

Registration of Mining Business Permits in the Indonesian Minerba One Data System (MODI) of the Ministry of Energy and Mineral Resources Reviewed from the Perspective of State Administrative Law

Muh. Rustiawan Ardiansyah*, Ahmad Redi

Universitas Borobudur, Jakarta, Indonesia, rustiawanadvokat@gmail.com

Universitas Borobudur, Jakarta, Indonesia, ahmad_redi@borobudur.ac.id

DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.47134/jcl.v3i3.1.5826>

*Correspondence: Muh. Rustiawan Ardiansyah

Email: rustiawanadvokat@gmail.com

Received: 22/05/2026

Accepted: 27/06/2026

Published: 27/06/2026



Copyright: © 2026 by the authors. Submitted for open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license

(<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

implement legally binding court decisions.

Abstract: *This study examines the Mining Business Permit (IUP) registration regulations in the Minerba One Data Indonesia (MODI) system of the Ministry of Mineral Resources and Energy from the standpoint of State Administrative Law. The study problem's primary focus is on how the Minister of Energy and Mineral Resources' Decree Numbers 15.K/HK.02/MEM.B/2022 and 297.K/MB.01/MEM.B/2023 differ in their IUP registration regulations and how this affects how State Administrative Court rulings are implemented. The normative legal research method used in this study includes a statutory regulatory approach, a comparison approach, and a case approach. Both primary legal resources, like laws and court decisions, and secondary legal resources, such as relevant books and academic publications, are used. The findings demonstrate that legally binding court rulings are still accepted by the Minister of Energy and Mineral Resources' Decree Number 15 of 2022 as the foundation for processing and registering IUPs in the MODI system. However, this approach was modified by the Minister of Energy and Mineral Resources Decree No. 297 of 2023, which concentrated on the organization and reconciliation of licensing data by the national and local governments. This difference in regulation has the potential to create a conflict between administrative policies and the obligation to implement court decisions, as reflected in the PT Gapura Mario Sejahtera dispute. The Supreme Court's decision in this case emphasized that administrative policies cannot override the obligation of state administrative officials to*

Keywords: *Mining Business Permit; MODI; Minister of Energy and Mineral Resources Decree; conflict of norms; State Administrative Law.*

Introduction

Coal and mineral resources are among the many natural resources that Indonesia is renowned for having. The Republic of Indonesia's 1945 Constitution states in Article 33, paragraph (3), the existence of these resources is not only a blessing but also a duty to use them to the fullest extent possible for the welfare of the people. One of the main pillars of the country's economy is the mineral and coal mining industry. Therefore, its management should not only be oriented towards increasing production and economic profit, but must

also uphold the values of environmental preservation and sustainability. Sutedi contends that the state has the right to manage natural resources in order to use coal and mineral resources to create additional value that can enhance public welfare (Selomitha, L. P., Karjoko, L., & Jaelani, 2024).

Minerals and coal are strategic natural resources that play a vital role in supporting the national economy. This sector not only influences economic growth but also contributes to improving public welfare. Therefore, the management of mineral and coal resources must be implemented based on principles that reflect the nation's core values and the principle of social justice.

In mining activities, the licensing mechanism plays a crucial role as an instrument for the government to control and oversee the implementation of mining activities. To prevent misuse of natural resources and minimize the potential for environmental damage, every company is required to obtain a Mining Business Permit (IUP) before undertaking exploration or production operations. The IUP serves not only as a legal basis for mining activities but also as a means to ensure that mining business activities are carried out in accordance with statutory provisions, including aspects of environmental protection. (Liofa & Dewanto, 2023) Given its strategic function, the IUP granting process must be carried out transparently, accountably, and in accordance with government administrative regulations to create legal certainty for business actors while simultaneously protecting the public. (Hudali Mukti, 2023)

In an effort to improve mining sector governance, the government developed the Minerba One Data Indonesia (MODI) system, an integrated digital-based system used to manage data and licensing processes in the minerals and coal sector. This system aims to integrate licensing information and strengthen inter-agency coordination to prevent overlapping permits. (Nurul Anisa et al., 2025) Additionally, according to Government Regulation Number 5 of 2021: Risk-Based Business Licensing Implementation, MODI is linked to the Online Single Submission (OSS) system, thus supporting increased transparency and efficiency in the mining licensing process.

