



Legal Politics of Judicial Supervision Constitution

Krismanto Manurung¹, Ismaidar², Tamaulina Br. Sembiring³

^{1,2,3} Program Studi Magister Ilmu Hukum Universitas Pembangunan Pancabudi Medan, Indonesia

Email : krismanto@gmail.com , ismaidar@dosen.pancabudi.ac.id ,
tamaulina@dosen.pancabudi.ac.id

Abstract *In order to preserve and uphold the honor, dignity, and the behavior of the judge is required to supervise the attitude of the constitutional judge to fit the code of ethics, so that each judge's ruling will be implemented in order to enforce the law and justice based on Pancasila and the Constitution 1945 as a permanent legal political for supervision of the constitutional judges . Meanwhile legal politics incidental that becomes a choice among others: a) Behavior of Constitutional Judges are supervised by the Board of Ethics established by the Constitutional Court, and for the reported judges or suspected violations of ethic codes of Constitutional Judges formed by Honorary Council of Constitutional Judges who were proposed by Ethics Council, with the task of implementing and serving as judicial ethic; and b) there is no judicial supervision against Constitutional Court's decision as well as supervision of a court decision which was in the Supreme Court through the mechanism of legal remedies (ordinary and extraordinary).*

Keywords: *Supervision, Behavior , Constitutional Judges*

1. INTRODUCTION

Political law and power related close , each other intertwined , And No can separated by law One with others . Politics as point beginning going to power , And law as instrument maintain power . Typical product political Good Constitution or instrument political other have characteristics as configuration politics that develop And control institution politics . Constitution assource legalistic that works frame for ruler maintain power is characteristics product political authoritarian , repressive And No side with interests society , contextualization product thus become justifier argument Lord Acton that *power tends to corrupt , and absolute power corrupt absolutely* .

Mahfud MD interprets political law as a manufacturing process and implementation law that can show nature and characteristics which way law will built and established . The elements political law meant includes ; 1) development law Which core making And update to materials law so that can in accordance with needs ; and 2) implementation provision the law that has been There is including affirmation function institution and coaching of the enforcer law .

Satjipto Rahardjo to mean political law as activity choose and the way you want to used For reach objective social and law certain in public . Whereas Sunaryati Hartono as quoted Armen Yasir defining it as A tool or means or step Which can used by government For create system law desired national and with system law national That will realized ideals Indonesian nation .

Study political law in approach Law Layout Country includes 1) substantial matters

Received: November 15, 2024; Revised: November 30, 2024; Accepted: Desember 11, 2024; Available online: Desember 13, 2024;

from in field studies science and engineering legislation ; 2) emphasize to process political And law formation products law And related with bodies statehood as well as method his work set political law And rule law ; and 3) includes organizers and goals of the state. Iman Syaukani And A. Ahsin Thohari mention that study political law includes :

1. process excavation values And aspiration Which develop in public by organizer country Which authorized formulate political law ;
2. process debate And formulation values And aspiration to in design laws by the organizers that authorized ;
3. organizer country Which authorized formulate And set politics law ;
4. regulation legislation Which load political law ;
5. factors Which influence political law ; And
6. implementation from regulation legislation Which is implementation political law .

The problem relatedness law and politics in approach political law cause a number of assumptions , including as follows view Which put forward Phillip Nonet And Philip Schelnik Which Then articulated in context Indonesianness by Mahfud MD. The Relation thus according to Mahfud is :

First , law determinant on political in meaning that activity -activity political set up by And must bow down on rule law ; *second* , political determinant law Because law is results or crystallization from wills political Which each other interact And each other competing ; and *third* , politics and law as subsystems community is at on position Which equal his determination balanced between Which One with Which other when political Already So product law so activity political Already must subject to the rules law . As for objective political law is ; 1) as tool Which used government For create a system law national Which desired ; 2) system law national That will realized ideals nation Which more big ; And 3) law national is law Which based on ideology And constitutional country, Pancasila And UUD Year 1945.

Bagir Manan has the opinion that at least there is two scope main political law , that is:

1. political formation law ; And
2. political enforcement law .

Political formation law is the policy in question with creation , renewal and development law . Includes ; (a) policy (Formation) regulation legislation ; (b) policy (formation) of law jurisprudence or decision law ; and (c) policy to regulation No written others . As for political enforcement law is the policy in question with ; (a) policies in the field of justice ; And (b) policy in field service law .

