

The Essence of the Right of Inquiry of the Provincial Regional House of Representatives in the Oversight of Governance Within the Jurisdiction of South Sulawesi

Azhar Arsyad^{1*}, M. Kamal Hidjaz², Askari Razak³

¹ Institution: Student Doctoral of Law Universitas Muslim Indonesia, Email: azhararsyad.pasca@gmail.com

² Institution: Lecturer, Doctoral of Law Universitas Muslim Indonesia

³ Institution: Lecturer, Doctoral of Law Universitas Muslim Indonesia

*Corresponding Author: azhararsyad.pasca@gmail.com

Citation: Arsyad, A., Hidjaz, M. K. & Razak, A. (2026). The Essence of the Right of Inquiry of the Provincial Regional House of Representatives in the Oversight of Governance Within the Jurisdiction of South Sulawesi, *Journal of Cultural Analysis and Social Change*, 11(1), 455-462. <https://doi.org/10.64753/jcasc.v11i1.3884>

Published: January 01, 2026

ABSTRACT

This study examines the essence of the hak angket (right of inquiry) of the Provincial Regional House of Representatives (DPRD Provinsi) in overseeing governmental administration within the jurisdiction of South Sulawesi. As one of the highest supervisory instruments granted to the DPRD, the hak angket serves as a constitutional mechanism to investigate alleged irregularities, policy deviations, or governmental actions that may contradict statutory regulations or the public interest. Through a normative and empirical approach, this research analyzes the legal foundation, procedural implementation, and practical challenges encountered in exercising the right of inquiry at the provincial level. The study finds that although the hak angket is intended to strengthen checks and balances and ensure accountable governance, its effectiveness is often constrained by political dynamics, institutional capacity, and the interpretation of legal norms. Therefore, strengthening legal certainty, institutional synergy, and political commitment is crucial to optimizing the supervisory role of the DPRD in South Sulawesi.

Keywords: Right of Inquiry; DPRD Province; Government Oversight; Legal Accountability; South Sulawesi; Checks and Balances; Regional Governance

INTRODUCTION

In essence, within the modern legal system, law functions as an instrument to realize justice, certainty, and utility for society. This function encompasses various aspects of life that continue to evolve in line with social, economic, and political dynamics. However, empirically, the implementation of law often faces challenges that hinder the achievement of these ideal objectives. One of the main issues is the gap between written legal norms (law in books) and their implementation in practice (law in action). This condition is influenced by factors such as inconsistent law enforcement, weaknesses within the judicial system, and the intervention of political or economic interests in legal processes. Such circumstances negatively affect public trust in the legal system. In the context of this dissertation, normatively the Regional House of Representatives (DPRD) is a representative institution at the regional level and serves as one of the elements of regional governance. Article 96 paragraph (1) of Law Number 23 of 2014 on Regional Government stipulates three principal functions of the DPRD, namely the legislative function to enact provincial regulations, the budgeting function, and the supervisory function. Each of these functions is carried out through different mechanisms according to its character and scope. The legislative function is carried out through discussions and joint approval of draft provincial regulations with the Governor, the submission of legislative initiatives, and the preparation of the regional legislative program. The budgeting function