However, the implementation of the Minerba One Data Indonesia (MODI) system in practice still faces various obstacles. One of the main issues that has emerged is legal fragmentation, namely the lack of synchronization between the laws and regulations that form the basis for regulations and their implementing regulations. (Asshididie, 2011) Regulation and Decrees of the Minister of Energy and Mineral Resources, such as Minister of Energy and Mineral Resources Decrees Nos. 15.K/HK.02/MEM.B/2022 and 297.K/MB.01/MEM.B/2023, as well as the ministry's internal technical guidelines governing MODI operations, are clear examples of this condition. In practice, this lack of synchronization can create uncertainty in the Mining Business Permit (IUP) registration process, so that applications that meet administrative and technical requirements cannot always be processed further. This irregularity in coordination is further exacerbated by changes in the authority structure in managing mining permits. Following the revision of the Mineral and Coal Mining Law, the authority to issue mining permits has been more centralized in the central government, thus reducing the role of regional governments in the licensing process. This situation has also given rise to criticism regarding the limited involvement of regional governments in managing natural resources within their

jurisdictions. (Utami, 2023) The rapid changes in the configuration of authority are often not accompanied by alignment of operational regulations, resulting in bureaucratic officials frequently facing dilemmas in determining which legal basis to follow, whether laws, government regulations, or internal ministry technical guidelines. This situation can then give rise to the phenomenon of non-decision, where administrative officials fail to respond to submitted Mining Business Permit (IUP) applications, creating legal uncertainty for business actors in the mining sector. (Jeriko, G. Y., & Herning, 2025)

This legal uncertainty can pose financial risks for business actors and hinder the continuity of business activities due to unclear permit status. Such conditions also have the potential to reduce investment interest and slow capital inflows into the national economy. (Bank World, 2022) One concrete example can be seen in the conflict between the administrative policies of the Ministry of Energy and Mineral Resources and the court ruling in the PT Gapura Mario Sejahtera case. In this case, Ministerial Decree No. 15 of 2022 previously stipulated that Mining Business Permit (IUP) registration could be processed if the applicant had a legally binding court ruling ordering the IUP registration process. However, following the enactment of Ministerial Decree No. 297 of 2023, this mechanism changed. Subsequent IUP registration is based on the results of the arrangement and reconciliation of licensing data between the central and regional governments, thus no longer directly referring to court rulings as the basis for registration. (Ardiansyah & Sara, 2025) Although Ministerial Decree No. 297 of 2023 contains transitional provisions, these provisions only apply to applications submitted before the ministerial decree was enacted.

The PT Gapura Mario Sejahtera case demonstrates a gap in the regulation of Mining Business Permit registration. The lawsuit was filed on October 6, 2023, shortly after the enactment of Ministerial Decree No. 297 of 2023. Despite this, The Jakarta State Administrative Court directed the Ministry of Energy and Mineral Resources to follow up on the IUP registration by using the procedure outlined in Ministerial Decree No. 15 of 2022, even at the cassation level. This situation raises a crucial legal issue: whether the Ministry of Energy and Mineral Resources is obligated to implement the court decision referring to the revoked regulation, or whether the ministry can continue to adhere to the new provisions in Ministerial Decree No. 297 of 2023 as the basis for rejecting the application. This normative conflict has the potential to hinder the implementation of the court decision and ultimately create legal uncertainty for IUP applicants.

