



Ni Luh Made Mahendrawati
<mahendrawati.warmadewa@gmail.com>

[IJCS] Submission Acknowledgement

Support Manager <support@lifescienceglobal.com>

7 April 2021 15.00

Kepada: Ni Luh Made Mahendrawati <mahendrawati.warmadewa@gmail.com>

Ni Luh Made Mahendrawati

Thank you for submitting the manuscript, "Prohibition of Monopolistic Practices and Unfair Business Competition in Indonesia: A Legal Mechanism to Balance the Public Interest" to International Journal of Criminology and Sociology. With the online journal management system that we are using, you will be able to track its progress through the editorial process by logging in to the journal web site:

Manuscript URL: <https://www.lifescienceglobal.com/pms/index.php/ijcs/authorDashboard/submission/7335>

Username: mahendrawati

If you have any questions, please contact me. Thank you for considering this journal as a venue for your work.

Support Manager

International Journal of Criminology and Sociology
<http://www.lifescienceglobal.com/pms/index.php/ijcs>



Ni Luh Made Mahendrawati
<mahendrawati.warmadewa@gmail.com>

RE: Article for review - IJCS

mzahid@lifescienceglobal.com

7 April 2021

<mzahid@lifescienceglobal.com>

15.26

Kepada: Ni Luh Made Mahendrawati <mahendrawati.warmadewa@gmail.com>

Dear Prof/Dr. Ni Luh Made Mahendrawati

We have received your article titled " Prohibition of Monopolistic Practices and Unfair Business Competition in Indonesia: A Legal Mechanism to Balance the Public Interest ". The article processing charges for an accepted paper are USD 700. Please Confirm!

Looking forward for your positive response.

Regards,

Zahid Khan

Manager Publications

www.lifescienceglobal.com

[Kutipan teks disembunyikan]



Ni Luh Made Mahendrawati
<mahendrawati.warmadewa@gmail.com>

RE: Article for review - IJCS

Ni Luh Made Mahendrawati <mahendrawati.warmadewa@gmail.com> 8 April 2021 10.03
Kepada: Ni Luh Made Mahendrawati <mahendrawati.warmadewa@gmail.com>

Dear Editor,
Thank for your kindness.
We hope the review results will be available soon in order the paper can be published as soon as possible.

Best regards,

Mahendrawati

[Kutipan teks disembunyikan]



Ni Luh Made Mahendrawati
<mahendrawati.warmadewa@gmail.com>

RE: Article for review - IJCS

mzahid@lifescienceglobal.com

29 April 2021

<mzahid@lifescienceglobal.com>

23.57

Kepada: Ni Luh Made Mahendrawati <mahendrawati.warmadewa@gmail.com>

Dear Prof/Dr. Ni Luh Made Mahendrawati

This is with reference to your manuscript entitled “**Prohibition of Monopolistic Practices and Unfair Business Competition in Indonesia: A Legal Mechanism to Balance the Public Interest**” submitted for publication in the International Journal of Criminology and Sociology. It is my pleasure to inform you that the referees have suggested to accept your manuscript after some minor revision.

You are required to revise your manuscript according to the referees’ comments below and **highlight the changes**, in addition to these comments also please have a look at Editorial Requirements at ‘Authors Guidelines’ particularly in term of reference section when revising your manuscript. We greatly, anticipate submission of your revised manuscript (in **MS-Word** or **LaTeX**) in **2 weeks** as your paper has been scheduled for Publication in the month of **May** 2021.

The attached file has been reviewed. You are requested to send the revised file according to the reviewer comments.

Reviewer comments :

Please use the correct word: commercial court, not commercial

Did you mean Number? please write as is, do not abbreviate it

We prefer to use 'of' rather than year in writing the time of enactment

The term of GBHN was mentioned first here, please explain the meaning.

Use more sources from international journal to justify the findings

Restructure the conclusion by mentioning the findings, practical and theoretical implications

If this is relevant, please cite this source:

Faujura, R.P., Gultom, E., & Sudjana, S. (2021). The Monopoly Practice and Unfair Business Competition in the Technology Transfer Activity Through the Foreign Patent in Indonesia. UUM Journal of Legal Studies 12(2), 69-91.

Please note that the publishing option for authors after their manuscript is accepted for publications:

OPEN ACCESS: Your article your article is published with barrier free access for readers. The article processing fee is US\$ 400.

Please make sure to send your response to the reviewers comments in a separate word file.

You are requested to kindly confirm a safe receipt of the message and don't hesitate to contact us if you have any additional query/concern.

Looking forward to hear from you at your earliest possible.

Regards,

Zahid Khan

Manager Publications

www.lifescienceglobal.com

From: mzahid@lifescienceglobal.com [<mailto:mzahid@lifescienceglobal.com>]

Sent: Thursday, April 08, 2021 10:22 AM

To: 'Ni Luh Made Mahendrawatii'

Subject: RE: Article for review - IJCS

noted

[Kutipan teks disembunyikan]



**Prohibition of Monopolistic Practices and Unfair Business
Competition in Indonesia A Legal Mechanism to Balance the
Public Interest.docx**

52K



Ni Luh Made Mahendrawati
<mahendrawati.warmadewa@gmail.com>

RE: Article for review - IJCS

Ni Luh Made Mahendrawati <mahendrawati.warmadewa@gmail.com> 30 April 2021 14.37
Kepada: mzahid@lifescienceglobal.com

Dear Editor,

We would like to submit the revised version of our paper entitled, Prohibition of Monopolistic Practices and Unfair Business Competition in Indonesia: A Legal Mechanism to Balance the Public Interest.

We hope the revision was satisfactory and the paper will be published soon. Below we attach the revised manuscript and the response to reviewer comments.

We are looking forward to hearing from you soon.

