

Research Article

Proportionality in Satpol PP Enforcement Operations: A Normative Review of Restrictions on Citizens' Rights

Hariato, Rizki Tri Anugrah Bhakti*, Dwi Afni Maileni, Indra Sakti

Faculty of Law, Universitas Riau Kepulauan, Batam, Indonesia, 29425

*Corresponding Author: rizki.tri.ab@gmail.com | Phone: +6289522594646

ABSTRACT

Public-order enforcement operations conducted by Indonesia's Civil Service Police Unit-Satpol PP are an important instrument for enforcing Regional Regulations, yet their implementation frequently generates tension between public-order objectives and the protection of citizens' rights. This study analyzes the legal limits of restrictions on citizens' rights in Satpol PP enforcement operations through the principle of proportionality and formulates an operational normative review framework. The research adopts a doctrinal legal method using statutory, conceptual, case-based, and limited comparative approaches. The data consist of primary, secondary, and tertiary legal materials analyzed through doctrinal analysis and qualitative content analysis by means of a proportionality matrix covering legality, legitimate aim, suitability, necessity, balancing of impacts, and procedural safeguards and accountability. The findings show that the main problem in Satpol PP enforcement lies not merely in the absence of formal authority, but in the escalation of coercive measures without adequate justification and in weak procedural protection. The study's novelty lies in proposing a stage-based proportionality review framework for Satpol PP enforcement operations that can be used to evaluate official action, strengthen standard operating procedures, and improve accountability in the enforcement of Regional Regulations from the perspectives of administrative law and the constitutional protection of citizens' rights.

Keywords: Proportionality; Satpol PP; Enforcement operations; Restrictions on citizens' rights; Administrative law

1. INTRODUCTION

The enforcement of regional regulations (Perda) through public-order operations carried out by the Civil Service Police Unit-Satpol PP represents one of the most visible manifestations of the state in everyday social life. On the one hand, local governments bear a constitutional and administrative mandate to maintain public order and public peace; on the other hand, enforcement measures may directly affect citizens' rights, including the right to security, property rights, the right to work, freedom of movement, and the right to fair treatment (Bouhey, 2015; Duniewska, 2022). This tension becomes even more salient when enforcement operations take place in situations marked by socio-economic vulnerability, such as the clearance of business premises, the seizure of goods, or the demolition of facilities that serve as sources of livelihood (Stone, 2020; Walpole, 2017). In such circumstances, the legal question is no longer merely whether Satpol PP has authority to act, but to what extent restrictions on citizens' rights can be justified as lawful, necessary and balanced.

Normatively, Satpol PP derives its position within government from Law No. 23 of 2014, which establishes the framework of regional government administration, while Government Regulation No. 16 of 2018 specifically governs its duties, functions, powers, and scope in the enforcement of Regional Regulations. The regulatory framework also confirms Satpol PP as an instrument of public-order enforcement that includes supervisory and preventive dimensions. Yet the mere existence of formal authority does not automatically ensure that administrative action satisfies rule-of-law standards (Cohen-Eliya & Porat, 2021; Vyhnánek et al., 2024). It is precisely at this point that the risk of excessive interference emerges, namely, when action that is formally lawful may nonetheless remain materially problematic if not constrained by proportionality.

In both constitutional and administrative law scholarship, proportionality has developed into a standard for assessing the validity of restrictions imposed on rights by public authorities. In doctrinal debates, proportionality is understood not simply as a balancing technique, but as a sequential review structure that requires justification for both the measure chosen and the public benefit sought. Bendor & Sela (2015) and Peters (2021) explain that proportionality remains relevant because it compels the state to provide reviewable reasons rather than relying solely on claims of order or efficiency.

In administrative law, the urgency of proportionality is even greater because administrative norms operate through interventions that shape legal positions; without adequate parameters, administrative action may easily become

procedurally forceful but substantively weak in justification (Bagir et al., 2020; Ondřejek & Horák, 2024). This point is also emphasized in administrative-law scholarship that treats proportionality as a safeguard against arbitrary and excessive public interference (Duniewska, 2022).

Even so, research on Satpol PP in Indonesia still tends to stop at institutional design, enforcement effectiveness, or problems of policy implementation, and has not sufficiently organized the normative-operational parameters of restrictions on citizens' rights at each stage of enforcement operations. This gap matters because, in practice, enforcement does not occur in a single moment; it unfolds through a chain of planning, notification, warnings, guidance, administrative sanctions, and more intensive measures such as seizure, eviction, or demolition (Akmal & Arlianti, 2022; Silalahi, 2024).

