the enforcement of public-order regulations by Satpol PP in Bone Regency reports the use of early detection and prevention, guidance, and public education, yet finds that public-order violations persist because of structural and social barriers.

Other studies identify more troubling dimensions. Effendy's examination of Satpol PP in Berau Regency finds that, despite the provision of guidance and public education, staffing shortages and the breadth of the operational area prevent patrols and public-order enforcement from becoming fully effective. Suhendi's research on Satpol PP's role in maintaining public order and tranquility in Indramayu underscores the importance of implementing Law No. 23 of 2014 and Government Regulation No. 16 of 2018, but concentrates on institutional roles and operational constraints rather than examining objectivity and freedom from political interference in depth. More recent research on the enforcement of regional regulations against street vendors in West Jakarta likewise shows that street-vendor management is a complex issue: it is presented as an effort to organize urban space, yet it also attracts public criticism concerning alleged unfairness and partiality toward particular economic interests.

Ramadhany's study of Satpol PP standard operating procedures (SOPs) confirms their importance to safety and public order, but leaves open the question of whether those procedures and their implementation can ensure action that is genuinely objective and non-discriminatory.

This is where the tension between administrative-law doctrine and enforcement practice becomes apparent. In theory, the AUPB and the principle of equality before the law require every Satpol PP action to rest on rational, transparent, and non-discriminatory criteria and to remain legally accountable. The literature on the AUPB emphasizes the prohibition on abuse of authority and the duty of officials to act carefully, proportionately, and in pursuit of public benefit. In practice, street-level discretion may be shaped by non-legal considerations, including political pressure from regional heads, local economic interests, or social stigma directed at groups such as street vendors and residents of informal settlements. This tension gives rise to a contested question in local law enforcement: does Satpol PP function primarily as an objective administrative-law enforcement body, or as a policy enforcer vulnerable to becoming an instrument of local political power?.

Against this background, the legal issue examined in this study is the objectivity of Satpol PP enforcement in maintaining public order in Indonesia. The principal research question is: to what extent has Satpol PP's enforcement of Perda and Perkada complied with the principles of objectivity, impartiality, and administrative justice embodied in the 1945 Constitution, Law No. 23 of 2014, Government Regulation No. 16 of 2018, and Law No. 30 of 2014 on Government Administration? This question encompasses three subsidiary issues: whether the normative standards of objectivity and non-discrimination have been adequately formulated within the regulatory framework governing Satpol PP; how the duty to 'act objectively and without discrimination' under Government Regulation No. 16 of 2018 relates to the non-judicial enforcement authority conferred by Article 255 of Law No. 23 of 2014; and the extent to which the design of that authority creates room for political interference or abuse of power.

This study undertakes a normative legal analysis of objectivity in Satpol PP's enforcement of public order in Indonesia. Its specific objectives are, first, to systematically examine the legislation governing Satpol PP's status, duties, and authority from the perspectives of the AUPB and administrative law; second, to formulate a concept of objective administrative-law enforcement suited to Satpol PP's role as an enforcer of regional regulations; and third, to develop normative parameters for assessing and strengthening Satpol PP's objectivity, professionalism, and relative insulation from political interference in enforcement operations. The study is therefore expected to enrich theoretical debate on objectivity and administrative justice in regional law enforcement while offering practical recommendations for regional governments in designing internal policies, SOPs, and oversight mechanisms for Satpol PP.

The significance of this inquiry lies in Satpol PP's frequent and direct engagement with citizens' fundamental rights, including the rights to work and a decent livelihood, to personal security, and to equal treatment before the law. In a democratic system of regional governance, non-objective public-order enforcement may generate public distrust, horizontal conflict, and even litigation before the State Administrative Court based on alleged abuse of authority. Strengthening the parameters of objectivity in Satpol PP's enforcement of regional regulations is therefore important not only for protecting citizens' rights but also for the legitimacy of regional government and the consolidation of good governance at the local level.

This article offers two contributions beyond the existing literature. First, studies by Gunawan, Suhendi, Effendy, and Jumadil et al. generally focus on the effectiveness of regional-regulation enforcement, Satpol PP's institutional roles and functions, or operational constraints; they do not treat 'objectivity in law enforcement' as the principal analytical category within an administrative-law framework. Second, Ramadhany's study of Satpol PP

SOPs and research on street-vendor management in West Jakarta emphasize managerial issues and urban spatial policy rather than developing normative parameters for testing whether enforcement is free from bias and political interference. This article explicitly integrates the duty to 'act objectively and without discrimination' under Government Regulation No. 16 of 2018 with the AUPB under Law No. 30 of 2014 and the principle of equality before the law, thereby constructing an evaluative framework for the objectivity of Satpol PP enforcement. It argues that Indonesian positive law already provides a strong normative foundation for objective enforcement, but that clearer standards, stronger accountability mechanisms, and appropriate institutional design are still required to make public-order enforcement fair, professional, and transparent—an agenda relevant to legal scholars, social scientists, policy planners, and regional government practitioners alike.