This situation reflects the tension between government administrative policies and the authority of the judiciary to enforce the law. In government administration, obstacles such as procedural delays, administrative inaccuracies, and unclear divisions of authority can complicate the implementation of legally binding court decisions. If a legally binding court decision cannot be implemented due to bureaucratic obstacles, the principles of legal certainty and the protection of public rights become difficult to achieve. Based on this phenomenon, research on the registration of Mining Business Permits in the Minerba One Data Indonesia (MODI) system from the perspective of State Administrative Law is crucial. The current regulatory framework governing mining permits does not fully demonstrate harmony between the various applicable regulations. Rapid changes in licensing policies without harmonization between regulations have created legal uncertainty for business actors, the government, and the public. This situation was clearly evident in the PT Gapura

Mario Sejahtera dispute, where a court ruling ordering the processing of an IUP clashed with new administrative policies that actually hampered its implementation. This demonstrates that the mining permit system through MODI still requires evaluation, particularly regarding the alignment between laws and regulations, the authority of administrative officials, and the effectiveness of the digital system in supporting legal certainty.

Methodology

The normative legal research technique used in this work is centered on the examination of laws and regulations, administrative policies, and court decisions related to the Mining Business Permit (IUP) registration process in the Minerba One Data Indonesia (MODI) system. The approaches used include a statute approach to examine the Minerba Law and its derivative regulations, a comparative approach to compare the provisions for IUP registration in the Decree Numbers 15 of 2022 and 297 of 2023 issued by the Minister of Energy and Mineral Resources, as well as a case study to assess the State Administrative Court's decision and the cassation ruling in the PT Gapura Mario Sejahtera dispute, specifically with regard to the duties of administrative officials in processing IUP applications. Laws and court decisions are examples of primary legal documents; books and research studies relevant to state administrative law and mining law are examples of secondary legal materials, make up the legal materials utilized. All legal materials are analyzed qualitatively through interpretation of legal norms, comparison of applicable regulations, and review of the position of court decisions within the framework of the authority of state administrative officials.

Result and Discussion

Comparison of IUP Registration Regulations between ESDM Ministerial Decree No. 15 of 2022 and ESDM Ministerial Decree No. 297 of 2023

Based on the Dictum of ESDM Ministerial Decree No. 15.K/HK.02/MEM.B/2022 and ESDM Ministerial Decree No. 297.K/MB.01/MEM.B/2023

Table 1. ESDM Dictum No. 15.K/HK.02/MEM.B/2022 and ESDM No. 297.K/MB.01/MEM.B/2023

Kepmen 15.K/HK.02/MEM.B/2022	ESDM	No.	Kepmen 297.K/MB.01/MEM.B/2023	ESDM	No.
First Dictum:			Ninth Dictum:		
The issuance of Metal Mineral and Coal Mining Business Permits is processed for Mining Business Permits that have been registered and/or were previously registered in the list of Mining Business Permits resulting from the arrangement of Mining Business Permits and Special Mining Business Permits that meet the requirements and are registered in the			The issuance and registration of Metal Mineral and Coal Mining Business Permits is carried out based on the results of the arrangement and/or reconciliation of Metal Mineral and Coal Mining Business Permit data between the Central Government and Regional Governments.		

Minerba One Data Indonesia (MODI) database and/or released by the Energy and Mineral Resources Minister.

Second Dictum:

The issuance of Mining Business Permits as referred to in the FIRST Dictum shall be carried out after fulfilling the technical, environmental, and financial requirements in accordance with statutory provisions.

Tenth Dictum:

The issuance and registration of Mining Business Permits as referred to in the NINTH Dictum shall be carried out after fulfilling administrative, territorial, technical, environmental, and financial requirements in accordance with statutory provisions.

Third Dictum:

In the event of a legally binding court decision declaring the validity or invalidity of a state administrative decision and/or ordering the Minister of Energy and Mineral Resources to issue a Mining Business Permit, the issuance of the Mining Business Permit shall be processed in accordance with statutory provisions.

Twenty-Third Dictum:

Applications for the processing of the issuance and registration of Mining Business Permits submitted before this Ministerial Decree comes into effect will continue to be processed based on Decree of the Minister of Energy and Mineral Resources Number 15.K/HK.02/MEM.B/2022.

