



Implications of civil procedure law reform on judicial practice

Husain N Yasin

Faculty of Law, Universitas Negeri Gorontalo, Gorontalo, Indonesia. E-mail: farlanyasin27@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Civil;
Law;
Reform.

Article history:

Received Dec 10, 2024;
Revised Dec 12, 2024;
Accepted Jan 9, 2025;
Online Jan 30, 2025.

ABSTRACT

In order to address the persistent issues of complexity and inefficiency in Indonesia's judicial system, reforms to civil procedural legislation aim to enhance accessibility and streamline processes. This study examines the effectiveness of these reforms, focusing on challenges such as overly formal procedures and insufficient human and technological resources, using a normative descriptive and juridical-analytical methodology. The findings highlight the positive impact of innovations like e-court systems in simplifying litigation processes, though the success of these reforms hinges on addressing technical infrastructure, enhancing judicial human resource capabilities, and fostering a transformative shift in legal culture. Practical implications of this research include providing actionable insights for policymakers to prioritize investments in technology and training, ensuring that procedural reforms benefit all societal segments, including rural and marginalized communities. The study contributes to the justice system by offering a blueprint for creating a more inclusive, efficient, and people-centered judiciary in Indonesia, fostering greater public trust and procedural fairness.

This is an open access article under the [CC BY-NC](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/) license.



Corresponding Author:

Husain N Yasin,
Faculty of Law,
Universitas Negeri Gorontalo,
Jl. jendral Sudirman, No. Gorontalo, Gorontalo, 96128, Indonesia
Email: farlanyasin27@gmail.com

1. Introduction

An essential component of our legal system, civil procedural law seeks to govern the processes by which civil disputes are resolved in court. Over the course of history, civil procedural law has progressed in tandem with the changing nature of legal systems worldwide (TK Harahap et al., 2023). According to legal philosophy, procedural law serves as a means to an end – the achievement of material justice – through the application of substantive law. This idea has been around since the Roman Empire, when the rigorous procedural rules that governed dispute resolution processes guaranteed that all parties were treated fairly (M.Y. Harahap, 2017).

Civil procedural law has evolved over time in response to societal demands and societal progress. For instance, traditional procedural law was quite formal; a case may be deemed null and invalid if any step of the procedure was skipped (Waruwu, 2022). The impact of common law, which placed an emphasis on moral and just principles, contributed to its development throughout the Middle Ages. Aiming to make the courts more inclusive and sensitive to

society's demands, the ideals of efficiency, accessibility, and simplicity started to influence civil procedural law reform in the modern age (Pandiangan, 2017).

In response to complaints about the length and difficulty of the legal procedure, reforms to civil procedural laws are often implemented. Procedural justice and other contemporary conceptions hold that fair procedural legislation should provide accountability, timeliness, and openness in case resolution. As a result of streamlining processes, cutting down on formalities, and incorporating technology into the litigation process, several nations eventually embraced these ideas. As the need for a quick, fair, and straightforward trial grows in Indonesian society, reform of civil procedural laws has emerged as a key problem (MY Harahap, 1997).

Concerns about civil procedural law in Indonesian setting highlight the complexities of the problems that the judicial system faces. A major problem is the difficulty of the processes, which prevents the people from easily accessing justice. The Indonesian judicial system is notoriously cumbersome and has many steps that must be strictly adhered to. As a consequence, parties sometimes end up paying more to have their cases resolved and the community as a whole has less access, particularly marginalized groups like women, the impoverished, and those living in rural regions.

Different areas of Indonesia apply civil procedural law differently, which is another major issue. Limited human resources, facilities, and equipment, as well as judges' abilities to comprehend more recent advancements in procedural law, are some of the technical limitations that the dispersed judicial system often encounters. Courts in more developed regions often use different standard procedures than courts in less developed areas, leading to inconsistent application of procedural law. The disparity in justice between rural and urban areas is exacerbated by this circumstance.

Another major problem is the court system's reluctance to adopt technology. As part of the reform, there have been attempts to establish electronic courts and litigation platforms; nonetheless, these initiatives continue to encounter several challenges. The community's degree of digital literacy varies, and many regional courts lack sufficient technology infrastructure. The objective of streamlining and speeding up the judicial process has not been entirely accomplished because of this, since digital system implementations typically do not work properly.