METHOD

This article employs normative legal research (doctrinal legal research), treating law as a normative system (law in books) rather than as an empirical social phenomenon. The analysis focuses on the normative construction of Satpol PP's authority and actions in enforcing Perda and Perkada, and on the extent to which Indonesia's positive-law framework—principally the 1945 Constitution, Law No. 23 of 2014 on Regional Government, Government Regulation No. 16 of 2018 on the Civil Service Police Unit, and Law No. 30 of 2014 on Government Administration—integrates objectivity, impartiality, and administrative justice into the maintenance of public order at the regional level. The study applies a statutory approach to examine positive legal norms governing Satpol PP's status and authority; a conceptual approach to clarify objectivity, discretion, the AUPB, and equality before the law within administrative law; and, to a limited extent, a case approach to relevant court decisions or concrete cases involving Satpol PP, insofar as such materials are available and accessible.

The unit of analysis is not individual officers but the normative configuration of Satpol PP's authority and the parameters of objective administrative-law enforcement attached to that authority. The objects of analysis are therefore the legal norms, principles, and doctrines that govern and explain: (1) Satpol PP's position as a regional institution responsible for enforcing Perda and maintaining public order; (2) the standards of conduct that expressly require Satpol PP to act objectively, professionally, and without discrimination; and (3) the relationship between Satpol PP's non-judicial enforcement authority and the AUPB under Law No. 30 of 2014. The study does not directly involve respondents or informants and does not employ surveys or interviews, because all findings are derived from the interpretation of written legal materials.

The research materials comprise primary, secondary, and tertiary legal sources. Primary legal materials include the relevant legislation—the 1945 Constitution, Law No. 23 of 2014, Government Regulation No. 16 of 2018, Law No. 30 of 2014, and related implementing regulations—and, where available, decisions of the State Administrative Court or other judicial decisions concerning Satpol PP actions. Secondary materials include administrative-law literature, monographs, journal articles, research reports, and other scholarly works addressing Satpol PP, the enforcement of regional regulations, the AUPB, objectivity in law enforcement, street-level bureaucracy, and official discretion. Tertiary materials, including legal dictionaries, encyclopedias, and bibliographic indexes, are used to clarify technical terms and facilitate literature searches. References are managed using software such as Mendeley or Zotero to maintain orderly citations and consistent Turabian-style footnotes.

The research procedure consists of several interrelated stages. First, the legislation governing Satpol PP and government administration is inventoried and classified, together with relevant literature on the AUPB, objectivity in law enforcement, and administrative justice. Second, a matrix is developed to map the relationship between the provisions of Law No. 23

of 2014, Government Regulation No. 16 of 2018, and Law No. 30 of 2014 and the concepts of objectivity, impartiality, and the prohibition on abuse of authority. Third, grammatical, systematic, and teleological interpretation is applied to determine the meaning of Satpol PP's enforcement authority and its duty to act objectively and without discrimination within the context of the rule of law and the protection of citizens' rights.

Legal materials are collected through library research involving systematic searches, critical reading, and structured note-taking across legislation, judicial decisions, and academic literature relevant to the research theme. The materials are then examined through normative qualitative analysis using descriptive-analytical and prescriptive-evaluative models. Descriptive analysis is used to explain the content of the norms, principles, and doctrines governing Satpol PP and the AUPB. Prescriptive evaluation is used to assess the adequacy and consistency of the normative framework in guaranteeing objectivity and administrative justice, and to formulate normative parameters and recommendations for strengthening Satpol PP's accountability, integrity, and professionalism. This analysis provides the basis for the conclusions and proposed improvements toward public-order enforcement that is fair, transparent, and insulated from political interference.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The Normative Framework for Objectivity in Satpol PP Public-Order Enforcement

Normatively, objectivity and non-discrimination in Satpol PP public-order enforcement are not merely ethical values; they are embedded in a multi-layered legal mandate. At the constitutional level, equality before the law provides the fundamental basis for equal treatment. At the sectoral statutory level, Law No. 23 of 2014 establishes Satpol PP as a regional institution responsible for enforcing Perda and Perkada and maintaining public order, including through non-judicial enforcement measures and administrative action. Government Regulation No. 16 of 2018 reinforces this mandate by requiring Satpol PP personnel to act objectively and without discrimination and to uphold human rights. Objectivity is therefore a legally prescribed standard of conduct for field enforcement.