A comparison of Decree No. 297.K/MB.01/MEM.B/2023 and Minister of Energy and Mineral Resources Decree No. 15.K/HK.02/MEM.B/2022 Mining Business Permit (IUP) registration requirements shows a change in the legal foundation of the mining permit administrative process. In Minister of Energy and Mineral Resources Decree No. 15 of 2022, the processing of IUP issuance is based not only on administrative data structuring but also allows for the implementation of legally binding court decisions. This clause is reflected in the Third Dictum, which says that the issuance of an IUP by the Minister of Energy and Mineral Resources may be carried out in compliance with statutory provisions if a court ruling declares the validity or invalidity of a state administrative decision and/or directs the IUP's issuance. Thus, the norms in the decree explicitly recognize court decisions as a normative basis for government administrative action in IUP registration.

ESDM Ministerial Decree No. 15 of 2022's recognition of court rulings shows how administrative policies and State Administrative Law principles are in line, especially with regard to administrative officials' duty to implement court decisions that have become legally binding. This concept aligns with the most recent revision to Article 115 of Law No. 5 of 1986 Governing State Administrative Courts, Law No. 51 of 2009, which stipulates that court decisions that have gained permanent legal force must be implemented by the relevant state administrative officials. Therefore, the provisions in ESDM Ministerial Decree No. 15 of 2022 reflect the application of the principle of legality in government administration, where administrative officials' actions are not only based on internal policies but also must comply with court decisions as part of the binding legal system.

Conversely, ESDM Ministerial Decree No. 297.K/MB.01/MEM.B/2023 demonstrates a shift in approach to regulating IUP registration. In this decree, the processing of IUP issuance and registration no longer directly refers to court decisions, but is instead based on the results of the structuring and reconciliation of permit data between the central and regional governments. The provision is stated in the Ninth Dictum, which emphasizes that the processing of IUP issuance and registration is based on the structuring and/or reconciliation of metal mineral and coal IUP data between the central and regional governments. Furthermore, the Tenth Dictum stipulates that this process can only be done after various administrative, territorial, technical, environmental, and financial requirements have been met in accordance with statutory provisions. This norm indicates a shift in policy focus from recognizing court decisions to an administrative approach that emphasizes the consolidation of permit data.

The change reflects a transformation in the administrative mechanisms in mining permit management, placing greater emphasis on structuring the national data system. In the context of public policy, this approach can be understood as the government's attempt to enhance the governance of mining permits through data integration and central and regional government reconciliation. But rules that no longer specifically use judicial rulings as the foundation for IUP processing have the potential to create problems in government administration practices, particularly when court decisions order administrative officials to take specific actions related to IUP registration.

From a State Administrative Law perspective, The authority and responsibilities of state administrative officers are affected by this shift in standards. According to Article 1, Number 3 of Law Number 30 of 2014 concerning State Administration, state administrative officers are essentially constrained by the legality concept, which emphasizes that all government actions must be based on statutory provisions. On the other hand, administrative officials also have an obligation to implement legally binding court decisions, as stipulated in the State Administrative Court Law. In situations where the new administrative policy no longer accommodates the implementation of court decisions as the basis for IUP registration, a potential legal dilemma arises for administrative officials: whether to comply with the ministry's internal administrative policies or implement binding court decisions.

When considering norm hierarchy theory and the principles of resolving conflicts within laws and regulations, the possibility of competing norms becomes even more pertinent. In administrative law practice, policy changes through newer ministerial decrees can be understood through the principle of *lex posterior derogat legi priori*, whereby newer regulations override older regulations. However, this principle cannot be used to ignore final and binding court decisions, as court decisions are binding and must be implemented by state administrative officials. Therefore, the shift in regulations in ESDM Ministerial Decree Number 297 of 2023 has the potential to create a conflict of norms between the ministry's administrative policies and the obligation to implement court decisions. This situation then becomes relevant for further analysis through a concrete case study of the PT

Gapura Mario Sejahtera dispute, which demonstrates how this conflict of norms arises in the practice of mining licensing administration.

Case of Dispute Between the Administrative Policy of the Ministry of Energy and Mineral Resources and the PTUN Decision

The Ministry of Energy and Mineral Resources' Director General of Mineral and Coal and PT Gapura Mario Sejahtera are at odds over the company's Production Operation Mining Business Permit (IUP) not being included in the Minerba One Data Indonesia (MODI) and Minerba One Map Indonesia (MOMI) systems, despite the company having submitted an official registration application. PT Gapura Mario Sejahtera holds a valid IUP and has an interest in having the permit registered in the national licensing system. However, administrative officials failed to follow up on the application, resulting in an act of omission in government administration.