For that reason, this study is important because it offers a more precise reading of the relationship between the principle of legality, the general principles of good governance (*Asas-Asas Umum Pemerintahan yang Baik/AUPB*) and the principle of proportionality in Satpol PP enforcement operations. Its relevance is both academic and practical. Academically, the study enriches Indonesian administrative-law discourse by connecting theories of rights limitation and proportionality doctrine with the highly contextual practice of enforcing Regional Regulations. Practically, its findings may serve as a reference for drafting standard operating procedures, coaching standards, enforcement formats, escalation parameters, and mechanisms of accountability and internal supervision so that enforcement remains effective without sacrificing the protection of citizens' rights.

Accordingly, this study aims to formulate operational proportionality parameters for assessing Satpol PP enforcement measures, to map the limits of lawful restrictions on citizens' rights, and to propose recommendations for strengthening procedural standards in line with rule-of-law principles. Its novelty lies in developing a stage-based proportionality assessment for Satpol PP operations that evaluates not only the final measure but the entire administrative sequence from preparation to execution, with explicit integration of legality, prudence, transparency, abuse-of-power control, and accountability. In that way, the study contributes to fairer enforcement practice, greater legal certainty, and stronger enforcement legitimacy.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The study of proportionality has developed in constitutional law and human rights law as an instrument for assessing whether state-imposed restrictions on rights can be justified as rational, necessary and balanced (Boyron & Marique, 2021; Sunggono & Harianto, 2009). According to Bendor & Sela (2015) and Peters (2021) proportionality is no longer understood merely as abstract balancing, but as a stepwise method of legal reasoning that requires argumentation at each stage of review. The debate shows that proportionality is not a neutral or sterile concept; it is shaped by institutional choices, the nature of the rights being limited, and the quality of governmental justification. The classic work of Bendor and Sela remains foundational because it highlights the problem of degree in the application of proportionality, while Anne Peters underscores the continuing relevance of proportionality as a clearer language of modern public law for reviewing state action.

As it has developed, proportionality has become even more important when the state acts in high-risk situations or crises, because executive discretion tends to expand. Vyhnánek et al (2024) show that the main challenge lies not only in selecting a standard of review, but in calibrating the intensity of review so that protection remains adequate without paralyzing the state's capacity to act effectively (Ondřejek & Horák, 2024). This finding is relevant to Satpol PP enforcement because field operations often occur under time pressure, in tense circumstances, and with a high potential for conflict. The literature on crisis governance and proportionality review therefore provides an important conceptual basis for translating proportionality from the realm of courts into the realm of operational decision-making in the field.

In Indonesia, proportionality discourse has developed primarily through scholarship on human-rights limitations and the reasoning of the Constitutional Court. Article 28J of the 1945 Constitution has become a central basis for discussing limitations on rights and how the Court interprets the constitutional conditions of such limitations. Even so, the use of proportionality in Constitutional Court decisions remains inconsistent, often implicit, and frequently unstructured in a complete sequential form (Lailam & Anggia, 2023; Rugian, 2021). Relatedly, Mujaddidi (2022) shows that proportionality discourse in Indonesia is already mature at the normative-constitutional level, but has not yet been fully consolidated into a uniform and operational review model.

More specifically, Indonesian legal studies on rights limitation emphasize that limitation clauses should not be read as a general license for coercive state action. Rather, they must be interpreted strictly, grounded in legitimate aims, and constrained by the protection of human dignity (Jayadi, 2018; Taqwa, 2025). This reinforces the need to read restrictions on rights not merely textually, but through the structure of justification and the risk of abuse of power. That concern is particularly important because administrative enforcement often occupies a gray area between rule enforcement, public service, and restrictions on civil liberty.

Meanwhile, Satpol PP occupies an institutional position within the framework of regional government, public order, public peace, and the enforcement of Regional Regulations. Its legal basis rests on the regional government regime under

Law No. 23 of 2014 and the institutional regulation of Satpol PP under Government Regulation No. 16 of 2018. These regulations are crucial for legality, but policy literature shows that the existence of legal authority does not automatically produce proportionate operational standards in the field, especially when enforcement involves vulnerable citizens, informal business spaces, or collective action by communities.

The problem is that most studies on Satpol PP remain descriptive and administrative in character, focusing on enforcement effectiveness, coordination obstacles, human-resource limitations, community resistance, or institutional performance. Those studies are important, but they do not treat proportionality as the primary unit of analysis. As a result, the dimensions of citizens' rights, less restrictive alternatives, the documentation of reasons for action, and the evaluation of the balance between public benefit and private loss have not been measured systematically. At this point, a gap emerges between legal scholarship, which is normatively rich, and public-administration scholarship, which is contextually rich but often normatively imprecise.