Construction political law in election political Indonesian law consists of on two models, there are political permanent and immutable law changed (permanent), and on the other side there is political law that can changed - change in accordance need in term time certain . As for political law Indonesia Which No changed is covering :

1. existence One unity system law Indonesia;
2. system law national built based on Pancasila And UUD Year1945;
3. justice law to citizen ;
4. formation law Which notice plurality public ;
5. law custom acknowledged its existence throughout Still valid ;
6. formation law based on participation public ;
7. law made And enforced for the sake of welfare general , democraticbased on law and the constitution .

In field constitution , KC Wheara as quoted by Mahfud MD ⁶ mention that “... *a constitution is indeed the resultant of parallelogram of political forces, economy social -which operate at thatof it adoption ...*” Meaning thus means ,

First , because constitution is product situation or condition nation at the time certain so constitution That can changed If situation andcondition public Already changed And give birth to demands new *second* , Contents constitution Actually is agreement about choice politics . He No can in a way categorical it is said Correct or Wrong or it is said Good or Bad *third* , Contents constitution No must follow theory certain or the system that valid in country certain . Contents constitution can chosen Alone by nation And country Which make it in accordance withneed domestic each.

The 1945 Constitution as product agreement politics in the era of struggle physique designed as constitution simple , short but expected flexible , can adapt with condition moment that , which arrived in time according to Soekarno will done changes and formation of the UUD more Good Again . Thus also according to Aaron al Rashid as quoted by Muhtadi, ⁷ UUD 1945 is still nature temporary until Then set by institution Which formed constitution For That . However in its development , abbreviation constitution the made into as instrument law the highest that perpetuates power every the regime that in power , so that Then precisely give birth to a country with democracy guided democracy and Pancasila democracy , both of which similar You're welcome No give protection and fulfillment rights public .

Practice state administration based on the original 1945 Constitution below regime Suharto on Finally deliver on efforts change constitution Which based on on :

1. The 1945 Constitution established structure power the constitutional system that rely on on

power highest in hand MPR Which fully do sovereignty people ; Which result No the occurrence each other supervise and each other to balance on institution statehood ;

2. UUD Year 1945 give power Which very big to holder power executive (President) ;
3. UUD Year 1945 contain articles Which too " flexible ' , so that can cause more from One interpretation (multi-interpretable) ;
4. UUD Year 1945 too Lots give authority to power President For arrange things important with law - law ; And
5. formulation of the 1945 Constitution concerning Spirit state administration Not yet Enough supported provision the constitution which contains rule base about life democratic , supremacy law , empowerment people , respect human rights, and autonomy area .

In speech closing Hearing MPR Annual Meeting 2002 , Amien Rais as quoted Isra ⁹ Balance state that :

“ Reformation constitution Which has done is a step democracy in effort to perfect Law - The 1945 Constitution (UUD) became a democratic constitution , the appropriate constitution with Spirit era, constitution Which capable accommodate dynamics nation and changing times in time Which will come . With UUD Which has amended , in front of We has stretched out a new era of Indonesia that is more democratic And more proceed . Writing This use approach normative . Writing This expected can find political law permanent and incidental in supervision judge constitution .

2. DISCUSSION

Urgency Supervision to Judge Constitution

Development statehood show that there is nothing any country who does not have constitution . English even though it is often made into as example country without constitution on in principle confess And to practice its constitutionality with constitution , although its shape No as Constitution Based on generally that written .

Ahh Struycken mention that UUD as constitution written is formal document Which inside it load :

1. results struggle political nation in time Which past ;
2. levels highest development state administration nation ;
3. view figures nation Which want to realized , Good For time Now and also For the time that will come ; And
4. a desire , with which development life state administration nation want to led .

As for prevalence Which found as material load UUD at least covering three matter

main , that is :

1. existence guarantee to rights basic man And its citizens ;
2. the determination arrangement state administration a country Which nature fundamental;
And
3. existence distribution And restrictions task state administration Which Also nature fundamentals.