Law No. 30 of 2014 supplies the evaluative framework by establishing the AUPB as standards for the exercise of governmental authority. The normative findings show that Satpol PP objectivity operates within a matrix of interlocking principles: objectivity requires impartiality; impartiality is protected by the prohibition on abuse of authority; every action must pursue the public interest; and accountability must be secured through openness and due care, including reasoned decisions and administrative prudence. Under this construction, objectivity in public-order enforcement cannot be established by a professed intention to act fairly; it must be evident in the applicable criteria, procedures, and reviewable reasons for action.

Table 1. Normative Findings: Legal Basis and Matrix of Principles Governing Satpol PP Objectivity

Normative Layer	Instrument	Core Finding	Direct Implication for Objectivity
Constitutional	1945 Constitution	Equality before the law (non-discrimination as a defining principle of the rule of law)	Enforcement must not be selective on the basis of status or group membership; comparable cases must receive equal treatment
Institutional authority	Law No. 23 of 2014	Satpol PP is authorized to enforce Perda and Perkada through non-judicial measures and administrative action	The power to act directly in the field requires limiting standards to prevent arbitrariness

Normative Layer	Instrument	Core Finding	Direct Implication for Objectivity
Standards of personnel conduct	Government Regulation No. 16 of 2018	Duty to act objectively and without discrimination, uphold human rights, and comply with legislation and the code of ethics	Objectivity is expressly prescribed as a duty; violations create grounds for correction and accountability
Standards for exercising authority	Law No. 30 of 2014 (AUPB)	Legal certainty, impartiality, due care, openness, non-abuse of authority, and the public interest	Objectivity becomes a reviewable legal-administrative standard: action must be rational, proportionate, documented, and reasoned
Matrix of principles (interlocking)	AUPB and Government Regulation No. 16 of 2018	Objectivity ↔ impartiality ↔ non-abuse of authority ↔ public interest ↔ openness/due care	Neglecting one principle—for example, failing to provide written reasons—weakens objectivity and increases the risk of discrimination or abuse

Source: Author's analysis, 2026.

The framework above demonstrates that objectivity is a legal-administrative standard attached to governmental action under the AUPB, not merely a matter of professional ethics. This distinction is essential to evaluating the tension between law and practice identified in the literature. Studies by Gunawan, Jumadil et al., Effendy, and Suhendi emphasize capacity, coordination, social resistance, and personnel or resource constraints in the maintenance of public order. These operational findings explain why field practice may fall short of the ideal, but they simultaneously confirm the need to bind authority exercised in sensitive public settings to the AUPB standards of due care, impartiality, and non-abuse of authority. Operational constraints may explain why enforcement is difficult, but they cannot justify lowering objectivity as the legal measure of valid administrative action.

The principle of equality before the law must consequently be translated into a duty to apply rational, consistent, and reviewable enforcement criteria. Ramadhany's analysis is particularly relevant because SOPs translate the mandate of objectivity from the normative level into operational procedures, sequential measures, and documentation. Research on street-vendor management, however, shows that SOPs do not automatically ensure objectivity when enforcement criteria and reasons for action are neither transparent nor consistently applied. Objectivity must therefore be demonstrated through: (i) an evidentiary standard for establishing a violation; (ii) criteria for selecting the objects of enforcement, including why one case is acted upon while another is not; and (iii) a proportionality standard explaining why a particular measure was selected. In this way, equality before the law becomes an administrative mechanism capable of reducing perceived selectivity and limiting non-legal intervention rather than remaining a slogan.

Testing the Consistency of Non-Judicial Enforcement Authority with the Duties of Objectivity and Non-Discrimination

Article 255 of Law No. 23 of 2014 provides the legal basis for Satpol PP to undertake non-judicial enforcement measures and administrative action in response to violations of Perda and Perkada. This field-oriented authority permits immediate action without judicial proceedings and is therefore a principal instrument for maintaining local public order. It does not, however, stand alone. Government Regulation No. 16 of 2018 expressly attaches standards of conduct and ethical-operational limits: Satpol PP must act objectively, without discrimination, with respect for human rights, and in compliance with legislation and the code of ethics. The normative analysis thus reveals a key relationship: Law No. 23 of 2014 provides the power to act, whereas Government Regulation No. 16 of 2018 supplies binding standards governing how that power must be exercised.