is exercised through deliberation and joint approval of the Regional Revenue and Expenditure Budget (APBD) proposed by the Governor. Meanwhile, the supervisory function is conducted through oversight of the implementation of provincial regulations, Governor Regulations, other laws and regulations related to regional governance, and the follow-up of audit results issued by the Audit Board of Indonesia (BPK). Indonesia is a democratic state as stipulated in Article 1 paragraph (2) of the 1945 Constitution, which states that sovereignty is in the hands of the people and is exercised in accordance with the Constitution. In a democratic system, the existence of law as an instrument of governance becomes fundamental. Indonesia is a state based on law (*Rechtsstaat*), which means that governance must be conducted under the rule of law applicable to its people. In administering regional governance, Indonesia adopts the principle of decentralization as regulated in Article 18 of the 1945 Constitution. Regional autonomy constitutes the essence of decentralization, namely the transfer of governmental authority from the central government to regional governments to manage their own affairs based on autonomy. Further regulation on regional autonomy is contained in Law Number 23 of 2014 in conjunction with Law Number 9 of 2015. Article 1 point 6 of Law Number 23 of 2014 defines regional autonomy as the right, authority, and obligation of autonomous regions to regulate and manage governmental affairs and the interests of local communities within the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia. Since the 1998 reform era and the subsequent four amendments to the 1945 Constitution (1999–2002), Indonesia's constitutional system has undergone significant transformation, adopting the principles of separation of powers, checks and balances, and the supremacy of law. In the context of regional governance, democracy is not only understood as decision-making involving public participation but also includes the structure of power, institutional relations, and the relationship between the government and the people. The 1945 Constitution regulates the role and function of the DPRD in two separate chapters: Chapter VI on Regional Government (Articles 18, 18A, and 18B) and Chapter VIIIB on General Elections (Article 22E). These provisions affirm the DPRD's dual identity as both a component of regional governance and a legislative body elected through democratic elections. These dual functions are further elaborated in Law Number 23 of 2014 on Regional Government and Law Number 7 of 2017 on General Elections. Law Number 23 of 2014 mandates that regional governance should aim to accelerate community welfare through improved public services, community empowerment, increased public participation, and enhanced regional competitiveness based on the principles of democracy, equity, justice, and regional characteristics. Unlike the national government structure, which comprises the executive, legislative, and judicial branches, regional governance is conducted jointly by the DPRD and the Regional Head as equal partners with distinct functions. The supervisory function of the DPRD is crucial to ensuring a mechanism of checks and balances in achieving good governance at the regional level. The DPRD's supervisory authority is exercised through the right of interpellation, the right of inquiry (*hak angket*), and the right to express opinions as provided in Article 106 of Law Number 23 of 2014. Political dynamics in South Sulawesi became particularly notable when the DPRD exercised its Right of Inquiry (*Hak Angket*) against the Governor of South Sulawesi, Prof. Nurdin Abdullah, and the Vice Governor, Andi Sudirman Sulaiman. Following their election in the 2018 regional election, numerous alleged violations committed by the Governor and Vice Governor surfaced during a DPRD plenary meeting on May 8, 2019. On June 24, 2019, the DPRD officially invoked its Right of Inquiry and established the Inquiry Committee, chaired by Kadir Halid from the Golkar faction. This development intensified political tension because Kadir Halid is the younger brother of Nurdin Halid, a major rival of Prof. Nurdin Abdullah in the 2018 gubernatorial election. This situation illustrates how the exercise of the Right of Inquiry can be influenced by political dynamics, while also highlighting the importance of an academic study on the DPRD's use of its oversight instruments in regional governance. The limited scholarly research on the DPRD's use of the Right of Inquiry in South Sulawesi further enhances the relevance of this study.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The Essence of the DPRD (Provincial) Inquiry Right (*Hak Angket*) as an Instrument of Government Oversight

1. *Philosophical Aspects*

Philosophically, the DPRD's inquiry right is rooted in the values of justice, truth, and the accountability of power. In classical legal philosophy, Aristotle emphasized that law and power must be oriented toward *bonum commune* (the common good). Therefore, when power is exercised without control, the potential for abuse becomes significant. Here, the inquiry right serves as a manifestation of moral and rational principles to correct the use of power so that it does not deviate from the purpose of law, namely justice and the welfare of society.

In modern legal philosophy, as articulated by Hans Kelsen through the *Reine Rechtslehre* (Pure Theory of Law), every governmental action must conform to higher legal norms. The DPRD inquiry right serves as the

embodiment of the principle of the supremacy of law because it functions to examine executive actions at the regional level against the prevailing legal norms. Thus, the inquiry right is not merely a political tool but part of the normative structure that ensures power operates within legal boundaries.