In the first instance, the Jakarta State Administrative Court granted PT Gapura Mario Sejahtera's lawsuit and ordered the administrative officials to enter the plaintiff's Production Operation Mining Permit (IUP) into the MODI system as part of the list of IUPs that meet the requirements. The court considered that the failure to follow up on the IUP registration application constituted administrative negligence that violated the principles of good governance. However, this decision was subsequently overturned on appeal by the High State Administrative Court. At the cassation stage, the Supreme Court, through Decision Number 636 K/TUN/TF/2024, overturned the appeal decision and adjudicated the case itself, granting PT Gapura Mario Sejahtera's lawsuit. The Supreme Court ordered the Director General of Minerals and Coal to register the company's Production Operation Mining Permit (IUP) in the MODI and MOMI systems as part of the government's administrative obligations in administering mining permits.

In its legal reasoning, the Supreme Court deemed the application of Minister of Energy and Mineral Resources Decree Number 297.K/MB.01/MEM.B/2023 as the basis for rejecting the IUP registration as inappropriate in this case. This was because PT Gapura Mario Sejahtera's IUP registration application was submitted on July 17, 2023, while Minister of Energy and Mineral Resources Decree Number 297 of 2023 was only issued on September 15, 2023. Therefore, it is against state administrative law's concept of non-retroactivity to apply this policy to applications that have already been submitted. Everyone has the right to protection, recognition, assurances, and just legal certainty, according to Article 28D paragraph (1) of the Republic of Indonesia's 1945 Constitution, is directly linked to the concept of legal certainty. The Supreme Court therefore determined that petitions filed prior to the policy's implementation could not be retroactively subject to the new administrative policy.

Furthermore, the Supreme Court also considered the legal status of PT Gapura Mario Sejahtera's Production Operation Mining Permit (IUP), which was deemed still valid and in force. In its deliberations, the Court stated that the permit had never been revoked by an authorized official or canceled through a valid legal process. This consideration relates to the principle of presumption of legality in state administrative law, specifically the idea that any administrative decision or action made by the government is deemed legitimate as long

as it has not been overturned by a court ruling or an authorized official. Therefore, as long as the IUP remains legally valid, state administrative officials have no basis to refuse its registration in the mining permit administration system.

The Supreme Court also assessed that PT Gapura Mario Sejahtera had fulfilled various administrative obligations required in managing mining activities. This includes fulfilling the provisions as outlined in Article 54 paragraph (1) letters a, b, and c of the Minister of Energy and Mineral Resources Number 26 of 2018 Regulation, which governs IUP holders' reporting duties, financial obligations, and fulfilling other administrative provisions in mining activities. With these administrative obligations fulfilled, there is no sufficient legal basis for administrative officials to refuse to register the Mining Permit (IUP) in the MODI and MOMI systems. Therefore, the Supreme Court ruled that the Director General of Minerals and Coal is required to register PT Gapura Mario Sejahtera's Production Operation IUP in the national mining licensing system.

The Supreme Court's ruling also demonstrates a conflict of norms between the ministry's administrative policies and the duty to carry out court rulings within the framework of state administrative law. On the one hand, Ministerial Decree No. 297 of 2023, which highlights the method for arranging and balancing permit data as a prerequisite for IUP registration, serves as the foundation for the Ministry of Energy and Mineral Resources' administrative policy. However, as stated in Article 115 of Law No. 5 of 1986 Governing State Administrative Courts, state administrative authorities are also required to carry out legally binding court rulings. Therefore, the ministry's internal administrative policies cannot, in principle, be used to override the obligation to implement court decisions. The case of PT Gapura Mario Sejahtera shows that the lack of synchronization between administrative regulations and court decisions can create legal uncertainty in the mining licensing system, particularly in the implementation of the MODI system as a digital instrument for managing mineral and coal licensing.