At the operational level, a procedural bridge is required to ensure that the relationship between statutory authority and the duty of objectivity does not remain merely declaratory. This bridge comprises: (i) an evidentiary standard for violations, including objective indicators and minimum proof; (ii) a proportionate sequence of measures, from persuasion and warnings to administrative guidance and enforcement; (iii) minimum documentation, including official reports, identification of the regulated object, the legal basis, and witnesses or evidence; and (iv) reason-giving sufficient to secure openness and accountability. Without a uniform procedural bridge, compliance with the duty to act objectively and without discrimination remains difficult to verify in practice, even though the duty is clearly prescribed by law.

Table 2. Normative Findings: Consistency of Enforcement Authority with the Duty of Objectivity

Assessment Component	Normative Basis	Key Finding	Consequence of a Weak Procedural Bridge
Authority to act	Article 255 of Law No. 23 of 2014	Satpol PP may undertake non-judicial enforcement measures and administrative action	Broad operational authority may produce disparities in treatment
Standard of conduct	Government Regulation No. 16 of 2018	Personnel must act objectively and without discrimination, uphold human rights, and comply with legislation and the code of ethics	Objectivity is difficult to measure without operational indicators and procedures
Proof of violation	Derived from SOPs and the AUPB	Objective indicators and minimum evidence are required before action is taken	Risk of assumed violations, wrongful targeting, or subjective assessment
Sequence of measures	Proportionality under the AUPB	A clear progression of persuasive and administrative measures is required	Risk of measures that are excessive, premature, or inconsistent across comparable cases
Documentation and reasons	Openness and due care under the AUPB	An official report, legal basis, and reasons for action are required	Enforcement becomes difficult to audit and vulnerable to selective inaction or non-legal intervention

Source: Author's analysis, 2026.

The non-judicial enforcement authority conferred by Article 255 of Law No. 23 of 2014 must be understood as bounded administrative discretion rather than an unrestricted mandate. As a street-level policy implementer dealing directly with citizens, Satpol PP needs the capacity to act promptly in the interests of public order. Precisely for that reason, however, its authority must be constrained by the AUPB under Law No. 30 of 2014: due care requires adequate facts and evidence; legal certainty requires a clear and consistently applied normative basis; non-abuse of authority requires action directed solely toward legitimate public purposes; and the public interest requires order to be protected without extinguishing citizens' fundamental rights. Government Regulation No. 16 of 2018 therefore operates as a guardrail, clarifying that broad authority must always be exercised rationally and accountably.

The studies by Gunawan, Jumadil et al., Effendy, and Suhendi reveal a recurring pattern: public-order enforcement is frequently shaped by limitations in capacity, coordination, and social acceptance. These constraints help explain why procedures and field practices may vary, but from the standpoint of objectivity such variation is precisely where selectivity can emerge. Without clear evidentiary standards, a defined sequence of measures, minimum documentation, and reason-giving, two substantively similar violations may be treated differently: one may trigger strict enforcement while another is ignored, or one may receive graduated warnings while another is met with immediate action. Research on street-vendor management further demonstrates that enforcement occurs in a sensitive socioeconomic environment, where procedural inconsistency is readily perceived as partiality. A uniform procedural bridge is therefore not an administrative accessory but a prerequisite for reconciling Article 255 authority with Government Regulation No. 16 of 2018 and the AUPB, so that objectivity can be demonstrated rather than merely asserted.

Normative Parameters for Assessing Objectivity and Strengthening Satpol PP Accountability

The principal normative finding is that objectivity in Satpol PP's enforcement of Perda and Perkada can be translated into reviewable parameters grounded in the AUPB under Law No. 30 of 2014 and the ethical-operational duties imposed by Government Regulation No. 16 of 2018. Translating these principles into operational criteria reframes objectivity not merely as a neutral attitude but as a quality of administrative action that must possess a legal basis, accountable reasons, and minimum procedures enabling verification. The parameters also serve as a bridge between Satpol PP's mandate to undertake non-judicial enforcement and administrative action and its duty to act objectively and without discrimination.