However thus , No all material load The Constitution is rules nationality . But there are also the rules that become base for law administration , criminal and others, including inside it arrange ethics life nation And state , as well as behavior organizer country is Wrong One load constitution . Because That , read UUD Also should done as *moral and philosophical reading of the constitution*.¹³

One of material the contents of the 1945 Constitution as set up in Article 24 paragraph (2) and Article 24C are formation Court Constitution as Wrong One enforcer law And justice , Which must own integrity And personality Which No despicable , fair , statesman Which control constitution And state administration , as well as No double as state officials . In approach different , prerequisites the to wish constitutional judge For guard And to uphold honor , nobility dignity , as well as behavior as state organizers .

However Thus , the arrest Chairman Court Constitution (MK) Akil Mochtar , by Commission Eradication Corruption (Corruption Eradication Commission) as if justify the occurrence division and dispersion crime in every organs of state power in all level (from *trias politics* become *trias corruption*), at a time confirm the need consider return involvement institution other in supervise behavior judge constitution after previously canceled through Decision MK No.005/PUU-IV/2006.

Unconstitutionality supervision Commission Judicial (KY) according to the Constitutional Court in the verdict based on on two *legal reasoning* main , that is problems interpretation former constitution (*original*) *intent*) And systematic, Which both of them according to court happen inconsistency between norming Article 24B paragraph (1) of the 1945 Constitution (UUD) with Constitution Number 22 of 2004 concerning Judicial Commission ¹⁹ as well as Constitution Number 4 of 2004 concerning Judicial Power related implementation other authorities in frame maintain and uphold honor , nobility dignity , and the behavior of judges, so that supervision KY against constitutional judges qualified contradictory with the Constitution In 1945, however on the other hand , the Supreme Court Justice and the judges of the judicial bodies in environment Supreme Court become object supervision KY.

Purpose avoid emptiness laws and supervisory organs behavior constitutional judge , formed supervisor permanent , Assembly Honor of Judges Constitution (MKHK) based on Article 27A of the Law Number 8 Years 2011 about Change on Constitution Number 23 of 2004 concerning Constitutional Court consisting of 5 people who then stated *illegal* return by Decision MK Number 49/PUU-IX/2011 with postulate that existence elements of the DPR, elements government , and supreme court judges potential cause conflict interest because the DPR, Government and Court Great, as well as Commission Judicial can become party Which litigated in Court Constitution. More from That , MK postulate that membership MKHK the No give guarantee independence and impartiality court , therefore the Constitutional Court is adamant forming MKHK alone with membership besides from MK also comes from other elements Which independent And No partisan.

Absence return supervisor behavior judge constitution , in a way internal MK to form Assembly Honor Court Constitution (MKMK) through Regulation Court Constitution (PMK) Number 1 of the Year 2013, consisting of 5 (five) person, consists of from element constitutional judge , commissioner KY, ex- leader institution country, ex- judge constitution / supreme court justice and senior professor of science law . Membership the remove element DPR, government And judge great as meant in Chapter 27A paragraph (2) Act MK. MKMK can formed based on request of the reported judge , or as instrument Which formed on base report and/ or information For Then plenary session in meeting closed.

Will but , caught Chairman MK active on 2 October 2013 to refute *legal reasoning* Constitutional Court Decision Number 49/PUU-IX/2011 and give answer on suspicion No its effectiveness institution internal supervisor in institution justice, at a time show weakness system supervision internal Which Not yet found the solution.

For President , caught chairman MK translated a condition Which fulfil rules matter about crunch Which force as meant Chapter 22 paragraph (1) UUD Year 1945, so that taken step constitutional save institution through Regulation Government Replacement Constitution (Government Regulation in Lieu of Law) Number 1 Year 2013 about Change Second On Constitution Number 24 Year 2003 about Constitutional Court , For furthermore determined by the Council The People's Representative Council (DPR) becomes Constitution Number 4 of 2014 about Determination Government Regulation in Lieu of Law Number 1 of 2013 concerning Change Second On Constitution Number 24 of 2003 concerning Court Constitution Become Act.

Meaning matter about urgent need in Government Regulation in Lieu of Law in a way bright (*expression verbis*) placed in two consideration basic :

1. that based on Article 24C paragraph (5) of the State Constitution Republic Indonesia Year 1945, judge constitution must own integrity and personality that is not ignoble , just , and statesmanlike control constitution and state administration as well as No double position as official country;
2. that For save democracy And country law Indonesia as well as For return authority And trust publicto Court Constitution as institution country Which operate function to uphold Basic Law , necessary done change to Constitution Number 24 Year 2003 about Court Constitution as has changed with Constitution

Number 8 of 2011 concerning Change On Constitution Number 242003 about Court The Constitution , especially to provision about terms and conditions selection , election and submission candidate judge constitution as well as formation assembly honor judge constitution .