Normative Conflict Between the Administrative Policy of the Ministry of Energy and Mineral Resources and the PTUN Decision

The administrative provisions in the Decree of the Minister of Energy and Mineral Resources Number 297.K/MB.01/MEM.B/2023 and the requirement to implement court decisions as stated in the Law on State Administrative Courts demonstrate a conflict of norms between the administrative policies of the Ministry of Energy and Mineral Resources and the decisions of the State Administrative Court. Mining Business Permits (IUP) must be registered in the Minerba One Data Indonesia (MODI) system based on the outcomes of the arrangement and reconciliation of licensing data between the federal government and local municipalities, as per Minister of Energy and Mineral Resources Decree Number 297 of 2023. This provision emphasizes the administrative aspect of data consolidation as a primary prerequisite for recording IUPs in the national system. However, in the case of PT Gapura Mario Sejahtera, the Supreme Court, through Decision Number 636 K/TUN/TF/2024, ordered administrative officials to register the applicant's IUP in the MODI system based on a legally binding court decision. Thus, a conflict arises between

administrative norms that emphasize data reconciliation mechanisms and judicial norms that require administrative officials to implement court decisions.

As most recently updated by Law Number 51 of 2009, Article 115 of Law Number 5 of 1986 regarding State Administrative Courts upholds the obligation of state administrative entities to execute court orders. This article mandates that court decisions that have gained permanent legal force be implemented by the proper state administrative staff. In this situation, administrative officials are not free to disregard court rulings or postpone their implementation due to new administrative regulations. Therefore, an administrative policy may be in violation with the fundamental tenets of the state administrative law system if it makes it more difficult to carry out a court ruling, which places court decisions as an instrument of oversight of government actions.

From the perspective of conflict of norms theory, the conflict between administrative policies and court decisions can be analyzed through several principles of statutory law, *Lex superior derogat legi inferiori* is one such argument that holds that more stringent laws take precedence over less stringent ones. Law Number 12 of 2011 Governing the Formation of Legislation, as revised by Law Number 13 of 2022, describes the hierarchy of Indonesian laws and regulations. prioritizes laws over rules or directives from ministries. Therefore, the obligation to enforce court decisions stemming from the State Administrative Court Law has higher legal force than administrative provisions contained in a ministerial decree. Within this framework, administrative policies that conflict with the obligation to enforce court decisions cannot be used as grounds for refusing to enforce those decisions.

This clash of standards is sometimes articulated through the theory of *lex superior* as well as *lex posterior derogat legi priori*, which states that a more recent rule may take precedence over an earlier one. The prior regulation in Ministerial Decree of Energy and Mineral Resources Number 15 of 2022 is believed to be replaced by the implementation of Ministerial Decree of Energy and Mineral Resources Number 297 of 2023, is frequently justified by this rationale. However, a court ruling with lasting legal effect cannot be overturned by the *lex posterior* concept. State administrative officers are required to carry out court rulings, which are final and binding. The Republic of Indonesia's 1945 Constitution's Article 28D, paragraph (1), which ensures everyone's recognition, protection, and fair legal certainty, may be violated if certain rulings are not carried out.

In state administrative law, the obligation of officials to implement court decisions is also related to the concept of the binding force of a court decision, namely the principle that a court decision is binding on both the disputing parties and the administrative officials who are the subject of the decision. If administrative officials fail to implement a court decision, the law provides a mechanism for enforcement through coercive measures or *dwangsom*, as stipulated in the provisions of the State Administrative Court Law. Furthermore, officials who fail to implement court decisions may also be subject to administrative sanctions because such actions are deemed contrary to the obligation to implement good governance. The principle demonstrates that in the state administrative law system, court decisions have a corrective function against government actions deemed unlawful.

On the other hand, Ministerial Decrees, as an instrument of administrative policy, are basically operational and internal government acts carried out in the context of performing governmental duties. Article 1, number 3 of Law Number 30 of 2014 concerning State Administration stipulates that the requirements of applicable laws and regulations must serve as the foundation for all government actions, these administrative policies must continue to be subject to the principle of legality. Therefore, administrative policies must not conflict with higher legal norms or with final and binding court decisions. In the context of the mining licensing system through MODI, the conflict between administrative policies and court decisions demonstrates that the digital licensing system developed by the government has not been fully integrated with state administrative law mechanisms. This situation has the potential to create legal uncertainty for IUP holders and could impact business actors' confidence in the mining licensing system in Indonesia.