These parameters are interlocking: weakness in one element can undermine the others. A clear legal basis without factual documentation and stated reasons, for example, weakens transparency and accountability; disregarding proportionality may invite allegations of discrimination even when the underlying legal basis is valid. The eight parameters—a clear legal basis, consistent enforcement criteria, non-discrimination, due care and factual documentation, proportionality, minimum transparency, traceable command accountability, and access to objection or review—are therefore positioned as a normative test of whether Satpol PP enforcement satisfies the requirements of administrative justice.

Table 3. Normative Parameters of Satpol PP Objectivity (AUPB and Government Regulation No. 16 of 2018)

Assessment Parameter	Core Duty	Minimum Compliance Indicator	Risk of non-compliance
Clear legal basis	Action must be grounded in Perda or Perkada and lawful authority	Applicable provision, scope of the violation, and identification of the competent authority	Action may be regarded as arbitrary or ultra vires
Consistent enforcement criteria	Comparable cases must be treated alike	Written priority criteria and enforcement standards consistently applied across places and times	Disparity and perceived selectivity
Non-discrimination	Action must not be based on status, group, or affiliation	Generally applicable parameters with no unjustified exceptions	Bias or stigma leading to conflict and delegitimation
Due care and factual documentation	The facts establishing a violation must be verified	Factual record, photographs or video, witnesses, and an official findings report	Wrongful targeting, limited reviewability, and dispute risk
Proportionality	The least restrictive effective measure must be used	Persuasive-to-administrative sequence and risk-based escalation	Over-enforcement or under-enforcement
Minimum transparency	Reasons and notice of action must be provided	Written warning or documented oral explanation, concise reasons, and legal basis	Opacity and allegations of concealed interests

Assessment Parameter	Core Duty	Minimum Compliance Indicator	Risk of non-compliance
ccountability and command trail	The persons ordering and carrying out action must be identifiable	Assignment order, chain of command, operational log, and official action report	Audit difficulty and evasion of responsibility
Access to objection or review	Citizens must have a channel for correction	Information on complaint or objection channels and an internal review mechanism	Closed correction mechanisms, escalating conflict, and litigation

Source: Author's analysis, 2026.

The parameters above directly answer the legal issue addressed in this article: whether Satpol PP maintains public order objectively and without discrimination, and how such objectivity can be tested. Translating the duty of objectivity into eight parameters makes it measurable and accountable through procedural evidence, including the legal basis, stated reasons, documentation, sequence of measures, and command trail. In administrative law, this framework also restricts abuse of authority: an action formally grounded in a Perda remains reviewable when its criteria are inconsistently applied, its documentation is inadequate, or its proportionality is not established. The AUPB thus serves as a guardrail preventing field discretion from becoming selectivity, while Government Regulation No. 16 of 2018 confirms that objectivity and non-discrimination are binding duties of Satpol PP personnel.

In relation to the existing literature—particularly the studies by Gunawan, Jumadil et al., Effendy, Suhendi, and Ramadhany, as well as research on the complexity of street-vendor management—most prior work evaluates Satpol PP in terms of effectiveness, institutional roles, and operational constraints such as staffing, coordination, community resistance, geographic coverage, and public communication. This article shifts the evaluative focus toward administrative justice and impartiality as standards of enforcement quality. Operational constraints are not disregarded; rather, they are treated as contextual factors that intensify the need for objective parameters. When resources are limited and sociopolitical pressures are high, consistent criteria, reason-giving, documentation, and accessible objection mechanisms are critical to preventing political interference or social bias from shaping enforcement decisions. The relevant question is therefore not only whether Satpol PP is effective, but whether it acts lawfully, fairly, and accountably within the rule-of-law framework and the AUPB.

CONCLUSION

This study concludes that objectivity in Satpol PP public-order enforcement is a binding legal-administrative standard rather than a discretionary ethical aspiration. Read together, the 1945 Constitution, Law No. 23 of 2014, Government Regulation No. 16 of 2018, and Law No. 30 of 2014 transform Satpol PP's broad non-judicial enforcement authority into bounded discretion. Its legality depends not only on the existence of a formal regulatory basis but also on impartial application, verified facts, proportional measures, transparent reasons, and traceable accountability. The eight interlocking parameters developed in this article—a clear legal basis, consistent criteria, non-discrimination, due care and factual documentation, proportionality, minimum transparency, command accountability, and access to objection or review—provide a normative instrument for distinguishing lawful and responsible enforcement from selective, arbitrary, or abusive action.