The continued emphasis on formality and copious paperwork in the legal system is another crucial factor. Rather than concentrating on the merits of the case, judges and court personnel often rush through the procedural requirements. This method often sidelines the primary goal of the legal system, which is to pursue material justice. People often see the court as more of a barrier to problem-solving than a venue for equitable and efficient resolutions (Butarbutar, 2011).

There has to be a sea shift in Indonesia's legal culture, an increase in the capacity of judicial institutions, and new regulations if the country's civil procedural laws are to be adequately addressed. With these changes, we can build a system that works better for everyone, is easier to use, and produces more equitable outcomes. The failure to take these issues seriously will ensure that civil procedural law remains a significant obstacle to the pursuit of justice in society.

In light of the above, the research question poses the following: (1) To what extent has the reform of civil procedural legislation improved the availability and effectiveness of Indonesia's judicial system? as well as (2) how may the reform of civil procedural law in Indonesia be made more effective, and what are the most significant challenges in this area?

2. Method

Examining statutes, rules, and legal principles pertaining to the reform of civil procedural law in Indonesia is the major goal of this study, which employs a normative legal research approach (Mahmud Marzuki, 2011). This research employs a normative legal approach to examine

statutes, rules, and principles related to the reform of civil procedural law in Indonesia, with a focus on improving accessibility, efficiency, and legal certainty. Data is sourced primarily from legal documents, government reports, academic literature, and case analyses, specifically examining the *Herzien Inlandsch Reglement*, *Rechtsreglement Buitengewesten*, and e-court and e-litigation systems. Relevant materials are selected based on their applicability to procedural reform, jurisdictional relevance, timeliness, and authoritative standing within Indonesian law. A normative descriptive technique is used to analyze the implementation of reforms, while a juridical-analytical strategy addresses barriers such as technological infrastructure, judicial capacity, and formalistic legal culture. Comparative analysis with other legal systems is employed to explore alternative solutions. The study, structured over 7-12 months, includes phases for preparatory work, data collection, analysis, writing, and dissemination, aiming to contribute to more inclusive and efficient civil procedural legislation in Indonesia.

This research employs a juridical-analytical strategy to address the second articulation of the issue by tracing the roadblocks to reforming Indonesia's civil procedural legislation. Practical considerations are addressed in this examination, including issues with technology infrastructure, judicial human resource capability, and a legal culture that is still heavily formalistic. Case participants, including those in rural locations, will have their impact on this transformation assessed in the research. Alternative viewpoints and answers to these challenges will be offered via a comparative legal approach with systems in other nations. The research is anticipated to aid in the creation of civil procedural legislation in Indonesia that is more accommodating to all segments of society by using these two methods.

3. Analysis and Results

3.1. The Effectiveness of Civil Procedure Law Reform in Increasing Accessibility and Efficiency of the Justice System in Indonesia

One way to understand how civil procedural law reform in Indonesia has improved the efficiency and accessibility of the judicial system is by looking at it through the lens of different schools of thought in legal theory, from the classical to the modern. Legal theory known as "procedural law" emphasizes the importance of formal processes in settling disputes and the inherent usefulness of these procedures in achieving justice (Sarwono, 2011). Hans Kelsen, whose "Pure Theory of Law" stresses the need for a well-organized legal framework to provide legal certainty, is a major person who supports the study of procedural law (Vinx, 2007). Civil procedural law finds relevance in Kelsen's ideas because they show how rules of law are put into practice in the course of routine court processes.

Furthermore, the idea of "procedural morality" put out by Lon L. Fuller stresses that the procedure as well as the content of a law are valid criteria for evaluation. Good legislation, in Fuller's view, must adhere to procedural norms like accessibility, uniformity, and clarity (Suwito et al., 2023). This perspective is used to assess how court proceedings might be made more accessible and accommodating to society's requirements within the context of civil procedural law. In an attempt to update Indonesia's civil procedural law, which is seen by many as too rigid and unable to adapt to the ever-changing nature of contemporary society, these concepts are gaining prominence (Abdul Manan, 2006).

Distributive justice, John Rawls's theory of justice, also made a contribution. Rawls stressed in A Theory of Justice that a fair procedure is just as important as the end result. To determine whether the judicial process can provide nondiscriminatory equal opportunity, this concept is pertinent within the framework of civil procedural law. This is significant because many people face financial, geographical, or cultural barriers that make it difficult for them to use the justice system (Amartya, 2012). In an effort to lower these obstacles, civil procedural law reform has included technologies like e-court and e-litigation; nonetheless, there are still several obstacles to its full implementation.