Accordingly, research on the proportionality of Satpol PP's operational measures in enforcement has clear theoretical and practical value. Theoretically, it bridges two bodies of thought that have largely developed separately: proportionality as a doctrine of rights limitation and public-order enforcement as a practice of field administration. Practically, it may generate more applicable operational parameters for drafting SOPs, training personnel, strengthening internal supervision, and evaluating enforcement measures in an accountable manner. In other words, the novelty of this study lies not only in its focus on Satpol PP, but in operationalizing the proportionality test at the level of concrete administrative action.

3. RESEARCH METHOD

This study uses doctrinal legal research with a prescriptive-analytical orientation to examine the legal norms governing Satpol PP's enforcement authority and to assess whether its operational design and practice comply with the principle of proportionality. The doctrinal approach is appropriate because the study does not merely describe social phenomena; it evaluates the consistency, justification, and coherence of legal norms and their application in governmental action. Methodological literature places doctrinal research at the core of legal scholarship that explains, interprets, and formulates legal arguments systematically (Hutchinson & Duncan, 2012; T. Hutchinson, 2015). Substantively, the study examines the enforcement of public order and public peace, which falls within Satpol PP's domain in the framework of regional governance. For that reason, the primary legal materials include the Constitution, legislation on regional government, regulations governing Satpol PP, as well as Regional Regulations and enforcement SOPs relevant to the object of study. The use of primary legal materials is important to ensure that the proportionality analysis remains anchored in the formal mandate and legal purposes of enforcement measures.

The study employs four complementary approaches. First, the statutory approach is used to map the structure of authority, limits of action, procedures, and forms of discretion. Second, the conceptual approach is used to operationalize proportionality as a tool for reviewing administrative action. Third, the case approach examines court decisions, Constitutional Court decisions, or dispute and objection documents relevant to rights restrictions and enforcement measures. Fourth, a limited comparative approach is used to build the proportionality framework from academic debates and comparative practice without shifting the principal focus away from the Indonesian context. Proportionality literature shows that structured review encompasses legitimate aim, suitability, necessity, and balancing.

The study's data sources consist of secondary and tertiary legal materials in addition to the primary legal materials described above. The materials were collected through library research and systematic document tracing based on inclusion criteria relevant to enforcement, rights restriction, the use of administrative authority, and proportionality reasoning. For scholarly materials, the search prioritized publications from 2015 to 2025 in order to remain consistent with contemporary developments in proportionality debates and Indonesian review practice. The analytical technique combines doctrinal analysis with qualitative content analysis of legal texts and policy documents. Content analysis is used to identify patterns of normative argumentation, the rationality of official action, and indicators of rights restriction in regulations and operational documents. Procedurally, the analysis includes inventorying and classifying legal materials, reducing the data on an issue basis, coding a proportionality-review matrix, interpreting the law, assessing consistency between legal objectives, enforcement instruments, and their effects, and formulating an operational model of proportionate Satpol PP enforcement. Document analysis and content analysis are appropriate because they permit close reading of policy texts and justificatory structures without sacrificing procedural precision (Bowen, 2009; Elo & Kyngäs, 2008).

To sharpen the analysis, the study develops a matrix built around several units of review: legality of authority, enforcement objectives, the fit between measures and objectives, the availability of alternatives, the balance between public interest and the protection of citizens' rights, and procedural safeguards. Through this matrix, the study moves beyond simply deciding whether a norm is formally compliant; it generates a more precise diagnosis of disproportionality in enforcement operations and identifies the direction of improvement. The methodological output targeted by the study

is an applicable proportionality-review model for drafting SOPs and evaluating Satpol PP action from the standpoint of administrative law and citizens' constitutional rights.

Furthermore, doctrinal analysis is combined with qualitative analysis of primary and secondary legal materials so that the assessment of Satpol PP action does not stop at the identification of norms, but also evaluates the structure of legal justification in a systematic way. The analytical process begins with the inventory and classification of legal materials into three groups: the legal basis and legal objectives of enforcement, the procedures and stages of enforcement measures, and the protection of rights and mechanisms of accountability. Finally, the study employs grammatical, systematic, and teleological interpretation to assess the correspondence between the wording of legal norms, policy objectives, and the administrative measures that may legitimately be taken in enforcement operations. At the evaluation stage, the measures examined are classified as proportionate, risky, or disproportionate based on the strength of their justification and the degree of rights restriction they impose.