One of substance material Government Regulation in Lieu of Law the formation of Assembly Honor Constitutional Judge as institution guard honor and behavior of judges constitution,³² Which formed MK together with KY,³³ consisting of 5 (five) people,³⁴ with authority :

1. call judge constitution Which allegedly do violation codeethics For give explanation and defense ;
2. call reporter , witness , and/ or party other Which related For asked for information , including For asked for document or other evidence ; And
3. give sanctions to judge constitution Which proven violatencode ethics.

Different with Spirit Perppu which encourages KY involvement in formation MKHK, in a way firm MK reject involvement KY with forming the Constitutional Judges Ethics Council through PMK Number 2 2013 concerning the Constitutional Judges Ethics Council which consists of 3 members (three) people each originate from former constitutional judge , academic and characters society , with term of office for 3 (three) years . Ethics Council this is what then entitled recommend formation Assembly Honor Judge Constitution if For to judge judge the reported person who did it violation heavy or the judge has get reprimand write and/ or oral as much as 3 (three) time.

Simultaneously with MKHK's exclusion from the formation Government Regulation in Lieu of Law with Ethics Council made by PMK No. 2/2013, the existence of The Perppu was born from Spirit maintain And return dignity dignity And honor MK, However cause polemic state administration . Besides allegedly reduce authority state institutions that are given constitution , Also has change Chapter 24B And 24C UUD Year 1945 with normwhich

are more low from constitution That Alone so that considered contradictory with the 1945 Constitution . Conditions so that in the end become argumentation law submitted testing degrees its constitutionality in MK.

On Thursday 13 February 2014, MK grant application testing Constitution Number 4 Year 2014 with Decision Number 1-2/PUU-XII/2014 concerning Testing Constitution Number 4 of 2014 about Determination Government Regulation in Lieu of Law Number 1 Year 2013 about Court Constitution Become The law , with state that Law - law Number 4 of 2014 is contradictory with the 1945 Constitution , no have strength law tie as well as enforce return Constitution Number 24 Year 2003 about Court Constitution as changed with Constitution Number 8 of 2011 concerning Change Second On Constitution No. 24 Year 2003 About Court Constitution. With thus , existence organ recruitment MK judges (expert panel), Assembly honor of Constitutional Court Judges, and conditions other Which set up in Government Regulation in Lieu of Law stated No have strength tie .

Different with Decision MK No. 005/PUU-IV/2006 Which use argumentation systematics and *original intent* the maker of the constitution Year 1945, And Decision MK No. 49/PUU-IX/2011 with argument No existence guarantee MKHK's independence and neutrality because its membership No neutral , so in Decision No. 1-2/PUU-IX/2014 deletion return institution constitutional judge supervision involving KY is based on on implementation principle *check and balance* Which No appropriate applied in power an independent judiciary , however arrange relation legislative and executive, as well as use terminology the occurrence smuggling law Which done Government Regulation in Lieu of Law Because neglect to Decision No.005/PUU-IV/2006, more from the Constitutional Court is of the opinion condition objectivity from right subjectivity President publish Government Regulation in Lieu of Law not fulfilled, that is No existence indication crunch Which force Which must completed as soon as possible maybe , maybe not have consequence *prompt immediately* (suddenly quick) For solve problem law as Which should there is in consideration Government Regulation in Lieu of Law No.1 Year 2013. With Thus , the deletion return institution supervisor judge's behavior constitution Which involving institution other can become president bad enforcement law , Which can to fertilize tyranny judicial , And tyranny power judiciary, Which run Court Constitution in a way monopolistic .

Will but , For ensure certainty law And so that No the occurrence emptiness law And institution supervisor behavior judge constitution again , on March 18 2014 the Constitutional Court issued PMK Number 2 2014 about Assembly Honor Court Constitution (MKHK) which at the same time state No PMK 1 of 2013 and PMK 2 apply Year 2013. MKHK model PMK 2

Year 2014 have a number of difference fundamental with form of PMK 1 of 2013, while the Council The ethics adopted by PMK 2 of 2014 are: similar with the intention PMK 2 of 2013 with affirmation academics referred to in PMK 2 In 2013 he became a professor knowledge law . Table following describe difference And equality in between institution supervisor behavior judge constitution since 2004.