Roscoe Pound's functional method may also be used to examine the reform of civil procedural legislation in Indonesia. Pound stressed that the purpose of law is to address societal requirements and efficiently settle disputes (Meliala & Rifai, 2022). Consequently, the Indonesian court system has been subject to a number of reforms to civil procedural rules with the goal of removing roadblocks. Nevertheless, court litigation processes are sometimes too convoluted and time-consuming, even with advancements like the e-court system. Recalling Pound's idea of law as a social engineering instrument, we should not limit legal reform to changes in regulations but should instead aim to alter both the culture and practice of the legal profession (Sundari et al., 2024).

The very formalistic colonial legal legacy of the Netherlands had an impact on Indonesia's civil procedural law system in the past. The *Herzien Inlandsch Reglement* (HER) and the *Rechtsreglement Buitengewesten* (RBG) laid the groundwork for this system, and they continue to serve as the foundation of civil procedural law in the majority of Indonesian courts today. Nevertheless, many believe that this system does not meet the requirements of contemporary society due to its rigidity and tendency to place undue stress on the individuals involved in the legal proceedings. As the need for a more just and efficient justice system grew throughout the reform period, civil procedural law reform became a prominent topic of discussion. The goal of these revisions is to bring civil procedural law into conformity with democratic ideals of efficiency and procedural fairness (Yudhanegara et al., 2024).

Reinforcing the notion of accessibility is a crucial part of reforming civil procedural law. Accessibility, in the context of legal philosophy, is the absence of needless obstacles that prevent members of the public from using the court system. This view is backed by the work of HLA Hart, who argued that everyone, especially marginalized groups, should be able to easily comprehend and comply with the law (Wijaya & Saupa, 2014). Accessibility is a major concern in Indonesia since many individuals still have trouble getting to the courts for reasons related to their income, location, or level of education. One attempt to make justice more accessible is the use of technology, such the e-court system. But the community's preparedness in terms of both technical infrastructure and digital literacy will determine how successful this project is (Hamzah, 2023).

Reforms to civil procedural law also place an emphasis on efficiency. legislation that is effective in reducing societal expenses, such as litigation costs, is good legislation, according to Richard Posner's theory of legal efficiency. People in Indonesia typically face expensive prices and long legal processes when trying to get justice (Block, 1996). To tackle this, civil procedural law changes have been implemented, including measures to streamline litigation processes and provide tools for alternative dispute settlement. Still, there are a number of challenges to their widespread use, such as pushback from judges used to the status quo (Imelda et al., 2024).

However, Indonesia's enduring legal culture is another obstacle that has to be overcome in the reform of civil procedural law. Many members of this legal culture hold the belief that rules governing procedures are inflexible and unchangeable. Court procedures reflect this attitude by placing an emphasis on procedure rather than content. Good processes, according to Ronald Dworkin's idea of procedural justice, should be able to represent core justice principles. For this reason, reworking Indonesia's civil procedural laws would need a shift in the community's and judicial officials' attitudes toward the rule of law as well as new legislative mandates.

Civil procedural law reform in Indonesia, on a bigger scale, should also include international trends in the law. Thanks to new technology and changes to procedural laws, many nations' legal systems are now more accessible and efficient than ever before. For instance, in order to streamline the litigation process and increase public access to justice, the court systems in Singapore and South Korea have extensively used technology. Indonesia may learn a lot from this experience and use it to improve its civil procedural laws in a more effective way (Ms & Rizaldi, 2020).

The degree to which the reforms have increased efficiency and accessibility of the judicial system is a measure of the efficacy of civil procedural law reform in Indonesia. Effective reforms, in theory, should be able to achieve the goals of the legislation, which are to provide inexpensive, transparent, and expedited justice to the community. But because of the institutional and cultural obstacles that the Indonesian judicial system faces, the efficacy of these changes is still up for question in reality.

Using digital technologies like e-court and e-litigation in the judicial process is a sign that reform is working. We hope that by using this approach, we can streamline administrative tasks, cut down on litigation expenses, and have cases resolved faster. People living in outlying places benefit from this technology in terms of accessibility as it allows them to submit paperwork or lawsuits without physically visiting a courthouse. The technical infrastructure and level of digital literacy in a community are two major factors that determine how successful an implementation of this system is in any given area. For instance, the e-court system's usefulness is severely diminished in places with insufficient internet access. This demonstrates how technical and social preparedness, in addition to legislation, determine the efficacy of change.