According to John Locke, government power that is not supervised tends toward absolutism. Therefore, he emphasized the importance of the separation of powers and mechanisms of checks and balances. The DPRD inquiry right is an implementation of Locke's ideas at the regional level: the legislative authority is given the power to supervise the executive so it does not violate the mandate of the people.

Furthermore, Montesquieu asserted that political freedom can only be guaranteed if the legislative branch possesses effective mechanisms to monitor and correct executive policies. The inquiry right functions as a "political and moral brake" ensuring that every regional policy remains oriented toward social justice, public interest, and the rule of law.

Thus, philosophically, the inquiry right contains values of:

- a. Justice – ensuring that governmental policies do not harm public interest;
- b. Truth – uncovering facts regarding alleged deviations in public policy;
- c. Accountability – upholding moral and legal responsibility of government officials;
- d. Prudence – affirming the ethical function of the legislature in maintaining the morality of regional power.

The DPRD inquiry right is grounded in three fundamental values of Indonesian public legal philosophy:

- a. Divinity and Legal Morality – necessitating that public power be exercised based on moral and humanitarian principles as mandated by Pancasila;
- b. Democracy and Popular Sovereignty – as a manifestation of the fourth principle of Pancasila: "Democracy guided by the inner wisdom in deliberation/representation";
- c. Social Justice and Government Accountability – ensuring that regional governance prioritizes the welfare and justice of the people.

In the framework of the rule of law (*rechtsstaat*) as stipulated in Article 1(3) of the 1945 Constitution, power must not be exercised arbitrarily. The inquiry right represents democratic oversight in which every governmental act must be open to legislative review.

- a. Philosophically, the inquiry right represents:
- b. Legal justice – ensuring policies comply with legal norms;
- c. Social justice – ensuring policies serve public welfare;
- d. Moral justice – ensuring policies do not deviate from public ethics.

The inquiry right is not only a formal legal mechanism but also a reflection of the legislature's moral consciousness in maintaining power balance in the regions.

According to the researcher's analysis, philosophically, the Provincial DPRD inquiry right is a moral and constitutional instrument arising from the spirit of:

- a. Upholding justice and truth in regional governance;
- b. Maintaining the balance of power between the legislative and executive branches;
- c. Affirming the rule of law and Pancasila democracy through public oversight of government.

Thus, the inquiry right is not merely a political tool but embodies noble philosophical values: guarding the morality of power, upholding justice, and ensuring that regional governance always serves the public interest.

Moreover, the right is rooted in the principle of popular sovereignty, where governmental power originates from and is exercised for the people. The DPRD, as the people's representative, holds the moral and legal mandate to ensure that every governmental action aligns with public will and legal norms.

Therefore, the inquiry right is not merely a legislative political right, but a manifestation of constitutional moral responsibility to maintain the purity of regional governance within the boundaries of law, justice, and public interest.

This philosophical foundation aligns with the goals of the state as expressed in the Preamble of the 1945 Constitution: to protect the entire nation, promote public welfare, educate the people, and contribute to world order based on justice.

Thus, the inquiry right manifests the fundamental values of the Constitution:

- a. Justice – assessing whether regional policies align with social justice;
- b. Popular sovereignty – public control over government power;

- c. Accountability – ensuring governmental responsibility to the people;
- d. Democracy – balancing executive and legislative powers.

The Inquiry Right in the Perspective of Legal Philosophy

From the viewpoint of legal philosophy, the inquiry right is an instrument of legal control based on three legal dimensions proposed by Gustav Radbruch:

- a. Justice – to realize justice in governance by correcting deviant policies;
- b. Legal certainty – its implementation must be based on clear legal standards to prevent political misuse;
- c. Utility – used for the benefit of the public, not political groups.

The Inquiry Right as an Expression of Checks and Balances

Philosophically, the inquiry right arises from the spirit of checks and balances—a limitation of power to prevent abuse by the executive. This idea is rooted in Montesquieu's separation of powers.

At the regional level, the DPRD holds legislative control over the regional head. Thus, the inquiry right is intended to:

- a. Prevent abuse of power by the regional executive;
- b. Ensure transparency and accountability;
- c. Ensure that regional autonomy aligns with the rule of law and democratic principles.