Table 1. Operationalization Matrix of Proportionality in Satpol PP Enforcement Operations

Component	Operational Definition	Indicators	Assessment	Data Sources
Legality	The enforcement measure rests on a legal basis.	Legal basis; authorized officers; object of enforcement; minimum formal procedures fulfilled.	0 = no legal basis/outside authority; 1 = legal basis exists but is incomplete; 2 = clear and appropriate.	1945 Constitution; Regional Government Law; Satpol PP Regulation.
Legitimate Aim	The measure is directed toward a legally justifiable objective.	Objective is formulated; objective is relevant to Satpol PP's mandate; objective does not deviate from the legal purpose.	0 = objective unclear; 1 = objective legitimate but vague; 2 = objective legitimate and specific.	Regulations; assignment letters; operational documents.
Suitability of the Measure	The measure has a rational connection to the objective pursued.	Type of measure is relevant; intensity of the measure fits the situation; the measure is normatively effective in achieving the objective.	0 = not relevant; 1 = partially relevant; 2 = relevant and rational.	SOPs; operational plans; chronology of action.
Impact	The burden imposed does not exceed the public benefit sought.	Impact on property rights; public benefit is measurable; efforts are made to minimize loss; the measure is not excessive.	0 = burden exceeds benefit; 1 = balanced; 2 = public benefit strong and losses minimized.	Operational documents; evaluation reports.
Procedural Safeguards	The measure is accompanied by response mechanisms, documentation, and avenues for objection.	Notification; officer identification; authorization; official reports; records of action; complaint or objection channels available.	0 = procedures ignored; 1 = procedures partial; 2 = procedures complete and auditable.	SOPs; warning letters; documentation; complaint mechanisms.
Accountability and Oversight	Institutional responsibility exists for both the measure and its outcomes.	Post-operation evaluation; internal supervision; follow-up on complaints; SOP revision when problems are found.	0 = no accountability; 1 = formal accountability without follow-up; 2 = evaluation and improvement exist.	Internal reports; inspectorate documents; audits; SOP evaluations.

The operational matrix in **Table 1** serves as a tool for assessing the consistency of Satpol PP's legal basis, enforcement objectives, choice of measures, and the degree of restriction imposed on citizens' rights. Through this instrument, the study identifies with greater precision the points at which disproportionality tends to arise in enforcement operations and formulates recommendations for strengthening SOPs and administrative accountability.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1. Normative Structure of Satpol PP Enforcement Authority and the Space for Rights Restriction

The normative review shows that Satpol PP enforcement operations rest on a relatively strong legal basis within the regional-government and regulatory-enforcement framework. Yet the strength of this legal basis does not automatically suffice to justify every administrative measure taken in the field. From the standpoint of administrative law, legality clarifies who is authorized to act and for what purpose authority is used, but it does not by itself resolve the question of the permissible intensity of intervention in citizens' rights (Elo & Kyngäs, 2008; Hutchinson & Duncan, 2012). The study therefore finds that the central issue is not merely the existence of authority, but the quality of the justification for using that authority at each stage of enforcement. Conceptually, the study finds that restrictions on rights in Satpol PP operations most often arise through direct and tangible measures such as seizure of goods, eviction from a location, demolition, suspension of activities, or restrictions on access to particular spaces. Such measures may be lawful if legality requirements are met, yet they may still be disproportionate when they are undertaken without adequate staging, without a specific objective, or without efforts to reduce their effects on affected citizens. At that point, proportionality functions as an instrument for controlling administrative discretion rather than as an obstacle to order enforcement.

4.2. Findings on Legitimate Aim and Suitability

Based on the analytical matrix used in this study, the legitimate aim element is generally the easiest to satisfy in the normative design of enforcement. Public order, public peace, safety protection, and the enforcement of Regional Regulations are all legally acceptable objectives. The problem arises when these objectives are stated too generally, are not translated into the specific context of an operation, or are unsupported by reasons tied to the concrete measure adopted. Under such conditions, an abstractly legitimate aim may lose much of its justificatory force once connected to actual enforcement action. As for suitability, the study finds that not every measure available within the administrative framework has a rational relationship with the purpose of enforcement. Coercive measures taken too early, for instance, may weaken the claim of rationality when more relevant options remain available to secure initial compliance, such as warnings, mediation, or scheduled adjustment. Within the proportionality framework, suitability is not assessed simply by whether a measure eventually produces order, but by whether the kind of measure chosen is genuinely appropriate to the problem confronted (Lailam & Anggia, 2023; Rugian, 2021). The analysis therefore indicates the need for a clearer differentiation between measures for minor administrative violations, repeated violations, and conditions that pose a direct threat to public safety.