Table 1
Institution Supervisor Behavior Judge Constitution

Institution	Position and Length of service	Former And Member	Authority
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Commission Judicial (Verdict MK No. 005/PUU-IV/2006 delete authority KY supervise and/ or to drop sanctions for judge constitution)	Constitutional organ Article 24B of the Constitution Year 1945 Law 22 of 2004 jo Act 18 Year 2011 Time position 5 year And can chosen Again For one period next .	Lifted and dismissed by the President with agreement Board Representative People. Consisting of 7 (seven) person : 2 person ex-judge; 2 person practitioner law ; 2 persons academics ; And 1 person figure public	"...and have authority other in frame guard And to uphold honor , dignity , and behavior judge". Uphold honor and dignity and maintain judge's behavior by do supervision to behavior judge in frame to uphold honor and nobility dignity and maintain judge behavior .
Assembly Honor Judge Constitution	Institutional organs PMK No. 1 Year 2013 Incidental Maximum 90 (nine) tens) day (60 + 30)	Formed MK consisting of 5 (five) people : 1 person judge constitution 1 person leader KY 1 person ex- leader institution country 1 person ex- judge constitution or judge great 1 person Teacher big knowledge law	Check and take decision to report and/ or information existence violation judge constitution to Article 23 (2) letters b, c, d, e, f, g, or No do obligations and violate prohibition Chapter 27B Act MK.

Assembly Honor Judge Constitution	Organ law -law Perppu No.1 of 2014 2013 jo Act 4 Year 2014 Fixed 5 years No can be selectedreturn	Formed MK with KY consisting of 5 (five) people : 1 person ex- judge constitution ; 1 person practitionerlaw ; 2 academic person Which Wrong One or both of them background behind law ; and 1 person figure public .	call the judgethe constitution that allegedly do violation code ethics For give explanation and defense call reporter , witness , and/ or other parties who related For asked for information , including For asked for document or proof other; give sanctionsto the judge the constitution that proven violatecode ethics .
Ethics Council Judge Constitution	Institutional organs , PMK No. 2 of 2014 2013 Permanent in nature ,	Formed MK, consisting of 3 three people : 1 person ex- judge constitution ;	Maintain andto uphold (honor , nobility dignity and behavior

	formed until formed MKHK based on Government Regulation in Lieu of Law No. 1 of 2013.	1 person academics ; And 1 person figure public .	judge, as well as code ethics And guidelines judge's behavior constitution , so that the judge did not do violation ; do collection , processing and review report and information about behavior judge; examine the judge reported or judge which is suspected do violation ; convey reports and information that has collected , processed And reviewed about behavior judge reported or judge which is suspected do violation , in assembly session honor ; convey report implementation task in writing every month to court .
Assembly Honor	Institutional organs PMK 2 Year 2013	Formed on proposal board ethics to the Constitutional Court in matter : ethics board to argue judge reported /alleged judge has	Further regulated in PMK.

		do violation heavy ; judge reported /the judge who alleged to have get reprimand oral / written as much as 3 time.	
Assembly Honor Court Constitution	Institutional organs PMK No. 2 Year 2014 In nature incidental , on base suspicion the occurrence serious violation judge reported .	Constitutional Court was formed proposal board ethics , consisting of 5 (five) people : 1 person judge constitution ; 1 person member KY; 1 person ex-judge constitution ; 1 teacher big law ; And 1 person figure public .	Task : do processing And ato the reports submitted ethics board about suspicion violation heavy Which done reported judge or judge unexpected , as well as about reported judge or alleged judge who has get verbal warning as much as 3 (three)time; convey assembly decision honor to MK.
			Authority : call And inspect judge reported or alleged judge submitted board ethics Forget explanation and defense , including request document or proof other ; call and

			request information reporter ,witness and/ or partiesother Which relatedwith suspicionviolation heavywhich is conductedjudge reported / judge expected toget information , including requestdocument or tool proof other; o drop decision in the form ofsanctions or rehabilitation .
Ethics Council Judge Constitution	Institutional organs PMK No. 2 Year 2014 Selected by the committee selection (suspected . Selection Committee) independent . Panel consists of of 3 (1 person ex- judge three people : 1 ex judge constitution ; 1 person academics ; And 1 person figurepublic . Member Panel chosen in meeting plenary judge Which closed .	Formed by MK related reportand/ or information suspicionviolation judge reported / (suspected . Consisting of 3 (constitution ; three people : 1 person ex- judge constitution ; 1 person Teacher great knowledgelaw ; and 1 person figure public .	Task : do collection , processing , andreview reports and/ or information suspicion violation judge (constitution ; convey report implementation taskin writing every yearto Court Constitution . Authority : to give opinionin general written onjudge's question constitution about something the act thatcontain