Reforming civil process laws aims, among other things, to make the court system more efficient. The backlog of cases in court is projected to be reduced by the use of digital methods and alternative conflict resolution, such as mediation, which simplify processes. But in reality, advocates and court officials who are used to the old ways of doing things usually put up a fight. For instance, many civil disputes need mediation, yet its efficacy is sometimes called into doubt because mediators aren't well-versed in the subject or get enough training. As a result, improving the efficiency of procedures calls for both new regulations and more capable human resources.

Indonesian legal culture is formalistic and focused on meticulous paperwork, which impacts the efficacy of change. The reform's goal is to cut out superfluous red tape, but it's hard to put into practice because of entrenched practices. The community's mentality mirrors this legal culture; despite the availability of alternatives like mediation and arbitration, many still see litigation as the exclusive means of resolving problems. Judiciary officials and the society must undergo a paradigm change for the reform to be successful.

Reforms to Indonesia's civil procedural laws have been seen by international legal experts as an attempt to incorporate international best practices. Using technology and regulated processes, Singapore has created a court system that is very efficient. Another country that has shown how judicial innovation may improve efficiency without compromising justice is South Korea. The social, cultural, and political circumstances of Indonesia are unique, thus it would be a mistake to generalize about how other nations have implemented reforms. While implementing reforms, it is important to keep in mind local demands while drawing from successful foreign practices.

Reforming Indonesia's civil procedural laws is, in general, best seen as a continuous process, one in which building on past successes while also addressing current obstacles is essential. There are now more chances than ever before to make the judicial system more accessible and efficient thanks to this reform, but removing the many cultural, institutional, and technological obstacles standing in the way will be crucial to its success. Reforms that are successful in the long run will have the capacity to establish a judicial system in Indonesia that is fair and inclusive, as well as procedurally efficient.

3.2. Main Obstacles Faced in Implementing Civil Procedure Law Reform in Indonesia

As part of its ongoing endeavors to enhance its judicial system's responsiveness to community concerns, Indonesia is reforming its civil procedural laws. Several long-standing issues, including high litigation expenses, poor public access to justice, and lengthy case resolution times, are the targets of this reform. This reform aims to modernize the Indonesian judicial

system by incorporating technology, streamlining litigation processes, and enhancing methods for alternative dispute settlement. The goal is to make the system more accessible, efficient, and equitable. Changes to civil procedural law, like other types of legal reforms, confront a number of complicated challenges (Pahlevi et al., 2021).

Civil procedural law reform has long faced institutional and cultural challenges within Indonesia's legal system, in addition to technological ones. Inadequacy in infrastructure, human resources, and enabling rules within judicial institutions is a common cause of these problems. Integrating contemporary ideas that are more adaptable and results-oriented is further complicated by the legal culture's tendency to be formalistic and procedure-oriented. Court officials and legal practitioners, among others, often put up roadblocks that make it harder to execute this change.

A number of interconnected factors, including infrastructure and supporting rules, contribute to the unreadiness of judicial institutions to deal with improvements to civil procedural law. There is a lack of adequate physical and technical infrastructure in many Indonesian courts, particularly those located in more rural locations. Digital methods like e-court and e-litigation are supposed to make the judicial system more efficient and accessible, yet this is a big roadblock in their way. Even without a reliable internet connection and sufficient hardware, some courts cannot employ these technologies. This causes reforms to advance at an uneven rate as courts in less developed regions struggle to adopt new practices at the same rate as courts in more developed regions (Akhyar, 2019).

The court system's human resources are equally as problematic as its infrastructure. Appropriate court personnel with a firm grasp of substantive law and the flexibility to embrace new technology and processes are essential to the reform of civil procedural law. On the other hand, many court employees, including judges and clerks, lack the knowledge and training necessary to use digital systems or keep up with legislative changes. Since many stakeholders are still used to the status quo and uneasy about the changes that come with reforms, the absence of training and capacity development programs for these human resources often slows down their implementation.