4.3. Necessity as the Most Vulnerable Point of Disproportionality

The most important finding of this study concerns necessity. Doctrinally, this element requires officials to choose the measure that restricts citizens' rights as little as possible while still achieving the legal objective. In the context of Satpol PP enforcement, necessity requires evidence that officers have considered or pursued less restrictive alternatives before escalating official action. Such alternatives may include staged warnings, written notification, guidance, negotiation, relocation, scheduling, or other relevant forms of administrative facilitation. The normative reading undertaken in this study shows that the main point of disproportionality lies not in the absence of a legal basis, but in leaps of escalation that are not accompanied by adequate justification. When policy documents or SOPs do not regulate in detail the conditions that permit accelerated escalation, discretion becomes too wide and difficult to audit. As a result, a measure that is formally permissible may become materially excessive. This finding is consistent with developments in proportionality scholarship that treat necessity as the principal safeguard against the use of overly intrusive public power. In enforcement practice, necessity also marks the quality of governance: the better the documentation, the stronger the legitimacy of the final measure taken.

4.4. Balancing Impacts and Protecting Citizens' Rights

The balancing element requires a complex assessment because it places the public benefit sought by the state against the burden borne by citizens. The analysis shows that enforcement aimed at maintaining order in public spaces or ensuring administrative compliance cannot be justified solely by reference to effectiveness when it causes severe losses without mitigation. Within this framework, the study argues that success in enforcement cannot be measured only by whether the object has been controlled, but must also incorporate the minimization of harm, humane treatment, and the protection of citizens' dignity. This normative finding is important because it corrects a purely administrative view of enforcement. Enforcement is indeed pursued in the public interest, but the public interest is not equivalent to unlimited justification. On the contrary, the legitimacy of enforcing Regional Regulations is strengthened when firm action is accompanied by measurable reasons, clear stages, and attention to the socio-economic consequences borne by affected citizens. For that reason, the study treats balancing not as a symbolic stage, but as the core of material justice in administrative action. The

study also shows that procedural safeguards play a central role in assessing the proportionality of enforcement measures. Adequate notification, clear officer identification, documentation of the measure, official reports, and complaint mechanisms are not mere administrative formalities; they are indispensable conditions for determining whether the measure can be accounted for. In many administrative cases, procedural weakness is often the first sign of disproportionality because it reflects the absence of space for correction and explanation for those affected. From a governance perspective, post-operation accountability also determines the institutional quality of proportionality. Internal evaluation of how an operation was conducted, follow-up on complaints, and revision of SOPs when problems are found are mechanisms that reduce the recurrence of measures that risk being disproportionate. The study therefore finds that proportionality in Satpol PP enforcement cannot be built only at the moment of operational decision-making; it must be embedded in a governance cycle that includes planning, implementation, documentation, evaluation, and policy revision.

4.5. Synthesis of Findings: Patterns of Disproportionality and the Proposed Assessment Model

Across the elements of review, the study identifies three recurring patterns of disproportionality in Satpol PP enforcement operations. First, escalatory disproportionality occurs when intensive measures are taken quickly without adequate prior alternatives. Second, justificatory disproportionality occurs when enforcement objectives are stated only in general terms and their rational relationship to the selected measure is left unexplained. Third, procedural disproportionality occurs when rights are restricted without proper notification, documentation, or a meaningful correction mechanism. These three patterns show that the problem lies not only in the text of norms, but in the quality of their operationalization. On the basis of these findings, the study proposes a proportionality assessment model for Satpol PP enforcement that places three elements at the minimum threshold: legality of authority, a legitimate and specific objective, and necessity grounded in the least restrictive alternative. If one of these elements is not satisfied, the measure is strongly at risk of being classified as disproportionate even if the pursuit of public order is otherwise justifiable. The remaining elements balancing, procedural safeguards, and institutional accountability—function to reinforce the quality of justification and the legitimacy of official action.