Conclusion

The discussion concludes that the Minister of Energy and Mineral Resources' Decree Number 297.K/MB.01/MEM.B/2023 and the Minister of Energy and Mineral Resources' Decree Number 15.K/HK.02/MEM.B/2022, the regulation of Mining Business Permit (IUP) registration in the Minerba One Data Indonesia (MODI) system indicates a change in administrative policy approach. ESDM Decree Number 15 of 2022 still allows for the implementation of legally binding court decisions as the basis for processing and registering IUPs in the MODI system. Conversely, ESDM Decree Number 297 of 2023 shifts this mechanism by emphasizing the arrangement and reconciliation of licensing data between the central and regional governments as the primary basis for IUP registration. This policy change has the potential to create a conflict of norms when faced with the obligation of state administrative officials to implement legally binding court decisions. This is reflected in the PT Gapura Mario Sejahtera dispute, which culminated in Supreme Court Decision No. 636 K/TUN/TF/2024, in which the Supreme Court affirmed that administrative policy cannot be used as an excuse to ignore the obligation to implement court decisions. Thus, the conflict between administrative policy and court decisions demonstrates the importance of aligning mining licensing regulations, the authority of state administrative officials, and the principle of legal certainty in governance.

In this regard, efforts to harmonize regulations within the mining licensing system are needed to avoid overlapping administrative policies and the obligation to implement court decisions. The government, The Ministry of Energy and Mineral Resources in particular must make sure that the MODI system's administrative policies continue to be consistent with the tenets of state administrative law and provisions in higher-level laws and regulations. Furthermore, improvements to the MODI system's operational mechanisms are needed to accommodate the implementation of legally binding court decisions without creating administrative obstacles. By aligning the digital licensing system, government administrative regulations, and law enforcement mechanisms, it is hoped that stronger legal certainty will be created for IUP holders while increasing the effectiveness of mining licensing governance in Indonesia.