Best regards,

[Kutipan teks disembunyikan]

2 lampiran



Response to reviewers.docx
16K



Rev1_Prohibition of Monopolistic Practices and Unfair Business Competition in Indonesia A Legal Mechanism to Balance the Public Interest.docx
48K



Ni Luh Made Mahendrawati
<mahendrawati.warmadewa@gmail.com>

RE: Article for review - IJCS

mzahid@lifescienceglobal.com

1 Mei 2021

<mzahid@lifescienceglobal.com>

00.26

Kepada: Ni Luh Made Mahendrawati <mahendrawati.warmadewa@gmail.com>

Dear Prof/Dr. Ni Luh Made Mahendrawati

Thank you for sending the revised version of your article. We have forwarded your article for English language editing

[Kutipan teks disembunyikan]



Ni Luh Made Mahendrawati
<mahendrawati.warmadewa@gmail.com>

Final - IJCS

mzahid@lifescienceglobal.com

5 Mei 2021

<mzahid@lifescienceglobal.com>

01.37

Kepada: Farrukh Imran <fimran@lifescienceglobal.com>

Cc: Ni Luh Made Mahendrawati <mahendrawati.warmadewa@gmail.com>

Dear Farrukh,

Please find attached the final copy of the manuscript after revision by author and Edited For English Language improvement. You are requested to compose and send galley proof to author.

Regards,

Zahid Khan

Manager Publications

www.lifescienceglobal.com



**Rev1_Prohibition of Monopolistic Practices and Unfair Business
Competiti....docx**

51K



Ni Luh Made Mahendrawati
<mahendrawati.warmadewa@gmail.com>

[IJCS] Invoice

Muhammad Umair Zia <omairzia@lifescienceglobal.com> 7 Mei 2021 18.33
Kepada: Ni Luh Made Mahendrawati <mahendrawati.warmadewa@gmail.com>

Dear Dr. **Ni Luh Made Mahendrawati**,

We understand from the Editor in chief of International Journal of Criminology and Sociology that your manuscript entitled “**Prohibition of Monopolistic Practices and Unfair Business Competition in Indonesia: A Legal Mechanism to Balance the Public Interest**” has been accepted for publication in International Journal of Criminology and Sociology. Please find attached the invoice for Open access charges covering the production costs.

Please click or copy/Paste in your browser the following hyperlink for payment through credit card.

https://www.2checkout.com/checkout/purchase?sid=1451442&quantity=1&product_id=36

Kindly process this as soon as possible to expedite publication of your article in the forthcoming issue of the journal.

Please acknowledge the receipt of the invoice.

Best Regards,

Thanking You
For Lifescience Global

Muhammad Umair Zia
Accountant



Virus-free. www.avast.com



LSG-INVOICE 202105-03-IJCS.pdf
88K



Ni Luh Made Mahendrawati
<mahendrawati.warmadewa@gmail.com>

Your order on www.lifescienceglobal.com: Payment received

2Checkout Support <support@2checkout.com> 8 Mei 2021 13.08
Kepada: Ni Luh Made Mahendrawati <mahendrawati.warmadewa@gmail.com>

Lifescience Global
<http://www.lifescienceglobal.com>

2checkout

Dear Ni Luh Made Mahendrawati,

Thank you for your order on 2021-05-08 from
<http://www.lifescienceglobal.com>! We received your payment
(**Visa/MasterCard - 3818**) for order **151199970**.

The charge on your bank statement will appear as
2CO.COM*Lifescien. 2Checkout.com, Inc. acts as an authorized
payment service provider of Lifescience Global online products and
services.

You can access your products according to the terms and
conditions you accepted during purchase.

Support information

Need technical support? For product installation, activation and other technical support issues, please contact Lifescience Global on +1 416 420 9739 or info@lifescienceglobal.com

Need order support? Use myAccount to easily manage your order, subscription, invoice and payment details. [Signup / Login](#) using your email address mahendrawati.warmadewa@gmail.com

2Checkout has processed your order as the authorized payment service provider of Lifescience Global.

Thank you,

The 2Checkout Team

www.2co.com

Composed version of your manuscript for IJCS Vol. 10 (Mahendrawati)

Farrukh Imran <fimran@lifescienceglobal.com>

6 Mei 2021 19.08

Kepada: Ni Luh Made Mahendrawati <mahendrawati.warmadewa@gmail.com>

Dear Ni Luh Made Mahendrawati,

Please find enclosed the composed version of your article and I will be grateful if you could kindly check the manuscript for any potential errors, missing lines/paragraphs, errors in figures/diagrams etc. Authors must ensure that all references are complete and accurate in accordance with the journal's instruction for author.

You are required to complete the following steps after reviewing the galley proofs of your manuscript:

1. Kindly ensure to return a typed **list of corrections** along with the corrected article within the **next three days** by email at

fimran@lifescienceglobal.com

a. Corrections reported on galley proofs PDFs / PDF comments are acceptable.

b. Please print the composed version and mark the suggestion/changes clearly, scan the corrected copy and send us via e-mail.

c. Corrections are also acceptable through a list of corrections. Please find attached a MS Word template file to use for the list of corrections.

2. Please find enclosed a copyright notice / author declaration from which needs to be filled in and returned along with your comments on the galley proofs.

Please submit the e-mail addresses of all co-authors in your article. We maintain contact information record of all contributing authors to keep them updated about the publication.

3. Article Reprints are supplied only ON ORDER. An order of a minimum one hundred (100) copies can be placed using the attached Reprint Order form.

Notes about the Galley Proofs:

The enclosed galley proofs have been prepared directly from the electronic files of the manuscript you provided. However, in the transformation process, certain errors may occur due to different software versions used. Thus the typesetting department is not responsible for the inclusion of such errors.

The conversion to PDF version may also distort your original figures, therefore kindly check them carefully and report these problems. All figures will be

reproduced directly from your supplied copies and the resolution of the figures in the final manuscript will be exactly the same as the figures you supplied to us with the original manuscript (except chemical structures).

This manuscript is being considered with the understanding that it is submitted on an exclusive basis and has not been submitted elsewhere simultaneously for publication.

Note: Please be informed that the coverage of the journal is still continued with Scopus which can be viewed via this link <https://www.scopus.com/sourceid/21100884991>, the list has been published by scopus in March 2021 and also be confirmed by scopus team so the current status is that the journal is indexed in scopus. However, it is under re-evaluation by SCOPUS team as per their policy and procedure.

Kindly acknowledge the receipt of this e-mail at your earliest convenience. For any other assistance or information feel free to contact us at info@lifescienceglobal.com.

With best wishes,

Farrukh Imran
Composer

----- End of Forwarded Message

4 lampiran



AUTHOR WARRANTY & COPYRIGHT_FORM.pdf

175K



Correction Form.doc

60K



Reprint Order Form (OA journal).pdf

88K



Mahendrawati_IJCS.pdf

224K

Ni Luh Made Mahendrawati <mahendrawati.warmadewa@gmail.com> 7 Mei 2021 05.21
Kepada: Farrukh Imran <fimran@lifescienceglobal.com>

Dear editor,

Thank you for your email.