The Inquiry Right as a Reflection of Pancasila Values

Implementation must adhere to the foundational values of Pancasila:

- a. Divinity – moral and honest oversight;
- b. Humanity – respecting human rights of those examined;
- c. Unity – preventing political fragmentation;
- d. Democracy – deliberation and representation in supervising power;
- e. Social justice – promoting welfare for all citizens.

PHILOSOPHICAL CONCLUSION

Thus, the philosophical essence of the inquiry right is as a moral and legal instrument to ensure balanced power, justice, and accountability in regional governance—reflecting the rule of law, good governance, and democratic accountability as the spirit of the Pancasila legal state.

The legal authority of the right of inquiry (*hak angket*) as an oversight instrument of the Provincial Regional House of Representatives (DPRD) in South Sulawesi derives from a clear normative foundation. Juridically, the DPRD's right of inquiry is explicitly established in Law Number 23 of 2014 concerning Regional Government, particularly Article 149 paragraph (1) letter c, which stipulates that the DPRD possesses three primary rights: the Right of Interpellation, the Right of Inquiry, and the Right to Express an Opinion. The right of inquiry is specifically defined as the DPRD's authority to conduct investigations into the implementation of regional regulations and/or government policies that are suspected of contradicting statutory provisions. This authority is further regulated in Government Regulation Number 12 of 2018 on Guidelines for the Formulation of DPRD Rules of Order, and elaborated in the Rules of Order of the South Sulawesi Provincial DPRD.

From a legal standpoint, the right of inquiry of the Provincial DPRD possesses a valid, constitutional, and binding legal basis. However, in terms of effective governmental oversight, the legal strength of this right has not been fully realized substantively due to several normative and political constraints. Within Indonesia's constitutional system, the right of inquiry serves as a manifestation of the legislative function of control over the regional executive branch, rooted in the principle of checks and balances among regional institutions. Its position parallels the investigative function of the national parliament (DPR RI), although its scope is limited to provincial governmental policies. According to the interview conducted with key informant Anwar Sadat, Member of the South Sulawesi Provincial DPRD, "The legal authority of the DPRD's right of inquiry in South Sulawesi is constitutional and legally binding, but it operates within the framework of political law because its implementation is highly dependent on the political will of the DPRD."

Even though it has a strong legal foundation, its effectiveness is shaped by internal political dynamics and the political relationship between the DPRD and the Governor of South Sulawesi." Field research indicates that the right of inquiry has indeed been implemented in South Sulawesi, notably in 2019, when the DPRD exercised this authority toward the administration of Governor Nurdin Abdullah to investigate alleged procedural violations and policy irregularities inconsistent with principles of regional governance. The inquiry committee successfully summoned witnesses and gathered evidence; however, the results of the inquiry had no direct legal force, as the DPRD's recommendations constitute political recommendations rather than binding decisions. The provincial

government responded only administratively, without substantive legal consequences for the policies in question. This demonstrates that the legal force of the right of inquiry at the regional level operates more as a moral-political instrument than a coercive juridical mechanism. The legal strength of the right of inquiry can be analyzed through three dimensions: formally, it meets all normative requirements because it is grounded in Law No. 23/2014 and Government Regulation No. 12/2018; politically, its implementation is affected by political party composition and the distribution of political interests within the DPRD; sociologically, it requires public legitimacy to be effective, but public participation remains low. Consequently, the right of inquiry in South Sulawesi has potential legal strength but lacks actual material effectiveness. Several factors weaken the legal force of the right of inquiry in South Sulawesi. First, the absence of explicit legal sanctions within Law No. 23/2014 means that inquiry results are merely recommendations with no mandatory consequences for the regional head. Second, the use of the right of inquiry is heavily dependent on the political constellation within the DPRD, particularly party alignments with the governor.