References

- Agassi, M. A., Hendrawan, R., & Mubarak, A. A. (2023). Analisis Politik Hukum Undang-Undang Nomor 3 Tahun 2020 Tentang Perubahan Atas Undang-Undang Nomor 4 Tahun 2009 Tentang Pertambangan Mineral Dan Batubara. *Jurnal Ilmiah Multidisiplin*, 397–412. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.5281/Zenodo.10282684>
- Ardiansyah, M. R., & Sara, R. (2025). Problems of Registration of Mining Business Permits in The ESDM Modi System from The Perspective of State Administrative Law. *JGSP: Jurnal Greenation Sosial Dan Politik*, 3(4), 875–883. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.38035/Jgsp.V3i4>
- Asnawi, M. I. (2019). Implikasi Yuridis Pengelolaan Pertambangan Dalam Aspek Kehidupan Sosial Ekonomi Masyarakat. *Jurnal Hukum Samudra Keadilan*, 14(1), 45–60. <https://doi.org/10.33059/jhsk.v14i1.909>
- Asshiddiqie, J. (2011). *Konstitusi dan Negara Hukum*. Konstitusi Press.
- Bank World. (2022). *Indonesia Mineral Sector Diagnostic Report*. World Bank Publications.
- Direktorat Jenderal Mineral dan Batubara Kementerian Energi dan Sumber daya Mineral. (2020). *Peningkatan Investasi PEDOMAN Pengusahaan Mineral dan Batubara Indonesia*. Direktorat Jenderal Mineral Dan Batubara Kementerian Energi Dan Sumber Daya Mineral.
- Farhan Tigor Lubis, M., & Khairil Afandi Lubis. (2024). Kontradiksi Kewenangan Pemerintah Terhadap Pengelolaan Tambang Pasca Lahirnya Uu No 3 Tahun 2020 Tentang Minerba. *Grondwet*, 3(2), 18–30. <https://doi.org/10.61863/gr.v3i2.41>
- Hamdani, F., Awang Maha Putra, E., Muhammad Azwar, L. (2024). Perizinan Dalam Pengelolaan Sda Pasca Pengesahan Revisi Uu Minerba: Perspektif Hukum Administrasi Dalam Konteks Welfare State. *Datin Law Jurnal*, 5(2), 97–107. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.36355/Dlj.V1i1>
- Hudali Mukti. (2023). *Perizinan Pertambangan Batu Bara Terintegrasi dalam Mewujudkan Pembangunan Daerah Berkelanjutan*. Deepublish.
- Irfani, N. (2020). Asas Lex Superior, Lex Specialis, Dan Lex Posterior: Pemaknaan, Problematika, Dan Penggunaannya Dalam Penalaran Dan Argumentasi Hukum. *Jurnal Legislasi Indonesia*, 16(3), 305.
- Jeriko, G. Y., & Herning, S. T. (2025). Fragmentasi Hukum Dalam Pengaturan Perizinan Pertambangan Dan Dampaknya Terhadap Kepastian Hukum Pemohon Iup Melalui Sistem Minerba One Data Indonesia. *Riwayat*, 7989–7908. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.24815/Jr.V8i4.50856>
- Kementerian Energi dan Sumber Daya Mineral. (2021). *Minerba One Data Indonesia: Framework and Implementation Guideline*. Direktorat Jenderal Mineral Dan Batubara.
- Kemertrian Energi dan Sumberdaya Mineral. (2024). *Neraca Sumber Daya dan Cadangan Mineral dan Batubara Indonesia Tahun 2025* (Vol. 2). Kementerian Energi Dan Sumber Daya Mineral.
- Liofa, L. P., & Dewanto, W. A. (2023). Restorasi Sebagai Pertanggungjawaban Pemulihan Fungsi Lingkungan Hidup Bagi Perusahaan Pemegang Izin Usaha Jasa Pertambangan. *Jurnal Yustika Media Hukum Dan Keadilan*, 26(2), 98–.
- Nurul Anisa, Ahmad Rustan, & Nur Nashriani Jufri. (2025). Dampak Tumpang Tindih Izin Usaha Pertambangan (Iup) Terhadap Keberlanjutan Pengelolaan Sumber Daya Alam. *Jurnal Yustisiabel*, 9(2), 177–194. <https://doi.org/10.32529/yustisiabel.v9i2.3982>
- Rembet, G. R. (2025). *Pelaksanaan Sistem Informasi Dalam Proses Penerbitan Izin Usaha Pertambangan Iup Di Dinas Penanaman Modal Dan Pelayanan Terpadu Satu Pintu (Dpmpstsp) Provinsi Kalimantan Timur*. Universitas Widya Gama Mahakam Samarinda.
- Selomitha, L. P., Karjoko, L., & Jaelani, A. K. (2024). Kajian Yuridis Pengaturan Perizinan Pertambangan Ditinjau Dari Perspektif Hukum Transendental Guna Mewujudkan Ekokrasi Di Indonesia. *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Program Doktor Ilmu Hukum Ums*, 175–189.

-
- Selomitha, L. P., Karjoko, L., & Jaelani, A. K. (2024). Kajian Yuridis Pengaturan Perizinan Pertambangan Ditinjau Dari Perspektif Hukum Transendental Guna Mewujudkan Ekokrasi Di Indonesia. *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Program Doktor Ilmu Hukum Ums*, 175–189.
- Simamora, B., Asnawi, E., Andrizal, A., & et al. (2023). Reconstruction of Regulations Concerning Custody of Money for Compensation for Losses for Land Procurement for National Strategic Projects for Certainty Law and Justice. *Jurnal Ilmiah Hospitality*, 12(2), 739–750.
- Utami, N. E. (2023). Sentralisasi Terhadap Kewenangan Pemerintah Daerah Dalam Perizinan Tambang Pasca Pemberlakuan Undang-Undang Mineral Dan Batubara. *Lex Reanissanee*, 8(2), 360–378. <https://doi.org/10.20885/JLR.vol8.iss2.art10>