Academic debate on proportionality in Satpol PP enforcement essentially moves between two poles: the need of the state and regional governments to maintain public order, and the constitutional-administrative obligation to protect citizens from excessive measures. From the perspective of administrative law, enforcement cannot be assessed solely in terms of formal legality, but must also be measured by the rationality of its objective, the necessity of its measures, and the balance of its impacts on those subjected to enforcement (Maulidina, 2024; Nurhikman et al., 2025). Proportionality therefore serves as an analytical device for testing whether Satpol PP action represents the most appropriate policy choice, rather than merely the fastest one. First, the structure of the proportionality test emphasizes that review must proceed sequentially through legitimate aim, suitability, necessity, and balancing. For Satpol PP enforcement, the implication is clear: demolition, forced eviction, or activity restrictions should not be treated as initial instruments when softer yet effective alternatives remain available. In this context, the necessity argument becomes crucial because it obliges officials to demonstrate why less restrictive options are inadequate. Second, the debate concerns administrative discretion, because field situations are often dynamic, risky, and not fully anticipated by technical rules (Arifin, 2025; Hilda et al., 2025). At the same time, discretion that expands without clear parameters may produce repressive, discriminatory, or inconsistent measures across cases. Indonesian administrative-law scholarship emphasizes that discretion must remain tied to the General Principles of Good Governance, accountability, and an orientation toward the public interest, rather than to operational efficiency alone. Proportionality therefore functions as a normative brake on discretion. Third, the debate extends to sanctions and stages of enforcement. Scholarship on administrative sanctions criticizes practices that impose severe sanctions from the outset because they may neglect considerations of utility, value, and efficiency in governance design (Kurniawan et al., 2023). For Satpol PP, this insight supports a staged model of enforcement that is more consistent with proportionality than a one-step, immediate-completion approach, especially in cases of violations that do not pose an acute threat to public safety.

In addition, institutional accountability and inter-agency coordination in enforcement often intersect with the security and public-order role of the police, so the limits of each institution's role, the chain of field command, and post-action responsibility must be formulated clearly in order to avoid both overlap and blame shifting (Simamora & Simatupang, 2025). Empirical studies of Satpol PP enforcement also show that effectiveness depends not only on the firmness of officers, but on procedural consistency, cross-agency support, and social acceptance of enforcement action (Djidar et al., 2024; Umayah et al., 2021). For that reason, a proportionality framework for Satpol PP should not stop at reviewing isolated measures; it should be expanded into a governance review of enforcement in order to prevent the excesses of power and preserve policy legitimacy.

The main implication of this study for administrative law is the need to shift from an enforcement model oriented solely toward results to one grounded in justification and auditability. In that framework, Satpol PP SOPs should explicitly specify categories of violation, stages of response, escalation indicators, lists of non-coercive alternatives,

formats for documenting the justification of measures, and post-operation evaluation mechanisms. With such a design, officers may still act firmly, but that firmness remains within a proportionality framework capable of legal and administrative review. Practically, the findings support strengthening personnel training in de-escalation, public communication, and documentation. Such training is important so that proportionality is not understood as an operational obstacle, but as a standard of professional conduct in the exercise of public authority. In the end, proportionate enforcement not only reduces the risk of disputes and public complaints, but also strengthens the legitimacy of Satpol PP as an instrument for enforcing Regional Regulations in a democratic rule-of-law state.

5. CONCLUSION

This study confirms that the central problem in Satpol PP enforcement operations lies not in authority alone, but in the way that authority is exercised when it directly affects citizens' rights. The legal framework of regional governance and the institutional regulation of Satpol PP provide a formal basis for maintaining public order and public peace. Yet formal legality is only an initial requirement; administrative validity in a rule-of-law state demands a deeper layer of justification, namely whether the measure pursues a legitimate objective, is chosen through appropriate means, is implemented at the necessary level of intervention, and is carried out in a balanced and accountable manner. At this point, proportionality becomes the key standard for assessing the quality of enforcement and for distinguishing between action that is firm yet lawful and action that is excessive even if it appears administratively effective.

The findings show that the risk of disproportionality arises most clearly in the escalation of measures. In many enforcement designs, the problem does not stem from the absence of a legal basis, but from leaps toward coercive action that are not preceded by an adequate consideration of alternatives. Necessity therefore becomes the decisive point of review. Measures such as seizure, eviction, demolition, or suspension of activities can be justified only when officials are able to show that softer options were considered or were no longer sufficient to achieve the legal objective. The study also finds that weaknesses in notification, documentation, and objection mechanisms often serve as early markers of proportionality problems, because the absence of procedural safeguards narrows the space for correction available to affected citizens and weakens institutional accountability.