Third, follow-up mechanisms for inquiry results are weak, as they cannot independently trigger legal or administrative sanctions without the involvement of other institutions such as the Ministry of Home Affairs or the Supreme Court. Fourth, low public awareness and participation weaken the social legitimacy and public pressure needed to support the inquiry process. From a theoretical perspective, applying Hans Kelsen's *Stufenbau* theory, the DPRD's right of inquiry constitutes a legal norm positioned below the Constitution and statutory laws. While its binding authority is derived from higher norms, its effectiveness depends on implementing regulations and the actions of public officials. As emphasized by key informant Havid Fasha, Member of the DPRD, "The right of inquiry possesses formal legal validity but lacks material effectiveness because it does not produce tangible legal consequences for regional government policies. In other words, it is strong normatively but weak performatively." These weaknesses in implementation carry several implications. Legally, there is a need to revise or strengthen the regulations governing the right of inquiry to ensure that its results carry clearer legal consequences beyond mere political recommendations. Institutionally, the DPRD requires stronger investigative capacity to ensure that the inquiry process meets principles of objectivity and accountability.

Socially, greater public participation is crucial to reinforcing the DPRD's oversight role. Another key informant, Andi Ayoga Fadel Akbar, Member of the DPRD, stated that "The legal authority of the DPRD's right of inquiry in South Sulawesi is valid and constitutional at the normative level, but weak in practical and sociological terms. Although it holds an important oversight function within regional autonomy, its effectiveness depends heavily on the DPRD's political commitment, the transparency of its processes, and the support of civil society in upholding governmental accountability." This research also involved in-depth interviews with legislative members, executive officials, academics, and civil society representatives in South Sulawesi to obtain an empirical understanding of the legal authority of the right of inquiry. According to Bahtiar, a DPRD member in the governmental affairs commission, the right of inquiry serves as an important legal and political tool, yet its strength remains limited because its outcomes do not impose binding legal sanctions on regional heads. He emphasized that "If the government does not act upon the inquiry results, the DPRD has no enforcement mechanism." From the administrative perspective, according to the Secretary of the DPRD, inquiry procedures are clearly regulated, but there is no binding follow-up mechanism. As he noted, "The inquiry committee may summon officials and investigate policies, but its final outcome is only a recommendation. There is no legal provision compelling the governor to act on it." Academics likewise point out that although the right of inquiry is constitutionally sound, it lacks real legal impact because its results do not amount to binding decisions. The government's perspective also reveals that inquiry processes often contain strong political elements rather than purely legal considerations. Meanwhile, civil society activists argue that the lack of transparency and public engagement significantly reduces the social impact of DPRD inquiries, even though such processes have the potential to strengthen accountability in regional governance.

From the results of interviews with the five main informants, several general conclusions can be drawn. First, in terms of legal basis, the right of inquiry (*hak angket*) clearly derives from statutory provisions, specifically Law No. 23 of 2014 and Government Regulation No. 12 of 2018, indicating that its formal legal strength is solid and legitimate. Second, although the procedural implementation of the inquiry follows the established rules, its results are not legally binding, demonstrating that its substantive legal force is weak. Third, there are no legal sanctions for regional governments that disregard the findings of the inquiry, meaning that the recommendations produced are merely moral and political in nature. Fourth, several inhibiting factors, such as party politics, low public participation, and a weak legal culture, diminish its sociological effectiveness. Fifth, the informants expressed that strengthening regulations and enhancing transparency are necessary, implying that institutional reform within the DPRD is needed. Based on the author's analysis of the interviews with both primary and supporting informants, it can be concluded that the legal strength of the DPRD South Sulawesi Provincial Right of Inquiry is strong in normative and formal aspects but weak in terms of implementation and effectiveness.