Inconsistencies between the previous regulations and the concepts advocated by the reform sometimes lead to regulatory hurdles. An example of a provision that is at odds with attempts to streamline and quicken the litigation process is the HIR and RBG's reliance on less flexible and formalistic processes. The Supreme Court Regulation (PERMA) on e-court is only one of several new rules that back the reform; yet, it is not uncommon for the old and new laws to not be perfectly in sync with each other. There are gaps in the law as a result of this discord, which could lead to field implementation misunderstandings (Arifany, 2021).

Another major barrier to reforming civil procedural law is a culture of process and formality within the legal system. The Dutch colonial system had a significant impact on Indonesian legal tradition, which places a premium on paperwork and following protocols. As a consequence, the litigation process may become lengthy and intricate, with each step having to be followed meticulously to prevent the case from being deemed invalid. Court staff and judges sometimes prioritize meeting procedural requirements over resolving substantive issues. Some people are opposed to reforms that try to streamline these processes because they believe it would weaken the credibility and honesty of the legal system (Afif, 2019).

An further obstacle is opposition from many stakeholders in the judicial system, such as judges and lawyers. Much of their resistance to the reform stems from a desire to stick with what has worked in the past. Reasons for this include people's hesitance to modify their established ways of doing things, a lack of knowledge about the reform's advantages, and apprehension about the future. On occasion, this opposition stems from special interests, such as those of certain groups or individuals that stand to lose out if the judicial system were to undergo change.

An organization's ability to implement change is impacted by both internal and external influences. Because of its enormous size, which is comprised of hundreds of islands with varied degrees of development, one of the primary obstacles in Indonesia is geographical in nature. The disparity in the availability of judicial infrastructure and technology contributes to the unequal execution of reform. Digital systems like e-court are still not widely available in certain regions because of slow internet connections and a lack of trained personnel to assist users. The community's poor level of legal knowledge is another barrier to implementing a more contemporary judicial system.

The reform of civil procedural law in Indonesia has been impeded in large part by geographical considerations. With over 17,000 islands distributed across different areas and each with its own unique degree of accessibility, Indonesia is the biggest archipelagic nation on the planet. It is common for rural regions like Papua, Maluku, and Nusa Tenggara to lag behind in infrastructure development, particularly when it comes to the technological network necessary to establish e-courts and other forms of digital justice. The disparity in development between urban and rural populations exacerbates the problem of unequal access to contemporary judicial systems.

Inadequate internet infrastructure is a major barrier to digital technologies' potential to aid in the reform of civil procedural law. Still, many areas lack reliable and fast internet connections, despite government initiatives like Palapa Ring that aim to increase internet access. From a judicial perspective, this restriction implies that some regions are unable to use the e-court system for the purpose of submitting lawsuits, retrieving court records, or participating in virtual trials. They are therefore stuck with antiquated methods, which are sometimes more costly and time-consuming, even when digital-based changes are beginning to bear fruit in other domains.

The absence of adequate technical assistance is another major issue. Inadequate personnel and technology prevent many outlying courts from using computerized systems. When it comes to e-court software and any potential technological difficulties, court personnel are often unprepared. On top of that, some courts struggle to install new systems because they lack the funds to purchase the necessary IT knowledge or to embrace new technology. The modernization process is slowed down when we rely on central funds, which aren't always evenly distributed between areas.

Conversely, the public's lack of legal knowledge makes the accessibility issue even worse. Particularly in more remote places, many residents are unaware of their rights under the law and how to seek justice. People with poor levels of legal literacy have a harder time navigating changes to civil procedural law reform, which impacts both their comprehension of and ability to use new systems like e-court (Hidayah & Komariah, 2022). Some individuals may not have the knowledge or access to technology necessary to utilize the program, which might prevent them from filing a case online. Since of this, the reform is unable to accomplish its inclusive aims since even more obstacles are created. The gap between various social classes is widened by inequality in technical literacy and education. Because of the higher levels of education and technological access enjoyed by city dwellers, they are more able to adjust to changes in the judicial system. On the other hand, those living in more isolated or rural locations may feel less informed about these changes and may even feel left out. People may continue to believe that the court system does not care about their problems because of this information gap, which erodes their faith in the system as a whole.

Advocates' and other parties' capacities are further affected by geographical obstacles and technical differences. There is a significant disparity in the availability of training and technology tools between advocates in metropolitan centers and those in more rural locations. Since they lack the necessary technological abilities and awareness of new processes, they are unable to fully engage with the digital judicial system. As a result, their clients often end

themselves at a disadvantage. Both individuals and the efficacy of civil procedural reform as a whole are affected by these differences.