Based on this analysis, the study offers a conceptual contribution in the form of a stage-based proportionality framework for Satpol PP enforcement operations that places legality, legitimate aim, suitability, necessity, balancing, and procedural safeguards in an interconnected structure. Its novelty lies in operationalizing a doctrine of proportionality that has so far been used more dominantly in constitutional review and judicial decisions at the level of concrete administrative action in the field. The study therefore not only enriches discourse on administrative law and rights limitation, but also provides a more applicable analytical instrument for assessing enforcement action with greater precision.

Practically, the study implies the need to refine Satpol PP enforcement SOPs so that they are more strongly grounded in justification and auditability. An ideal SOP should set out categories of violation, response stages, escalation indicators, non-coercive alternatives, formats for recording the reasons for action, and post-operation evaluation procedures. Capacity-building for personnel should be directed toward communication, conflict de-escalation, and the recording of administrative action so that proportionality is understood as a standard of professionalism rather than as an operational burden. Ultimately, proportionate enforcement will improve the quality of rights protection without negating the public-order function, while also strengthening the legitimacy of Satpol PP as a Regional Regulation enforcement apparatus within a democratic rule-of-law framework. Future research may extend this analysis through empirical studies of regional SOPs, operation documentation, and patterns of administrative objections so that the proportionality model proposed here can be tested across different local contexts. Through that step, the agenda of building enforcement that is effective, fair, and constitutional can be advanced on a more sustainable basis.

REFERENCES

- Akmal, D. U., & Arlianti, D. L. (2022). *Dinamika Perlindungan Hak Konstitusional Warga Negara Dalam Implementasi Pengujian Undang-Undang di Mahkamah Konstitusi*. *Mulawarman Law Review*, 49–70. <https://doi.org/10.30872/mulrev.v7i1.780>
- Arifin, F. (2025). *Rekonseptualisasi Diskresi Perspektif Hukum Administrasi Negara: Analisis Kritis Terhadap Implementasi Undang-Undang Administrasi Pemerintahan Nasional*. *Audi Et AP : Jurnal Penelitian Hukum*, 4(01), 25–37. <https://doi.org/10.24967/jaeap.v4i01.3867>
- Bagir, Z. A., Asfinawati, Suhadi, & Arianingtyas, R. (2020). *Limitations to Freedom of Religion or Belief in Indonesia: Norms and Practices*. *Religion & Human Rights*, 15(1–2), 39–56. <https://doi.org/10.1163/18710328-BJA10003>
- Bendor, A. L., & Sela, T. (2015). *How proportional is proportionality?* *International Journal of Constitutional Law*, 13(2), 530–544. <https://doi.org/10.1093/icon/mov028>