We've checked the final version of our article.

We provide some corrections in the comments in the attached pdf file.

Sincerely,

[Kutipan teks disembunyikan]

2 lampiran



Mahendrawati_IJCS_rev.pdf

406K



AUTHOR WARRANTY & COPYRIGHT_FORM.pdf

448K

Farrukh Imran <fimran@lifescienceglobal.com> 7 Mei 2021 17.22
Kepada: Ni Luh Made Mahendrawati <mahendrawati.warmadewa@gmail.com>

Dear Ni Luh Made Mahendrawati,

Thanks for your email. Your pointed correction has been incorporated in your manuscript. Copyright form also received.

Best regards,
Farrukh Imran

[Kutipan teks disembunyikan]

[Kutipan teks disembunyikan]

[Kutipan teks disembunyikan]

[Kutipan teks disembunyikan]

[https://www.scopus.com/
sourceid/21100884991](https://www.scopus.com/sourceid/21100884991), the list
has been published by scopus in
March 2021 and also be
confirmed by scopus team so the
current status is that the journal
is indexed in scopus. However, it
is under re-evaluation by
SCOPUS team as per their policy
and procedure.

[Kutipan teks disembunyikan]

www.lifescienceglobal.com
<[http://www.lifescienceglobal.
com](http://www.lifescienceglobal.com)>

[Kutipan teks disembunyikan]



Lampiran

Prohibition of Monopolistic Practices and Unfair Business Competition in Indonesia: A Legal Mechanism to Balance the Public Interest



Ni Luh Made Mahendrawati
Warmadewa University, Indonesia

Abstract

The study is to explore the legal mechanism of prohibition of monopolistic practices and unfair business competition in Indonesia by looking at the role of Business Competition Supervisory Commission (KPPU). This study was conducted using the empirical normative method. In this context, the regulatory reference used is Law No. 5 of 1999 (Anti-Monopoly Law). Other regulations are Article 34 of Law No. 5 of 1999 and Presidential Decree No. 75 of 1999 and named the Business Competition Supervisory Commission (KPPU). Several KPPU decisions analyzed were in the cities of Medan, Semarang, Surabaya, Makassar and Central Jakarta. The results showed that Law No. 5 of 1999 regarding Prohibition of Monopolistic Practices and Unfair Business Competition in Indonesia was formulated to the principle of balancing interests, namely the balance between the interests of business actors with the public interest. The formulation of the principle of balance can be found in the considerations, explanations and articles in Law No. 5 of 1999.

Keywords: Monopolistic Practices, Legal Procedures, Unfair Competition, Business Competition, Balance Principle.

1. Introduction

In the era of globalization and free trade as it is today, economic activity is becoming increasingly intense and broad reaching all parts of the world and has a broad scope of human activity wherever located, distance and time are no longer a barrier to economic activity (Nakanishi, 2009; Shimomura, 2009). Economic globalization activities are manifested in various forms: liberalization of trade in goods and services, increasing migration temporarily or permanently, foreign direct investment by multinational companies, and standardization of various regulations. Furthermore, advances in communication and network technology provide faster and greater means of transporting goods, are easier to provide services, and are faster and clearer in conveying information. Globalization also drives the progress of the supply chain system, in terms of the production network, which includes all production facilities and inventory facilities needed to run production and distribution networks consisting of all the supply and distribution facilities needed to deliver goods to buyers

In the perspective of fair competition, economic activity is basically a series of activities that are simultaneous, comprehensive and continuous (Hartono, 2007; Toha & Retnaningsih, 2020). Those who carry out economic activities are called economic actors, both individuals and groups or business entities. In general, economic activities can be classified into two main activities, namely producing goods and/or services. In general, all economic activities are divided into 2 categories, namely goods and services. Production of goods, including agriculture, mining, manufacturing, construction, etc. Each of these sectors produces material products. The service industry includes banking, communication, computer software development, etc. (Encyclopædia Britannica, 2017), and activities to distribute goods and/or services from producers, intermediaries to consumers (Hübner, 2007). Furthermore,

these two main activities can be reduced to various other fields of activity that are more detailed.

It must be recognized that economic activities cannot be separated from competition between business actors. This is a requirement for the implementation of a market economy. Moreover, in the global era that demands a free market economic system, so that competition between business actors will be more open. Sometimes the business competition is fair competition, but on the contrary, business actors can conduct unfair competition in order to get the maximum profit. With regard to business competition law, in Law No. 5 of 1999 has established a body or commission called the Business Competition Supervisory Commission (KPPU) which is given such broad authority ranging from receiving reports on alleged monopolistic practices and or unfair business competition, summoning business actors, to deciding cases and imposing sanctions on businessmen).

Bearing in mind the provisions of procedural law that are specific in handling business competition cases. Furthermore, in the case of business competition as regulated in Law no. 5 of 1999 loaded with economic legal content, being on the same side of the judiciary as an institution that carries out the functions of the judiciary power is required to provide justice and legal certainty for all parties and furthermore the judge's decision must be able to provide balance and benefit for all parties, then in law enforcement business competition Judges are required to be able to understand the principles of economic law and general legal principles while at the same time creating balance through their decisions.

2. Literature Review

In the era of globalization, the demands and interests of the protection of members of the community in realizing the ideals of welfare state require an increasingly extensive legislation regulation. In Neo Classical theory (Harahap, 1995), demands for economic transformation are no longer merely pursuing growth, but furthermore the transformation demanded and pursued is a scope of life that concerns the basic needs of global, regional and national societies that have dimensions. The first is justice by developing patterns that are able to sustain the balance between too much and too little to consume the earth's power source. Thus, the equitable distribution will be realized in the role of the economy as well as the control of resources and economic activities that are evenly distributed across all levels of society. Economic power is not concentrated centrally in the hands of a handful of people which creates inequality that destroys the ideals of the economic order of the self government enterprise or a shared economy.

The second is the sustainability by increasing economic production results do not arbitrarily deplete the earth's resources and the ability of ecosystems. But what is desired is that each generation recognizes the obligation to preserve the earth's resources and ecosystems as rights that must be maintained for the next generation. The third is the coverage by giving and opening opportunities as wide as possible for all levels of society to participate in the role of economic life to achieve welfare improvement. It is not just giving opportunities to small groups that are centralistic, which will cause social inequality and conflict.