Comprehensive solutions that address all interconnected technical, institutional, cultural, and social issues are necessary to overcome challenges to the implementation of civil procedural law reform in Indonesia. The foundation of every contemporary judicial system, like e-court, is an improved technology infrastructure, and without it, this reform would not be able to function. In order to ensure that all parts of Indonesia, especially more rural ones, have access to the internet, the government must speed up the process. All courts need consistent and dependable internet access, thus national projects like Palapa Ring need to be maintained and even extended. It is also important for courts to have the right software and technology to support digital systems effectively.

The reform must be complemented by an increase in the capability of human resources, such as judges, court clerks, and court personnel, as infrastructure development alone will not be sufficient. They need ongoing instruction in the proper use of technology, the administration of digital systems, and the interpretation of new rules. So that recent grads may start lending a hand to a more contemporary judicial system right now, schools of law should include reform-relevant curriculum. To speed up the process of adapting to change, it is vital that judicial officials undergo intense training immediately.

A further critical step in resolving the discrepancy between the old and new regulations is regulatory harmonization. Reform concepts that are more adaptable and efficient should be considered when evaluating regulations like HIR and RBG that nevertheless make reference to formalistic processes. To guarantee that current legislation are compatible with the demands of contemporary society, the Supreme Court must spearhead this harmonization endeavor by enlisting the help of legal specialists. Harmonious rules allow improvements to be implemented more easily and without field confusion. Fundamental change is also necessary for the more formalistic legal culture. The community, as well as judges and attorneys, need to undergo social and educational reforms to alter their perspective. To lessen the need for undue formality in the legal system, this education must stress the significance of speed and substance. By rewarding courts that do a good job of implementing reforms, for example, we may use an incentive method to transform the culture of the judicial system. To be more adaptable, court officials may feel this pressure.

The community's lack of knowledge about technology and the law also has to be addressed via continuous public education campaigns. Legal literacy campaigns may be organized by the government, NGOs, and local communities to inform individuals of their rights and how to use the online judicial system. Establishing technology-based legal aid centers allows for the provision of digital services to individuals in distant places. These centers may be accessed by hotlines or apps that provide detailed instructions on how to use the e-court system, among other digital resources (Akhyar, 2019).

The law has established the notion of simple, swift, and low-cost justice, and judges are obligated to uphold this principle in order to provide justice while also minimizing the time spent by the parties involved in the case resolution process. Similarly, the Sigli District Court has two jurisdictional areas—Pidie and Pidie Jaya—but its justices review and determine matters from both. The goal of this paper is to analyze the Sigli District Court with an eye on eliminating unnecessary red tape and improving access to affordable, efficient justice. The empirical research technique in the field of law is used.

First, the analysis found that the Sigli District Court has not been doing a great job of implementing the ideal of simple, swift, and low-cost justice. Second, there are still many problems with the Sigli District Court's efforts to apply the principle of simple, fast, and low-cost justice. Some of these problems include: the parties not showing up when they were supposed to; the mediator not being effective; the large number of cases received; the large number of witnesses present; the parties not taking the case seriously; and the fact that the

summons did not meet the parties at the designated location. With the goal of delivering justice while saving time for the parties who resolve the matter, the law regulates the concept of simple, swift, and low-cost justice, and the judge is obligated to implement the principle.

Similarly, the Sigli District Court judge who reviewed the evidence and rendered a decision did so despite the fact that the court's jurisdiction extended to both Pidie and Pidie Jaya. The goal of this paper is to investigate the challenges and successes of the Sigli District Court's adoption of principles of justice that are straightforward, efficient, and inexpensive. An empirical research approach in the field of law is used. This is what the research found: first, Sigli District Court's implementation of a straightforward, efficient, and inexpensive judicial concept has been less than ideal. Second, there are still a lot of problems with the simple, fast, and cheap principles that are being tried in the Sigli District Court. These problems include things like the following: the parties not being serious, the mediation process, the number of cases entered, the number of witnesses presented, the summoning not meeting at the place, and Keuchik forgetting to inform the parties. They also forgot to stamp on all the evidence.