			<p>doubt as violation in Chapter 21 paragraph (2) PMK;</p> <p>call and examine the judge reported / suspected do violation to Chapter 21 Article (1) of PMK For give explanation and defense , including for asked for document or tool proof other; call and request information reporter , witnesses and/ or other parties who associated with suspicion violations that conducted by the judge reported / suspected violation Chapter 21 paragraph (2) PMK including request document or tool proof other;</p> <p>to drop sanctions in the form of a warning oral to judge reported / suspected which is proven violate Chapter 21 Article (2) of PMK;</p> <p>propose formation assembly honor to check and take decision to judge</p>
--	--	--	---

			<p>reported / suspected which is suspecteddo serious violation What is meant isChapter 21 paragraph (2)PMK and forcheck andtake decision tojudge reported / suspected which has get verbal warning and/ or written as much as 3 (three)time; propose discharge judge reported / suspected Which allegedly hasdo serious violation to provisionin Article 21 paragraph (2) PMK And judge reported / suspected which has get verbal warningas much as 3 (three) time.</p>
--	--	--	---

Source : data processed from the KY Law No. 22 of 2004 in conjunction with Law No. 18 of 2004 2011, Power Act Justice No. 4 of 2004 in conjunction with Law No. 49 Year 2009, Decision MK No. 005/PUU-IV/2006, Act MK No. 24 of 2003 Jo. Law No. 8 of 2011, Constitutional Court Decision No. 49/PUU-IX/2011, PMK No. 1 of 203, Perppu No. 1 of 2011 2013 Joe. Act No. 4 Year 2014, PMK No. 2 Year 2013, Decision MK No. 1-2/PUU-IX/2014, PMK No. 2 Year 2014.

Table the show that the institutional MK is very prone to to effort involvement other parties in supervise judge's behavior constitution , And tend reject every actions Which leading

on entry element extra judicial in realm enforcement ethics of judges, Which Actually intended No For involved in mechanism judicial .

3. CLOSING

- a. Although there is rejection to existence mix hand institution non -judicial (*extra judicial*) in supervision of constitutional judges , but has become choice political permanent law that in frame maintain and uphold honor , nobility dignity , and behavior judge needed supervision to the judge's behavior to be appropriate code ethics and guidelines behavior so that every the judge's decision is implemented in frame to uphold law and justice based on Pancasila and the Constitution 1945 ;
- b. Political law incidental supervision judge based on norm UUD The year 1945 was :
 - i. behavior of constitutional judges supervised by an ethics board formed by the Constitutional Court, whereas to judge reported or unexpected do violation code ethics and/ or guidelines behavior of constitutional judges formed Assembly Honor Judge Constitution Which its formation proposed by the ethics board , with task carry out And functioning as justice ethics ;
 - ii. the Constitutional Court's decision does not can done supervision judicial as as it is supervision decision courts located in the area MA through mechanism effort law (ordinary and extraordinary) usual). However thus , decision MK can done public through monitoring of implementation decision referred to , including correct through activity academic but No can change verdict .

4. LIST LIBRARY

Arto, A. M. (2001). *Ideal conceptions of the Supreme Court: Redefinition of the role and function of the court to build a new Indonesia*. Yogyakarta: Library Students.

Assembly Deliberation People Republic Indonesia. (2005). *Guide to socialize the Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia 1945: As per the order of chapters, articles, and verses*. Jakarta: Secretariat General MPR RI.

Asshiddiqie, J. (2014). *Justice ethics and ethics constitution*. Jakarta: Sinar Graphics.

Constitution No. 22 of 2004 concerning the Judicial Commission (Sheet) of the Republic of Indonesia, as amended by Constitution No. 18 of 2011 concerning amendments to Constitution No. 22 of 2004 concerning the Judicial Commission.