The aspirations towards building a just, sustainable economy and the coverage demanded by the values of globalization require a variety of laws and regulations that are fast, in line with the very rapid changes in the global economy. In general, the law aims to create a balance of interests in the form of legal certainty so that proportional justice is born in a prosperous society (Hartono, 2007). The balance function also includes the structure of the economic life of the community in order to meet their needs. The balance order is very important to be realized in the economic order in the form of laws and regulations. For Indonesia, the legal order must be based on the values of the Pancasila and the 1945 Constitution as a basic norm. Which serves as the highest source of law. These principles of

law should be absorbed and placed in the provisions of the laws and regulations in Indonesia, both directly stated in the articles, as well as the principles and objectives of these regulations. Thus, it can be expected that the law will be able to function in realizing a just and prosperous society, or at least achieving a balance of interests in society.

3. Method

This study was conducted using the empirical normative method. Normative-empirical legal research (applied law research) is a research that uses normative-empirical legal case studies in the form of legal behavior products. This study analyzes regulations related to monopolistic practices and unfair business competition in Indonesia, and analyzes various KPPU decisions related to monopolistic practices in several cities in Indonesia.

This normative-empirical legal research method is basically a combination of the normative legal approach with the addition of various empirical elements. In this normative-empirical research method it is also about the implementation of normative legal provisions (laws) in their actions in every particular legal event in a society. In this context, the regulatory reference used is Law No. 5 of 1999 (Anti-Monopoly Law). Other regulations are Article 34 of Law No. 5 of 1999 and Presidential Decree No. 75 of 1999 and named the Business Competition Supervisory Commission (KPPU). Several KPPU decisions analyzed were in the cities of Medan, Semarang, Surabaya, Makassar and Central Jakarta. The data analysis technique was carried out using descriptive analytical methods by referring to various reports and secondary data regarding cases handled by KPPU and bankruptcy. The analysis is also based on examples of data regarding the pricing of basic needs in the form of gas by the state gas company. Therefore, the judicial case study approach is used as an analysis in this study as a legal case study in the context of anti-monopoly and sound business practices. This is because of the conflict so that it will involve the interference of courts and the anti-monopoly commission in Indonesia to be able to provide resolution decisions regarding cases of monopoly, bankruptcy, pricing and fair competition.

4. Results


Regarding KPPU's role in enforcing Competition Law in Indonesia is that it is to oversee the implementation of Law No. 5 of 1999 (Anti-Monopoly Law) where the Commission was formed. This establishment is based on Article 34 of Law No. 5 of 1999 which instructed that the formation of the organizational structure, duties and functions of the commission be determined through a Presidential Decree. This commission was then formed based on Presidential Decree No. 75 of 1999 and named the Business Competition Supervisory Commission (KPPU).

Therefore, Anti-Monopoly law enforcement and business competition is under the authority of the KPPU (Putri & Prananingtyas, 2020; Lee, 2015; Maarif, 2004; Wahyuningtyas, 2016). However, this does not mean that there are no other institutions authorized to handle monopoly and business competition matters. The District Court and the Supreme Court were also given the authority to settle the case. The District Court was given the authority to handle objections to the KPPU's decision and deal with violations of competition law which became a criminal case because KPPU's decisions were not carried out permanently. The Supreme Court is authorized to settle cases of violation of competition law in the case of an appeal against the district court decision. As an independent institution, it can be said that the authority possessed by KPPU is very large which includes the authority possessed by the judiciary. This authority includes investigations, prosecutions, consultations, examining, adjudicating, and deciding cases.

Table 1. Postponement of Debt Payment Obligations and Bankruptcy Cases

the	Commercial Court	Postponement		Bankruptcy		In
		Semester I 2019	Semester I 2020	Semester I 2019	Semester I 2020	
	Medan	14	14	3	3	
	Semarang	7	16	12	16	
	Surabaya	24	36	16	4	
	Makassar	6	1	2	2	
	Jakarta Pusat	112	182	43	22	
	Total	163	249	76	47	

context of constitutional law, KPPU is a state auxiliary organ that has the authority under Law No. 5 of 1999 to enforce business competition law. In a simple state auxiliary organ is a state institution formed outside the Constitution and is an institution that helps carry out the duties of the main state institutions (executive, legislative, and judiciary) which are often also referred to as quasi-independent state institutions (Risnain, 2018). The role of a quasi-independent state institution becomes important as a responsive effort for countries that are transitioning from authoritarianism to democracy (Kagramanto, 2007).

**Figure 1.** Diagram of No. of Postponement of Debt Payment Obligations and Bankruptcy Cases

KPPU's position in fuel subsidies can be an example in this context (Iwantono, 2003). As understood, Law No. 22 Year 2001 regarding Oil and Gas amended by the Constitutional Court ordered the government to regulate prices not limited to subsidized fuel. KPPU is in a position to support subsidies while asking that the government set limits on the price of non-subsidized fuel, so that the competitive landscape is that subsidized fuel is available, while non-subsidized fuel is affordable. Business actors compete for the market (tenders to become subsidized fuel suppliers) and in the market (head-to-head competition) in the range below the upper limit price for non-subsidized fuel. In other words, KPPU is not anti-subsidized. However, it has a hard position when subsidies are used as weapons to blackmail people with the mode of reducing subsidized goods. The aim is to condition the people to buy non-subsidized goods which are first reduced by volume and raised in price. It is very clear that if nationalism is interpreted as the spirit of subsidies to help the people's low purchasing power, then KPPU is one of the pillars of this (Widiyanti et al., 2019; Wahyuningtyas, 2014; Simbolon, 2019; Wategama et al., 2008). As a role of KPPU in providing fair pricing, the

findings of this study showed the adjustments to the Decree of the Board of Directors of PT Perusahaan Gas Negara (Persero) Tbk. No. 006904.K/HK.00.01/UT/2013 dated July 31, 2015 concerning Gas Prices in Business Entity Certificate in Distribution Region III for Service and Commercial Industry Customers as well as Manufacturing and Power Generation Industry Customers are in Table 2.