The practical implication is that regional governments should embed these parameters in Satpol PP SOPs, operational orders, field records, reason-giving practices, supervision, and internal complaint-review mechanisms. Such institutionalization would strengthen the protection of citizens' rights, reduce enforcement disparities, and enhance the legitimacy of local public-order governance. Because this study is doctrinal, it does not measure the extent to which these standards are implemented across regions. Future research should therefore combine the proposed framework with comparative case studies, administrative-file audits, officer interviews, and citizen perspectives to test its applicability and identify the institutional conditions under which objective enforcement can be sustained.

REFERENCES

Aji, YU Bayu. *Kompleksitas Pelaksanaan Penertiban Penjualan Minuman Berarkohol Dal; am Operasi Yustisi Studi Kasus D*. Repo.apmd.ac.id, 2024. http://repo.apmd.ac.id/3204/.

Cahyono, M, ID Pramudiana, and N Sholichah. "Efektivitas Absensi Online Berbasis Android (PRESTIGE) Pada Peningkatan Kedisiplinan dan Kinerja Satuan Polisi Pamong Praja Kabupaten Gresik." *Soetomo Administrasi Publik*, no. Query date: 2025-12-12 13:11:54 (2024).

Fauzira, D. ... *Operasional Warung Kopi Dalam Surat Edaran Penjabat Gubernur Aceh Dalam Tinjauan Konsep Al-Ḥisbah (Studi Pada Satuan Polisi Pamong Praja dan …*. no. Query date: 2025-12-12 13:11:54 (2024).

Fetalya, F. ... *Banda Aceh Menurut Qanun Kota Banda Aceh Nomor 6 Tahun 2018 Tentang Penyelenggaraan Ketertiban Umum Dan Ketenteraman Masyarakat Dalam …*. no. Query date: 2025-12-12 13:11:54 (2023).

Karman, H. *KOMUNIKASI PERSUASIF SATUAN POLISI PAMONG PRAJA DALAM MENGATASI PELANGGARAN KAWASAN TANPA ROKOK DI KABUPATEN TAKALAR …*. Eprints.ipdn.ac.id, 2025. http://eprints.ipdn.ac.id/20244/.

Lestari, P. ... *Eksploitasi Anak Di bawah Umur Di Jembatan Pante Pirak Kota Banda Aceh (Studi di Dinas Sosial dan Satuan Polisi Pamong Praja Kota Banda Aceh)*. no. Query date: 2025-12-12 13:11:54 (2022).

Nikodimus, N. "… Pegawai Negeri Sipil Pada Satuan Polisi Pamong Peraja di Kabupaten Melawi: Kinerja Pegawai Negeri Sipil Pada Satuan Polisi Pamong Peraja di Kabupaten …." *FOKUS: Publikasi Ilmiah untuk Mahasiswa, Staf …*, no. Query date: 2025-12-12 13:11:54 (2025). https://www.jurnal.unka.ac.id/index.php/fisip/article/view/1459.

Rahmi, RN. ... *Aceh (Studi Implementasi Qanun Kota Banda Aceh Nomor 06 Tahun 2018 Tentang Penyelenggaraan Ketertiban Umum Dan Ketenteraman Masyarakat)*. no. Query date: 2025-12-12 13:11:54 (2023).

Raihan, MH, RD Prihandianto, and AF Dimyati. "Analisis Proses Rekrutmen Karyawan Satuan Polisi Pamong Praja Menggunakan Metode DMAIC." *eProceedings of Engineering*, no. Query date: 2025-12-12 13:11:54 (2025).

Syahrir, MIH. *Implementasi Peraturan Daerah Kabupaten Cirebon Nomor 5 Tahun 2014 tentang Penataan dan Pemberdayaan Pedagang Kaki Lima Perspektif Maslahah Mursalah …*. Repository.syekhnurjati.ac.id, 2025. https://repository.syekhnurjati.ac.id/16142/.

Tisna, IGO, and AAA Lestari. "Efektivitas Penegakan Hukum oleh Satuan Polisi Pamong Praja Terkait Pelanggaran Ketertiban Umum di Kota Denpasar." *Jurnal Hukum Mahasiswa*, no. Query date: 2025-12-12 13:11:54 (2023). https://e-journal.unmas.ac.id/index.php/jhm/article/view/8360.

Wibawa, RS. "Kekuatan Hukum Tindakan Represif Kepolisian dalam Unjuk Rasa yang Mengakibatkan Kericuhan." *Journal Sains Student Research*, no. Query date: 2025-12-12 13:11:54 (2023). https://ejurnal.kampusakademik.co.id/index.php/jssr/article/view/356.