Constitution No. 24 of 2003 concerning the Constitutional Court, as amended by Constitution No. 8 of 2011 concerning amendments to Constitution No. 24 of 2003 concerning the Constitutional Court.

Constitution No. 4 of 2004 concerning Power Justice.

Constitution No. 4 of 2014 concerning the Determination of Government Regulations in Lieu of Law, Print Blue Updates Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia, Le ip-MA, Jakarta, 2003.

Constitution No. 48 of 2009 about Power Justice.

Decision MK No. 1-2/PUU-IX/2014 about Testing Constitution No. 4 of 2014 concerning the Determination of Government Regulation in Lieu of Law No. 1 of 2013 about Second Amendments to Constitution No. 24 of 2003 concerning the Constitutional Court.

Decision MK No. 138/PUU-VII/2009 about Testing Government Regulation in Lieu of Law No. 10 of 1999 concerning Eradication of Criminal Terrorism to UUD 1945.

Decision No. 005/PUU-IV/2006 about Testing Constitution No. 22 of 2004 concerning the Judicial Commission and Legal No. 4 of 2004 concerning Power Justice to the Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia.

Decision No. 49/PUU-IX/2011 concerning Testing Constitution No. 8 of 2011 concerning Amendments to Constitution No. 23 of 2004 concerning the Constitutional Court to UUD 1945.

Fatwa, A. M. (2009). *Portrait of the Constitution post-amendment to the 1945 Constitution*. Jakarta: Compass.

Government Replacement Constitution No. 1 of 2013 concerning Second Amendment to Constitution No. 24 of 2003 concerning the Constitutional Court.

Isra, S. (2006). *Reformation post-constitutional law amendment to the 1945 Constitution*. Field: Andalas University. Jakarta: Eagle Press.

Journal Constitution, 1(1), November, Constitutional Court Constitution, Jakarta, 2008.

Journal Constitution, 10(4), December, Secretariat and Secretariat General MK, 2013, Jakarta.

Kusnardi, M., & Ibrahim, H. (1988). *Introduction to the law and layout of the Indonesian state*. Jakarta: Center Studies HTN Law Faculty UI.

Mahfud, M. D. (1998). *Politics of law in Indonesia*. Jakarta: LP3ES.

Manan, B. (2003). *Theory and politics of the constitution*. Yogyakarta: UII Press.

Miscellany Justice Magazine Law, 21(244), March, IKAHI, 2006, Jakarta.

- MK-RI. (2004). *Print Blue Court Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia*. Jakarta: Secretariat General MK RI.
- Muhtadi. (2001). *Principles of deliberation consensus in the 1945 Constitution*. Thesis, Faculty of Law, Tadulako University, Palu: FH Untad.
- Panggabean, H. P. (2001). *Function of the Supreme Court in daily practice: Efforts to cope with arrears of cases and empowerment of the MA's supervision function*. Jakarta: Library Ray Hope.
- Rahardjo, S. (1986). *Ilmu hukum*. Bandung: Alumni.
- Regulation of Government Replacement No. 1 of 2013 about the Second Amendment to Constitution No. 24 of 2003 concerning the Constitutional Court.
- Regulation of the Constitutional Court No. 1 of 2013 about Board Ethics of the Constitutional Court.
- Regulation of the Constitutional Court No. 2 of 2013 about the Honor Assembly of the Constitutional Court.
- Regulation of the Constitutional Court No. 2 of 2014 about the Honor Assembly of the Constitutional Court.
- Soemantri, M. S. (1986). *MPR(S) Decree as one of the sources of state law administration*. Bandung: Remadja CV's Work.
- Syahuri, T. (2006). *Constitutional law: Process and procedure of changing the 1945 Constitution in Indonesia 1945-2002 and comparisons with other state constitutions in the world*. Bogor: Ghalia Indonesia.
- Syaukani, P., & Thohari, A. A. (2003). *Basics of political law*.
- Usfunan, Y. (n.d.). *Supervision of judges*. Retrieved from <http://www.kompas.com/kompas-print/0703/15/opinion/3369799>
- Widjoyanto, J., Israel, B., & Sir, M. (Eds.). (2002). *New Constitution through the Independent Constitutional Commission*. Jakarta: Sinar Hope.
- Yasir, A. (2014). *Legislation law*. Port Lampung: Justice Publisher.