- Boughey, J. (2015). The Reasonableness of Proportionality in the Australian Administrative Law Context. *Federal Law Review*, 43(1), 59–90. <https://doi.org/10.22145/flr.43.1.3>
- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document Analysis as a Qualitative Research Method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27–40. <https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027>
- Boyron, S., & Marique, Y. (2021). Proportionality in English Administrative Law: Resistance and Strategy in Relational Dynamics. *Review of European Administrative Law*, 14(1), 65–93. <https://doi.org/10.7590/187479821X16190058548736>
- Cohen-Eliya, M., & Porat, I. (2021). Proportionality in the Age of Populism. *The American Journal of Comparative Law*, 69(3), 449–477. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ajcl/avac005>
- Djidar, H., Darmadi, D., & Burhan, Y. (2024). Eksistensi Satuan Polisi Pamong Praja Dalam Penegakat Aturan di Kabupaten Luwu Timur. *Journal Publicuho*, 7(3), 1612–1626. <https://doi.org/10.35817/publicuho.v7i3.524>
- Duniewska, Z. (2022). Zasada proporcjonalności a prawo administracyjne – zagadnienia wybrane. *Studia Prawno-Ekonomiczne*, 123, 9–26. <https://doi.org/10.26485/SPE/2022/123/1>
- Elo, S., & Kyngäs, H. (2008). The qualitative content analysis process. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 62(1), 107–115. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2007.04569.x>
- Hilda, H. H. S., Muflih Munazih, & Siti Kunarti. (2025). Tinjauan Hukum Administrasi Negara Terhadap Pembentukan Koperasi Desa Merah Putih Melalui Instruksi Presiden. *JURNAL USM LAW REVIEW*, 8(2), 901–922. <https://doi.org/10.26623/julr.v8i2.12031>
- Hutchinson, T. (2015). The Doctrinal Method: Incorporating Interdisciplinary Methods in Reforming the Law. *Erasmus Law Review*, 8(3), 130–138. <https://doi.org/10.5553/ELR.000055>
- Hutchinson, T. ., & Duncan, N. (2012). Defining and describing what we do: Doctrinal legal research. *Deakin Law Review*, 17, 83–119.
- Jayadi, A. (2018). What Constitutes as Limitation of (Human) Rights in Indonesian Legal Context? *Hasanuddin Law Review*, 3(3), 290. <https://doi.org/10.20956/halrev.v3i3.1203>
- Kurniawan, I. G. A., Samsithawrati, P. A., & Lulo, L. de D. M. (2023). Eksistensi Sanksi Administratif Bisnis Digital dalam Perspektif Economic Analysis of Law. *Jurnal Ius Constituendum*, 8(1), 115–131. <https://doi.org/10.26623/jic.v8i1.6281>
- Lailam, T., & Anggia, P. (2023). The Indonesian Constitutional Court Approaches the Proportionality Principle to the Cases Involving Competing Rights. *LAW REFORM*, 19(1), 110–127. <https://doi.org/10.14710/lr.v19i1.54087>
- Maulidina, E. I. (2024). Urgensi Uji Kebutuhan dan Proporsionalitas dalam Pengecualian Hak-Hak Subjek Data Pribadi di Indonesia. *Jurnal Analisis Hukum*, 7(2), 143–159. <https://doi.org/10.38043/jah.v7i2.5464>
- Mujaddidi, S. (2022). Konstitusionalitas Pembatasan Hak Asasi Manusia dalam Putusan Mahkamah Konstitusi. *Jurnal Konstitusi*, 18(3), 539. <https://doi.org/10.31078/jk1833>
- Nurhikman, E. N., Djaja, N., & Luna, L. (2025). Proporsionalitas dan Akuntabilitas dalam Tata Kelola Digital Atas Pembatasan Akses Internet Bagi Anak di Indonesia. *JURNAL USM LAW REVIEW*, 8(3), 2014–2037. <https://doi.org/10.26623/julr.v8i3.12924>
- Ondřejek, P., & Horák, F. (2024). Proportionality during Times of Crisis: Precautionary Application of Proportionality Analysis in the Judicial Review of Emergency Measures. *European Constitutional Law Review*, 20(1), 27–51. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1574019624000051>
- Peters, A. (2021). A plea for proportionality: A reply to Yun-chien Chang and Xin Dai. *International Journal of Constitutional Law*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/icon/moab071>
- Rugian, I. A. (2021). Prinsip Proporsionalitas dalam Putusan Mahkamah Konstitusi (Studi Perbandingan di Indonesia dan Jerman). *Jurnal Konstitusi*, 18(2), 461. <https://doi.org/10.31078/jk1829>
- Silalahi, A. D. (2024). Paradox of State of Law Idea on Pancasila Philosophical Justification as Sources of Law. *Jurnal Konstitusi*, 21(1), 62–76. <https://doi.org/10.31078/jk2114>
- Simamora, J., & Simatupang, L. D. (2025). Penguatan Kedudukan dan Kewenangan Konstitusional Polri sebagai Alat Negara dalam Bidang Keamanan dan Ketertiban. *Negara Hukum: Membangun Hukum Untuk Keadilan Dan Kesejahteraan*, 15(2). <https://doi.org/10.22212/jnh.v15i2.4424>
- Stone, A. (2020). Proportionality and Its Alternatives. *Federal Law Review*, 48(1), 123–153. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0067205X19890448>

- Sunggono, B., & Harianto, A. (2009). *Bantuan Hukum dan Hak Asasi Manusia*, Bandung: CV. Mandar Maju.
- Taqwa, M. D. (2025). Penelusuran Ide Proportionality dalam Pasal 28J(2) UUD NRI Tahun 1945. *Jurnal Konstitusi*, 22(3), 483–507. <https://doi.org/10.31078/jk2234>
- Umayah, D., Purnomo, E. P., Fadhlurrohman, M. I., Fathani, A. T., & Salsabila, L. (2021). The Implementation of Indonesian Sustainable Palm Oil (ISPO) Policy in Managing Oil Palm Plantation in Indonesia. *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*, 943(1), 012022. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/943/1/012022>
- Vyhnánek, L., Blechová, A., Bátrla, M., Míšek, J., Novotná, T., Reichman, A., & Harašta, J. (2024). The Dynamics of Proportionality: Constitutional Courts and the Review of COVID-19 Regulations. *German Law Journal*, 25(3), 386–406. <https://doi.org/10.1017/glj.2023.96>
- Walpola, S. (2017). The Development of the High Court's Willingness to Overrule Common Law Precedent. *Federal Law Review*, 45(2), 291–314. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0067205X1704500206>