As part of this reform, it is necessary to enhance the function of mediators and advocates. To help advocates adjust to digital processes and new technology, there should be specialized training programs. In order to alleviate the strain on the courts, it is necessary to empower mediators and arbitrators to enhance the standard of alternative conflict resolution. The public now has additional choices for effective and efficient conflict resolution.

To keep changes on track, it is vital to monitor and evaluate them regularly. Case resolution times and public satisfaction levels are two unambiguous performance metrics that the Supreme Court could use to monitor the implementation of changes across all courts. A dedicated team should be established for this purpose. To make sure reforms keep changing to meet public demands, the results of these assessments should be utilized to improve implementation tactics. On a global scale, Indonesia may take a page out of South Korea's or Singapore's book by studying how their legal systems have used technology to great effect. To acquire technical and financial backing for changes, as well as to embrace best practices, Indonesia might benefit from comparative research and international collaboration. A community-based strategy has the potential to reach out to isolated places in the long run. Together with community leaders, the courts may disseminate information about changes and clarify how residents can use contemporary justice services. We may progressively overcome the hurdles to adopting revisions to civil process legislation with this overall solution. A more inclusive, efficient, and fair justice system for all Indonesian people can only be achieved via a collective effort of the community, judicial institutions, and the government, as well as by reforms at the regulatory level.

4. Conclusion

Modernizing Indonesia's civil procedural laws is pivotal to achieving a judicial system that is more inclusive, efficient, and equitable. While reforms have improved accessibility and efficiency through innovations like e-court systems, significant barriers persist. Structural challenges, such as insufficient human resources and inadequate technology infrastructure, combine with cultural hurdles, including the persistence of a formalistic legal culture, to impede progress. Additionally, geographic constraints and low community legal literacy exacerbate these issues. Addressing these obstacles requires a comprehensive strategy that prioritizes streamlined procedures, enhanced technology, robust human resource development, legal culture transformation, and improved public legal awareness. The government must play an active role by fostering collaboration among stakeholders, harmonizing regulations, and providing resources for capacity building and infrastructure development. Learning from international best practices tailored to Indonesia's socio-cultural context can further accelerate reform. In the long term, these changes can enhance the quality of justice in society by creating a community-oriented judiciary, increasing public trust in the legal system, and strengthening the foundation of justice in the nation.