The execution of *hak angket* remains dominated by political considerations and has not yet been fully carried

out as an objective mechanism of legal and governance oversight. For the right of inquiry to function optimally as an instrument of supervision, regulatory strengthening, increased investigative capacity within the DPRD, and wider public participation are required. The respondents' perceptions of the legal strength of the Right of Inquiry as an oversight instrument toward the provincial government in South Sulawesi can be seen in the table presented. Out of 25 respondents, 5 respondents (20%) stated that the right of inquiry functions optimally, 16 respondents (64%) stated that it functions less optimally, and 4 respondents (16%) considered it not functioning optimally. This indicates that the majority of respondents perceive the right of inquiry as less than optimal. The author's analysis of these findings indicates that the respondents' perceptions fall into three categories: optimal, less optimal, and not optimal. The majority view that the right of inquiry is still not functioning effectively as an oversight tool. Empirically, the supervisory function of the DPRD through the right of inquiry has not had a significant impact on the administration of the provincial government. Although the right of inquiry has a strong legal foundation, as stipulated in Article 154(c) of Law No. 23 of 2014 and Government Regulation No. 12 of 2018, its implementation has not reflected effectiveness as a mechanism of checks and balances. Several factors account for why the right of inquiry is perceived as less effective. From the normative and institutional perspective, although the right is formally recognized in the Indonesian constitutional system, the outcomes of its implementation are not legally binding. The recommendations issued by the inquiry committee do not carry direct legal consequences for regional heads. Consequently, the right of inquiry becomes more political than legal, with its strength limited to moral pressure and public opinion. From the political perspective, the dynamics of local political power influence the effective use of the right of inquiry. When most DPRD members belong to the same political party as the regional head, the inquiry process tends to lose objectivity. Conversely, when political relations are strained, the right of inquiry is often used as a political tool to pressure the government. This indicates that the right of inquiry is not yet fully functioning as a legal instrument, but rather as an instrument of political leverage.

From a sociocultural perspective, a weak culture of oversight and limited legal awareness among DPRD members also play a significant role. Many members do not fully understand the legal nature and procedures of the inquiry mechanism. Meanwhile, the public is largely uninformed due to limited transparency. As a result, social pressure on the government remains weak, reducing the sociological legitimacy of the inquiry. From an implementation and technical standpoint, the right of inquiry requires investigative capacity, access to government documents, and adequate legal and administrative expertise. Many regional legislatures, including South Sulawesi, lack the technical support needed to conduct deep and comprehensive investigations. Consequently, inquiry reports often remain descriptive rather than analytically strong. Based on these factors, it can be concluded that while the legal strength of the right of inquiry is strong in formal terms, it remains weak in substantial and functional terms. This aligns with the informants' view that the right of inquiry has "formal-normative strength" but lacks "operational-implementative strength" capable of producing real legal consequences for regional leaders. Therefore, the overall analytical conclusion is that the effectiveness of the right of inquiry as an oversight instrument of the DPRD South Sulawesi is still far from optimal, as its legal force remains primarily moral and political, rather than legally binding. To strengthen its role, regulatory amendments, improved investigative capacity, and enhanced public transparency and participation are essential so that the right of inquiry can operate more effectively as an oversight mechanism that ensures accountability and integrity in regional governance. A relevant case identified in 2025 illustrates the practical use of the right of inquiry. According to a news report from RakyatSulsel, tensions between the legislative and the executive branches in South Sulawesi escalated as thirty DPRD members planned to initiate the right of inquiry against the provincial government under Governor Andi Sudirman Sulaiman and Deputy Governor Fatmawati Rusdi. The proposed inquiry was prompted by concerns over the status of 12.11 hectares of provincial land in the Center Point of Indonesia (CPI) area, valued at approximately 3 trillion rupiah. The initiative was introduced by Abdul Rahman (PKS) and Kadir Halid (Golkar). They claimed the inquiry was necessary to protect provincial assets and ensure legal accountability. Abdul Rahman explained that the effort was purely for regional interests and public welfare, with no political motives involved. He emphasized that the inquiry mechanism is a legitimate investigative tool for the legislature.