Table 2. Price Adjustment of Gas by KPPU

No.	Price Classification	Enforcement	Amount	Surcharge provisions
1.	P0	1 August 2015	IDR 7.400/ m ³	120%
2.	P1	1 August 2015	IDR 167.600/MMB TU + IDR770/ m ³	120%
3.	P2	1 August 2015	IDR 167.600/MMB TU + IDR 750/ m ³	120%
4.	General Price	1 August 2015	IDR 167.600/MMB TU + IDR 850/ m ³	120%

Source: Case Decision of No. 09/KPPU-L/2016

President with the approval of the DPR appointed KPPU members in carrying out their duties are responsible to the President. This is in line with practice in USA where the FTC is responsible to the President. This provision is reasonable because KPPU carries out part of the duties of the government, while the highest authority of the government is under the President. Nevertheless, it does not mean that KPPU in carrying out its duties cannot be free from government interference. Independence is still maintained by the involvement of the DPR to participate in determining and controlling the appointment and dismissal of KPPU members. Besides the duties and authority possessed by KPPU which is so important, in reality, KPPU still experiences obstacles in carrying out its duties. These constraints cause KPPU to not be able to carry out their duties optimally. For instance, KPPU has the authority to conduct research and investigation, but KPPU does not have the authority to conduct searches on business actors who are indicated to have violated Law No. 5 of 1999. In conducting research and investigations, KPPU is often constrained by the nature of company confidentiality, so that KPPU cannot obtain data company needed. Although KPPU is authorized to request information from Government agencies, up to now there has not been a good collaboration between KPPU and government agencies in the matter of investigating allegations of unfair business competition. As a result, KPPU often experiences difficulties in carrying out their duties due to lack of supporting data. In addition, KPPU is authorized to summon business actors or witnesses, but KPPU cannot force their presence. The existence of these obstacles resulted in the Commission not being able to optimally exercise its authority. In addition to overcoming the problems above, the challenge that must be answered next is to clarify the institutional status of KPPU in the constitutional system. This is important because the unclear status of the KPPU in the constitutional system makes this Commission vulnerable to debate its existence, especially when this commission carries out its duties and functions.

5. Discussion

Regarding the principle of business competition balance in the framework of Indonesian nationalism, the question that is often raised by the public is, is healthy competition in accordance with the personality of the nation which has a family economic philosophy? Some even think that the competition values as regulated in Law No. 5 Year 1999 concerning Prohibition of Monopolistic Practices and Unfair Business Competition (Competition Law) and the Business Competition Supervisory Commission (KPPU) as their

supervisory institutions are entrusted by the IMF, entrusted by neo-liberal, exploitative neoliberal organizations. competition, anti-subsidies and anti-national interests.

This mindset is not wrong if it is related to the time of enactment of Law and KPPU in 1999 which coincides with the early years of the effectiveness of the IMF Letter of Intent (LoI). However, when examined further, it appears that the desire to have instruments and policies that are pro-healthy competition and anti-conglomerate business structures was actually declared 10 years earlier by the people through the MPR as in the 1988 GBHN Economic Policy Direction which outlines: (1) developing a populist economic system that relies on fair market mechanisms with the principles of fair competition; (2) avoiding monopolistic market structures; (3) optimizing the role of government in correcting market imperfections by removing all obstacles that interfere with market mechanisms. This determination was further strengthened by TAP MPR X of 1998 which was alarming, namely "the implementation of the national economy which lacks the mandate of Article 33 of the 1945 Constitution and tends to show a very monopolistic style". This constitutional document shows that competition and KPPU are actually the culmination of the desires of the Indonesian people themselves who were dissatisfied with past business patterns and economic structures. The DPR responded by making the Competition Law the first initiative in the legislation history. So, commitment with the IMF turned out to be only a stimulant that accelerated the realization of this desire.

If nationalism is defined as a determination to protect national interests in the sense of the interests of small businesses and cooperatives, then this law has fulfilled them. Article 50 excludes the Act on small business operators and cooperatives. The law does not exclude business behaviour, but rather excludes its subjects, namely small businesses and cooperatives. This can be interpreted as the commitment of the state through the Act, as in Article 3 regarding the objectives, namely to create a conducive business climate through a fair business competition arrangement so as to ensure the certainty of equal business opportunities for large business actors, medium business actors and small business actors. With this exception, the law respects the conditions and efforts of the sustainable small businesses and cooperatives that dominate our national business actors.

Competition policy includes enforcement and regulation or government policy (Wibowo et al., 2019). If the KPPU sees that a sector is too strategic to be released from competition, due to technological reasons or the high concentration of product characteristics due to the lack of investment, the KPPU will advise the government to regulate it. If a product requires subsidies due to the low purchasing power of the people, the KPPU asks the government to give it. Furthermore, if nationalism is also interpreted as SOE control over the strategic business sector and the maximum limit of foreign ownership in certain businesses, then KPPU will not sue it. Even Article 51 of the Law justifies SOEs controlling strategic sectors as respected natural monopolies, provided they do not abuse them. The same thing is also done if the law or the government issues an upper limit or even closes on foreign ownership, the KPPU will always respect it as long as it is consistently regulated. If this happens, KPPU will guarantee fair competition between domestic business actors without discrimination. As a result, fair competition is the identity of the Indonesian people. It contains a stimulant to compete towards a business structure that is not monopolistic. Ideally, fair competition is aimed at increasing consumer and producer welfare by reducing deadweight loss (economic inefficiency factor).

6. Conclusion

Law No. 5 of 1999 was formulated to the principle of balancing interests, namely the balance between the interests of business actors with the public interest. The formulation of the principle of balance can be found in the considerations, explanations and articles in Law

No. 5 of 1999. In this context, business actors are prohibited from entering into agreements with other business actors to jointly control the production and or marketing of goods and or services which may result in monopolistic practices and or unfair business competition.

In the realization, of the principle of balance of interest in Law No. 5 of 1999 does not yet reflect proportional equity to carry out the role of the economy and control of resources and economic activities, so that it has not fully implemented the principle of economic democracy by taking into account the balance of interests. The principle of balance includes the balance between business people and the public interest. For this reason, the balance which was conducted by KPPU must refer to the laws and regulations with values of justice that are recognized in society. In applying balance, the judge in the decision is based on the principles, aims and objectives of Law No. 5 of 1999, namely maintaining public interest and increasing national economic efficiency as an effort to improve people's welfare. Lastly, the conclusion mainly highlight that Competition Law is a synthesis of two diametric points, namely free fight liberalism which adheres to unlimited competition and statism which prioritizes state ownership and control in the economy. Competition law is a bridge that guarantees competition in regulatory corridors, and in Indonesia, this role was conducted by KPPU to oversee the monopolistic practices and unfair business competition.