References

- Abdul Manan. (2006). *Aneka Masalah Hukum Perdata Islam di Indonesia*. Kencana.
- Afif, M. (2019). MEMBERANTAS KORUPSI MELALUI BUDAYA HUKUM YANG BAIK DAN CITA-CITA HUKUM DI DUNIA PERADILAN INDONESIA. *SUPREMASI: Jurnal Hukum*, 1(2), Article 2. <https://doi.org/10.36441/supremasi.v2i1.107>
- Akhyar, S. (2019). Efektivitas Pelaksanaan Asas Peradilan Sederhana, Cepat Dan Biaya Ringan Berkaitan Dengan Yurisdiksi Pengadilan Negeri Sigli. *Syah Kuala Law Journal*, 3(3), Article 3. <https://doi.org/10.24815/sklj.v3i3.12583>
- Amartya, S. (2012). What do We Want From a Theory of Justice? *. In *Theories of Justice*. Routledge.
- Arifany, P. H. (2021). Analisis Implementasi Pelaksanaan E-Court di Pengadilan Agama. *Jurnal Riset Hukum Keluarga Islam*, 37–42. <https://doi.org/10.29313/jrhki.v1i1.199>
- Block, W. (1996). O.J.'s defense: A reductio ad absurdum of the economics of Coase and Posner. *European Journal of Law and Economics*, 3(3), 265–286. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00709143>
- Butarbutar, E. N. (2011). ASAS PRADUGA TIDAK BERSALAH: PENERAPAN DAN PENGATURANNYA DALAM HUKUM ACARA PERDATA. *Jurnal Dinamika Hukum*, 11(3), Article 3. <https://doi.org/10.20884/1.jdh.2011.11.3.175>
- Hamzah, M. G. (2023). *Peradilan Modern*. PT. RajaGrafindo Persada - Rajawali Pers.
- Harahap, M. Y. (1997). Beberapa tinjauan mengenai sistem peradilan dan penyelesaian sengketa. In *PT. Citra Aditya Bakti*. PT. Citra Aditya Bakti.
- Harahap, M. Y. (2017). *Hukum Acara Perdata: Tentang Gugatan, Persidangan, Penyitaan, Pembuktian, dan Putusan Pengadilan*. Sinar Grafika.
- Harahap, T. K., Prayuti, Y., Latianingsih, N., Damanik, A., Maheni, T., Farida, I., Muhtar, M. H., & Mustaqim. (2023). PENGANTAR ILMU HUKUM. *Penerbit Tahta Media*. <https://tahtamedia.co.id/index.php/issj/article/view/255>
- Hidayah, N. P., & Komariah. (2022). Upaya Peningkatan Literasi Hukum Masyarakat Tentang Peer to Peer Lending. *Jurnal Dedikasi Hukum*, 2(1), Article 1. <https://doi.org/10.22219/jdh.v2i1.20914>
- Imelda, C., Damanik, P., Yakub, Y., Apriyanti, A., Kelvin, E., Apriyani, R., Erwinta, P., Susanti, E., Sukmareni, S., Attas, S. M. A., Yudhanti, R., & Rahmadanil, R. (2024). *Hukum Acara di Indonesia*. CV. Gita Lentera.
- Mahmud Marzuki, Peter. (2011). *Penelitian Hukum*. Kencana Prenada Media Group.
- Meliata, A., & Rifai, A. (2022). Urgensi Reformasi Hukum Acara Perdata Indonesia. *Buletin Pemberdayaan Dan Pengembangan Masyarakat*, 1(1), Article 1. <https://doi.org/10.25273/bppm.v1i1.13114>
- Ms, Z. H., & Rizaldi, A. (2020). MERESPON NALAR KEBIJAKAN NEGARA DALAM MENANGANI PANDEMI COVID 19 DI INDONESIA. *Jurnal Ekonomi Dan Kebijakan Publik Indonesia*, 7(1), Article 1. <https://doi.org/10.24815/ekapi.v7i1.17370>
- Pahlevi, R. R., Zaini, Z. D., & Hapsari, R. A. (2021). Analisis Perbuatan Melawan Hukum (Onrechtmatigedaad) Terhadap Sengketa Kepemilikan Hak Atas Tanah. *Pagaruyuang Law Journal*, 5(1), Article 1. <https://doi.org/10.31869/plj.v5i1.2826>
- Pandiangan, H. J. (2017). PERBEDAAN HUKUM PEMBUKTIAN DALAM PERSPEKTIF HUKUM ACARA PIDANA DAN PERDATA. *To-Ra*, 3(2), Article 2. <https://doi.org/10.33541/tora.v3i2.1154>
- Sarwono, J. (2011). *Hukum Acara Perdata*. Sinar Grafika.
- Sundari, N., Luthfiah, F. Z., & Rahmawati, W. (2024). Peran Hukum Sebagai Alat Rekrayasa Masyarakat menurut Roscoe Pound. *Das Sollen: Jurnal Kajian Kontemporer Hukum Dan Masyarakat*, 2(01), Article 01. <https://journal.forikami.com/index.php/dassollen/article/view/566>
- Suwito, Setiyawan, D., Muhtar, M. H., & Ahmad. (2023). Contemplating the Morality of Law Enforcement in Indonesia. *Journal of Law and Sustainable Development*, 11(10), e1261–e1261. <https://doi.org/10.55908/sdgs.v11i10.1261>
- Vinx, L. (2007). *Hans Kelsen's Pure Theory of Law: Legality and Legitimacy*. Oxford University Press.
- Waruwu, R. P. R. (2022). URGENSI REFORMASI SISTEM HUKUM ACARA PERDATA DALAM PERSPEKTIF KETENTUAN PASAL 136 HIR/162 RBG. *Jurnal Pilar Keadilan*, 1(2), 32–57.
- Wijaya, A., & Saupa, T. (2014). Rechtsvinding Di Tinjau Dari Hukum Acara Perdata [Journal:eArticle, Tadulako University]. In *Legal Opinion* (Vol. 2, Issue 4, p. 151613). <https://www.neliti.com/publications/151613/>
- Yudhanegara, F., Arifuddin, Q., Muhtar, M. H., Yani, M. A., Amalia, M., Judijanto, L., & HR, M. A. (2024). *Pengantar Filsafat Hukum: Sebuah Ontologi, Epistemologi, dan Aksiologi Ilmu Hukum*. PT. Sonpedia Publishing Indonesia.