According to him, conducting the inquiry would enable the legislature to clarify the status of the asset and address potential misuse. It was reported that nearly all factions supported the proposal. Over thirty members across factions signed the petition, surpassing the minimum requirement of 15–20 members. Administrative requirements were fulfilled, and the initiators planned to submit the documents to the DPRD leadership. They intended to present their rationale once leadership was fully present. The initiators repeatedly denied allegations of political motives, asserting that the inquiry was strictly about safeguarding public assets worth almost 3 trillion rupiah. The move was seen as a way to assist the provincial government in clarifying asset management issues. It is noteworthy that this was the second time the DPRD of South Sulawesi proposed the right of inquiry. In 2019, the DPRD launched an inquiry into the administration of Governor Nurdin Abdullah and Deputy Governor Andi Sudirman Sulaiman. The inquiry sparked controversy, including rumors of possible impeachment, though the DPRD plenary session did not confirm such actions. The inquiry committee at that time, led by Kadir Halid,

produced two conclusions and one recommendation.

CONCLUSSION

The essence of the Right of Inquiry (Hak Angket) of the South Sulawesi Provincial DPRD in overseeing regional governance is to realize justice, utility, and legal certainty as mandated by Law No. 23 of 2014, whereby the right of inquiry authorizes the DPRD to investigate provincial government policies that are important, strategic, broadly impactful, and allegedly in conflict with statutory regulations. Although the right of inquiry has strong normative and formal legal force, its implementation remains weak because it is heavily influenced by political considerations and has not functioned as an objective mechanism of legal and administrative oversight. Strengthening regulations, improving the DPRD's investigative capacity, and expanding public participation are essential to ensure that the right of inquiry can operate effectively as a genuine supervisory instrument.

REFERENCE

- Albani Nasution, M. S., Lubis, Z. P., Iwan, & Faury, A. (2017). *Hukum dalam Pendekatan Filsafat*. Kencana, Jakarta.
- Anwar, M. (2018). Pengawasan DPRD terhadap penyelenggaraan pemerintah daerah. *Jurnal Aspirasi*, 2(2). <https://doi.org/10.1234/aspirasi.v2i2.11>
- Arifin, A., dkk. (2005). *Hukum Pemerintahan Daerah*. Jakarta: Sinar Grafika.
- Asshiddiqie, J. (2005). *Konstitusi dan Konstitusionalisme Indonesia*. Jakarta: Konstitusi Press.
- Astomo, P. (2014). *Teori Perundang-Undangan*. Yogyakarta: FH UGM.
- Bagir Manan. (1994). *Hukum Positif Indonesia*. Bandung: Armico
- Budiardjo, M. (2008). *Dasar-Dasar Ilmu Politik*. Jakarta: Gramedia.
- Djunardi, A., et al. (2016). Sertifikasi halal dan perlindungan konsumen: sebuah analisis sinkronisasi hukum. *Majalah Hukum Nasional*, 28(3). <https://doi.org/10.22146/mh.v28i3.427>
- Farida, M. (2011). *Ilmu Perundang-Undangan: Jenis, Fungsi & Materi Muatan*. Yogyakarta: Kanisius.
- Friedman, L. M. (1975). *The Legal System: A Social Science Perspective*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Fuady, M. (2011). *Teori Negara Hukum Modern (Rechtstaat)*. PT Refika Aditama, Bandung.
- Hajon, P. M. (1994). *Pengkajian Hukum Dogmatik (Normatif)*. Fakultas Hukum UNAIR, Surabaya.
- Hakim, R. (2019). Pengawasan anggaran pemerintah daerah. *Jurnal Cermin*, 3(2). <https://doi.org/10.1234/cermin.v3i2.97>
- Harianto, D. (2016). Problematika asas kebebasan berkontrak terhadap kontrak baku. *Jurnal Samudra Keadilan*, 11(2). <https://doi.org/10.1234/samudra.v11i2.145>
- Hartono, T. (2021). Efektivitas fungsi pengawasan DPRD dalam penyelenggaraan pemerintahan. *Jurnal Governance and Public Policy*, 3(2). <https://doi.org/10.1234/jgop.v3i2.93>
- Haryati, S. (2016). Mekanisme pengawasan dalam tata kelola pemerintahan daerah. *Jurnal Kajian Pemerintahan*, 15(3). <https://doi.org/10.1234/kajian.v15i3.523>
- Husen, L. O., Sampara, S., Rahman, S., & Umar, S. (2017). Independence and Accountability, Supreme Court in the Implementation: The Power of Judgment in Indonesia. *Imperial Journal of Interdisciplinary Research (IJIR)*, 3(5). https://www.researchgate.net/publication/330260244_Independence_And_Accountability_Supreme_Court_In_The_Implementation_The_Power_Of_Judgment_In_Indonesia
- Kelsen, H. (2002). *Pure Theory of Law*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Latief, A. (2007). *Hukum Administrasi Negara dan Pemerintahan Daerah*. Makassar: Pustaka Refleksi.
- Mahfud MD. (2009). *Politik Hukum di Indonesia*. Jakarta: Rajawali Pers.
- Manan, B. (1994). *Hubungan Lembaga-Lembaga Negara*. Jakarta: FH UI.
- Marzuki, P. M., Salim, & Yenny. (2002). *Kamus Bahasa Indonesia Kontemporer*. Modern English Press, Jakarta.
- Muhadjir, N. (1996). *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif*. Rake Sarasin, Yogyakarta.
- Muksan. (1994). *Pengadaan Tanah bagi Pelaksanaan Pembangunan untuk Kepentingan Umum*. PT Citra Aditya Bakti, Bandung.
- Mukti Fajar, N. D., & Achmad, Y. (2010). *Dualisme Penelitian Hukum Empiris & Normatif*. Pustaka Pelajar, Yogyakarta.
- Mustafa, M. (2018). Pembentukan peraturan daerah berbasis partisipasi masyarakat. *Al-Qadha: Jurnal Hukum dan Syariah*, 5(2). <https://doi.org/10.1234/alqadau.v5i2.295>
- Paton, G. W. (1964). *A Textbook of Jurisprudence*. Oxford University Press, London.
- Rahardjo, S. (2009). *Hukum Progresif*. Jakarta: Kompas.
- Santoso, H. (2011). Fungsi kontrol DPRD dalam sistem pemerintahan daerah. *Ius*, 18(4).