References

- Encyclopædia Britannica. (2017). *Service industry*. Retrieved from <https://www.britannica.com/topic/service-industry>, February 25, 2017.
- Harahap, M. Y. 1995. Development of Permanent Jurisprudence. *Mimbar Hukum* 16(5).
- Hartono, S. R. (2007). *Indonesian Economic Law*. Bayumedia Pub.
- Hübner, R. (2007). *Strategic supply chain management in process industries: An application to specialty chemicals production network design* (Vol. 594). Springer Science & Business Media.
- Iwantono, S. (2003, October). Economic Crisis and Cartel Development in Indonesia. In *5th International Cartels Workshop* (pp. 1-3).
- Kagramanto, B. L. (2007). Implementation of Law No. 5 of 1999 by KPPU. *Jurnal Ilmu Hukum Justitia*.
- Lee, A. (2015). Onwards and upwards for Indonesian antitrust. *International Financial Law Review*.
- Maarif, S. (2004). Competition Law in Indonesia: experience to be taken for the development of Competition Law in China. *Wash. U. Global Stud. L. Rev.*, 3, 333.
- Nakanishi, N. (2009). Successive Expansion and Stability of Network Integration in International Trade. In *International Trade and Economic Dynamics* (pp. 161-185). Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.
- Putri, P. K., & Prananingtyas, P. (2020). Supervision of kppu on the action of mergers done by mining companies. *Diponegoro Law Review*, 5(1), 108-123.
- Risnain, M. (2018). Eksistensi Lembaga Quasi Judisial Dalam Sistem Kekuasaan Kehakiman Di Indonesia: Kajian Terhadap Komisi Pengawas Persaingan Usaha. *Jurnal Hukum dan Peradilan*, 3(1), 49-58.
- Shimomura, K. (2009). *International trade and economic dynamics: essays in memory of Koji Shimomura*. Springer
- Simbolon, A. (2019). Prevention of monopolistic practices and unfair Business Competition through business Competition Supervision. *Journal of Legal, Ethical and Regulatory Issues* 22(1).
- Toha, K., & Retnaningsih, S. (2020). Legal policy granting status of fresh start to the individual bankrupt debtor in developing the bankruptcy law in Indonesia. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, 9(2), 157-161.

- Wahyuningtyas, S. Y. (2014). Challenges in Combating Cartels, 14 Years After the Enactment of Indonesian Competition Law. *Yearbook of Antitrust and Regulatory Studies (YARS)*, 7(10), 279-306.
- Wahyuningtyas, S. Y. (2016). The online transportation network in Indonesia: A pendulum between the sharing economy and ex ante regulation. *Competition and Regulation in Network Industries*, 17(3-4), 260-280.
- Wattegama, C., Soehardjo, J., & Kapugama, N. (2008). Telecom Regulatory and Policy Environment in Indonesia Results and Analysis of the 2008 TRE Survey. *Available at SSRN 1554762*.
- Wibowo, Y. S., Luddin, M. R., & Sari, E. (2019). Understanding Organizational Commitments in the Public Sector: A Case Study of Commissioners and Investigators at The Business Competition Supervisory Commission (KPPU). *Policy & Governance Review*, 3(3), 208-224.
- Widiyanti, R., Hidayat, N. N., Setianto, N. A., Mastuti, S., & Muatip, K. (2019, November). Vertical Integration of Broiler Industries in Indonesia (Analysis of Case Decisions No. 02/KPPU-I/2016). In *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science* (Vol. 372, No. 1, p. 012005). IOP Publishing.

Prohibition of Monopolistic Practices and Unfair Business Competition in Indonesia: A Legal Mechanism to Balance the Public Interest



Abstract

The study is to explore the legal mechanism of prohibition of monopolistic practices and unfair business competition in Indonesia by looking at the role of Business Competition Supervisory Commission (KPPU). This study was conducted using the empirical normative method. In this context, the regulatory reference used is Law No. 5 of 1999 (Anti-Monopoly Law). Other regulations are Article 34 of Law No. 5 of 1999 and Presidential Decree No. 75 of 1999 and named the Business Competition Supervisory Commission (KPPU). Several KPPU decisions analyzed were in the cities of Medan, Semarang, Surabaya, Makassar and Central Jakarta. The results showed that Law No. 5 of 1999 regarding Prohibition of Monopolistic Practices and Unfair Business Competition in Indonesia was formulated to the principle of balancing interests, namely the balance between the interests of business actors with the public interest. The formulation of the principle of balance can be found in the considerations, explanations and articles in Law No. 5 of 1999.

Keywords: Monopolistic Practices, Legal Procedures, Unfair Competition, Business Competition, Balance Principle.

1. Introduction

In the era of globalization and free trade as it is today, economic activity is becoming increasingly intense and broad reaching all parts of the world and has a broad scope of human activity wherever located, distance and time are no longer a barrier to economic activity (Nakanishi, 2009; Shimomura, 2009). Economic globalization activities are manifested in various forms: liberalization of trade in goods and services, increasing migration temporarily or permanently, foreign direct investment by multinational companies, and standardization of various regulations. Furthermore, advances in communication and network technology provide faster and greater means of transporting goods, are easier to provide services, and are faster and clearer in conveying information. Globalization also drives the progress of the supply chain system, in terms of the production network, which includes all production facilities and inventory facilities needed to run production and distribution networks consisting of all the supply and distribution facilities needed to deliver goods to buyers

In the perspective of fair competition, economic activity is basically a series of activities that are simultaneous, comprehensive and continuous (Hartono, 2007; Toha & Retnaningsih, 2020). Those who carry out economic activities are called economic actors, both individuals and groups or business entities. In general, economic activities can be classified into two main activities, namely producing goods and/or services. In general, all economic activities are divided into 2 categories, namely goods and services. Production of goods, including agriculture,

mining, manufacturing, construction, etc. Each of these sectors produces material products. The service industry includes banking, communication, computer software development, etc. (Encyclopædia Britannica, 2017), and activities to distribute goods and/or services from producers, intermediaries to consumers (Hübner, 2007). Furthermore, these two main activities can be reduced to various other fields of activity that are more detailed.

It must be recognized that economic activities cannot be separated from competition between business actors. This is a requirement for the implementation of a market economy. Moreover, in the global era that demands a free market economic system, so that competition between business actors will be more open. Sometimes the business competition is fair competition, but on the contrary, business actors can conduct unfair competition in order to get the maximum profit. With regard to business competition law, in Law No. 5 of 1999 has established a body or commission called the Business Competition Supervisory Commission (KPPU) which is given such broad authority ranging from receiving reports on alleged monopolistic practices and or unfair business competition, summoning business actors, to deciding cases and imposing sanctions on businessmen).