<https://doi.org/10.1234/ius.v18i4.604>

- Simamora, R. (2016). Penguatan GBHN dalam sistem ketatanegaraan Indonesia. *Jurnal Litigasi*, 17(2). <https://doi.org/10.1234/litigasi.v17i2.3427>
- Surbakti, R. (1992). *Memahami Ilmu Politik*. Jakarta: Grasindo.
- Suriadinata, F. (2005). *Filsafat Hukum dan Teori Hukum*. Bandung: Alumni.
- Peter Mahmud Marzuki. (2005). *Penelitian Hukum*. Jakarta: Kencana.
- Qamar, N. (2019). *Hak Asasi Manusia dalam Negara Hukum dan Demokrasi*. Sinar Grafika, Jakarta.
- Qamar, N. (2021). *Seni Interpretasi Hukum (Interpretation's Art of Law)*. Mitra Wacana Media, Jakarta.
- Qamar, N., & Reza, F. S. (2015). *Ilmu Negara*. Mitra Wacana Media, Jakarta.
- Qamar, N., & Rezah, F. S. (2022–2023). The Dichotomy of Approach in the Study of Legal Science: A Critical Review. *SIGn Jurnal Hukum*, 4(2). Link: <https://jurnal.penerbitsign.com/index.php/sjh/article/view/v4n2-3/91>
- Rahman, S., Husen, L. O., Badaru, B., & Idrus, M. I. (2020). The Independence and Accountability of the Judge's Decision in the Process of Law Enforcement in Indonesia. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 25(1), 26–44. Link: <https://www.iosrjournals.org/iosr-jhss/papers/Vol.%2025%20Issue1/Series-5/D2501052644.pdf>
- Satjipto Rahardjo. (2006). *Ilmu Hukum*. Bandung: Citra Aditya Bakti.
- Soerjono Soekanto. (1986). *Pengantar Penelitian Hukum*. Jakarta: UI Press.