Bearing in mind the provisions of procedural law that are specific in handling business competition cases. Furthermore, in the case of business competition as regulated in Law no. 5 of 1999 loaded with economic legal content, being on the same side of the judiciary as an institution that carries out the functions of the judiciary power is required to provide justice and legal certainty for all parties and furthermore the judge's decision must be able to provide balance and benefit for all parties, then in law enforcement business competition Judges are required to be able to understand the principles of economic law and general legal principles while at the same time creating balance through their decisions.

2. Literature Review

In the era of globalization, the demands and interests of the protection of members of the community in realizing the ideals of welfare state require an increasingly extensive legislation regulation. In Neo Classical theory (Harahap, 1995), demands for economic transformation are no longer merely pursuing growth, but furthermore the transformation demanded and pursued is a scope of life that concerns the basic needs of global, regional and national societies that have dimensions. The first is justice by developing patterns that are able to sustain the balance between too much and too little to consume the earth's power source. Thus, the equitable distribution will be realized in the role of the economy as well as the control of resources and economic activities that are evenly distributed across all levels of society. Economic power is not concentrated centrally in the hands of a handful of people which creates inequality that destroys the ideals of the economic order of the self government enterprise or a shared economy.

The second is the sustainability by increasing economic production results do not arbitrarily deplete the earth's resources and the ability of ecosystems. But what is desired is that each generation recognizes the

obligation to preserve the earth's resources and ecosystems as rights that must be maintained for the next generation. The third is the coverage by giving and opening opportunities as wide as possible for all levels of society to participate in the role of economic life to achieve welfare improvement. It is not just giving opportunities to small groups that are centralistic, which will cause social inequality and conflict.

The aspirations towards building a just, sustainable economy and the coverage demanded by the values of globalization require a variety of laws and regulations that are fast, in line with the very rapid changes in the global economy. In general, the law aims to create a balance of interests in the form of legal certainty so that proportional justice is born in a prosperous society (Hartono, 2007). The balance function also includes the structure of the economic life of the community in order to meet their needs. The balance order is very important to be realized in the economic order in the form of laws and regulations. For Indonesia, the legal order must be based on the values of the Pancasila and the 1945 Constitution as a basic norm. Which serves as the highest source of law. These principles of law should be absorbed and placed in the provisions of the laws and regulations in Indonesia, both directly stated in the articles, as well as the principles and objectives of these regulations. Thus, it can be expected that the law will be able to function in realizing a just and prosperous society, or at least achieving a balance of interests in society.

3. Method

This study was conducted using the empirical normative method. Normative-empirical legal research (applied law research) is a research that uses normative-empirical legal case studies in the form of legal behavior products. This study analyzes regulations related to monopolistic practices and unfair business competition in Indonesia, and analyzes various KPPU decisions related to monopolistic practices in several cities in Indonesia.

This normative-empirical legal research method is basically a combination of the normative legal approach with the addition of various empirical elements. In this normative-empirical research method it is also about the implementation of normative legal provisions (laws) in their actions in every particular legal event in a society. In this context, the regulatory reference used is Law No. 5 of 1999 (Anti-Monopoly Law). Other regulations are Article 34 of Law No. 5 of 1999 and Presidential Decree No. 75 of 1999 and named the Business Competition Supervisory Commission (KPPU). Several KPPU decisions analyzed were in the cities of Medan, Semarang, Surabaya, Makassar and Central Jakarta. The data analysis technique was carried out using descriptive analytical methods by referring to various reports and secondary data regarding cases handled by KPPU and bankruptcy. The analysis is also based on examples of data regarding the pricing of basic needs in the form of gas by the state gas company. Therefore, the judicial case study approach is used as an analysis in this study as a legal case study in the context of anti-monopoly and sound business practices. This is because of the conflict so that it will involve the interference of courts and the anti-monopoly commission in Indonesia to be able to provide resolution decisions regarding cases of monopoly, bankruptcy, pricing and fair competition.

4. Results

Regarding KPPU's role in enforcing Competition Law in Indonesia is that it is to oversee the implementation of Law No. 5 of 1999 (Anti-Monopoly Law) where the Commission was formed. This establishment is

based on Article 34 of Law No. 5 of 1999 which instructed that the formation of the organizational structure, duties and functions of the commission be determined through a Presidential Decree. This commission was then formed based on Presidential Decree No. 75 of 1999 and named the Business Competition Supervisory Commission (KPPU).

Therefore, Anti-Monopoly law enforcement and business competition is under the authority of the KPPU (Putri & Prananingtyas, 2020; Lee, 2015; Maarif, 2004; Wahyuningtyas, 2016). However, this does not mean that there are no other institutions authorized to handle monopoly and business competition matters. The District Court and the Supreme Court were also given the authority to settle the case. The District Court was given the authority to handle objections to the KPPU's decision and deal with violations of competition law which became a criminal case because KPPU's decisions were not carried out permanently. The Supreme Court is authorized to settle cases of violation of competition law in the case of an appeal against the district court decision. As an independent institution, it can be said that the authority possessed by KPPU is very large which includes the authority possessed by the judiciary. This authority includes investigations, prosecutions, consultations, examining, adjudicating, and deciding cases.

Table 1. Postponement of Debt Payment Obligations and Bankruptcy Cases

Commercial Court	Postponement		Bankruptcy	
	Semester I 2019	Semester I 2020	Semester I 2019	Semester I 2020
Medan	14	14	3	3
Semarang	7	16	12	16
Surabaya	24	36	16	4
Makassar	6	1	2	2
Jakarta Pusat	112	182	43	22
Total	163	249	76	47

In the context of constitutional law, KPPU is a state auxiliary organ that has the authority under Law No. 5 of 1999 to enforce business competition law. In a simple state auxiliary organ is a state institution formed outside the Constitution and is an institution that helps carry out the duties of the main state institutions (executive, legislative, and judiciary) which are often also referred to as quasi-independent state institutions (Risnain, 2018). The role of a quasi-independent state institution becomes important as a responsive effort for countries that are transitioning from authoritarianism to democracy (Kagramanto, 2007).




Figure 1. Diagram of No. of Postponement of Debt Payment Obligations and Bankruptcy Cases

KPPU's position in fuel subsidies can be an example in this context (Iwantono, 2003). As understood, Law No. 22 Year 2001 regarding Oil and Gas amended by the Constitutional Court ordered the government to regulate prices not limited to subsidized fuel. KPPU is in a position to support subsidies while asking that the government set limits on the price of non-subsidized fuel, so that the competitive landscape is that subsidized fuel is available, while non-subsidized fuel is affordable. Business actors compete for the market (tenders to become subsidized fuel suppliers) and in the market (head-to-head competition) in the range below the upper limit price for non-subsidized fuel. In other words, KPPU is not anti-subsidized. However, it has a hard position when subsidies are used as weapons to blackmail people with the mode of reducing subsidized goods. The aim is to condition the people to buy non-subsidized goods which are first reduced by volume and raised in price. It is very clear that if nationalism is interpreted as the spirit of subsidies to help the people's low purchasing power, then KPPU is one of the pillars of this (Widiyanti et al., 2019; Wahyuningtyas, 2014; Simbolon, 2019; Wattegama et al., 2008). As a role of KPPU in providing fair pricing, the findings of this study showed the adjustments to the Decree of the Board of Directors of PT Perusahaan Gas Negara (Persero) Tbk. No. 006904.K/HK.00.01/UT/2013 dated July 31, 2015 concerning Gas Prices in Business Entity Certificate in Distribution Region III for Service and Commercial Industry Customers as well as Manufacturing and Power Generation Industry Customers are in Table 2.

Table 2. Price Adjustment of Gas by KPPU

No.	Price Classification	Enforcement	Amount	Surcharge provisions
1.	P0	1 August 2015	IDR 7.400/ m ³	120%
2.	P1	1 August 2015	IDR 167.600/MMB TU + IDR770/ m ³	120%
3.	P2	1 August 2015	IDR 167.600/MMB TU + IDR 750/ m ³	120%

4.	General Price	1 August 2015	IDR 167.600/MMB TU + IDR 850/ m ³	120%
----	---------------	---------------	---	------

Source: Case Decision of No. 09/KPPU-L/2016

President with the approval of the DPR appointed KPPU members in carrying out their duties are responsible to the President. This is in line with practice in USA where the FTC is responsible to the President. This provision is reasonable because KPPU carries out part of the duties of the government, while the highest authority of the government is under the President. Nevertheless, it does not mean that KPPU in carrying out its duties cannot be free from government interference. Independence is still maintained by the involvement of the DPR to participate in determining and controlling the appointment and dismissal of KPPU members. Besides the duties and authority possessed by KPPU which is so important, in reality, KPPU still experiences obstacles in carrying out its duties. These constraints cause KPPU to not be able to carry out their duties optimally. For instance, KPPU has the authority to conduct research and investigation, but KPPU does not have the authority to conduct searches on business actors who are indicated to have violated Law No. 5 of 1999. In conducting research and investigations, KPPU is often constrained by the nature of company confidentiality, so that KPPU cannot obtain data company needed. Although KPPU is authorized to request information from Government agencies, up to now there has not been a good collaboration between KPPU and government agencies in the matter of investigating allegations of unfair business competition. As a result, KPPU often experiences difficulties in carrying out their duties due to lack of supporting data. In addition, KPPU is authorized to summon business actors or witnesses, but KPPU cannot force their presence. The existence of these obstacles resulted in the Commission not being able to optimally exercise its authority. In addition to overcoming the problems above, the challenge that must be answered next is to clarify the institutional status of KPPU in the constitutional system. This is important because the unclear status of the KPPU in the constitutional system makes this Commission vulnerable to debate its existence, especially when this commission carries out its duties and functions.

5. Discussion

Regarding the principle of business competition balance in the framework of Indonesian nationalism, the question that is often raised by the public is, is healthy competition in accordance with the personality of the nation which has a family economic philosophy? Some even think that the competition values as regulated in Law No. 5 Year 1999 concerning Prohibition of Monopolistic Practices and Unfair Business Competition (Competition Law) and the Business Competition Supervisory Commission (KPPU) as their supervisory institutions are entrusted by the IMF, entrusted by neo-liberal, exploitative neoliberal organizations. competition, anti-subsidies and anti-national interests.

This mindset is not wrong if it is related to the time of enactment of Law and KPPU in 1999 which coincides with the early years of the effectiveness of the IMF Letter of Intent (LoI). However, when examined

further, it appears that the desire to have instruments and policies that are pro-healthy competition and anti-conglomerate business structures was actually declared 10 years earlier by the people through the MPR as in the 1988 GBHN Economic Policy Direction which outlines: (1) developing a populist economic system that relies on fair market mechanisms with the principles of fair competition; (2) avoiding monopolistic market structures; (3) optimizing the role of government in correcting market imperfections by removing all obstacles that interfere with market mechanisms. This determination was further strengthened by TAP MPR X of 1998 which was alarming, namely "the implementation of the national economy which lacks the mandate of Article 33 of the 1945 Constitution and tends to show a very monopolistic style". This constitutional document shows that competition and KPPU are actually the culmination of the desires of the Indonesian people themselves who were dissatisfied with past business patterns and economic structures. The DPR responded by making the Competition Law the first initiative in the legislation history. So, commitment with the IMF turned out to be only a stimulant that accelerated the realization of this desire.

If nationalism is defined as a determination to protect national interests in the sense of the interests of small businesses and cooperatives, then this law has fulfilled them. Article 50 excludes the Act on small business operators and cooperatives. The law does not exclude business behaviour, but rather excludes its subjects, namely small businesses and cooperatives. This can be interpreted as the commitment of the state through the Act, as in Article 3 regarding the objectives, namely to create a conducive business climate through a fair business competition arrangement so as to ensure the certainty of equal business opportunities for large business actors, medium business actors and small business actors. With this exception, the law respects the conditions and efforts of the sustainable small businesses and cooperatives that dominate our national business actors.

Competition policy includes enforcement and regulation or government policy (Wibowo et al., 2019). If the KPPU sees that a sector is too strategic to be released from competition, due to technological reasons or the high concentration of product characteristics due to the lack of investment, the KPPU will advise the government to regulate it. If a product requires subsidies due to the low purchasing power of the people, the KPPU asks the government to give it. Furthermore, if nationalism is also interpreted as SOE control over the strategic business sector and the maximum limit of foreign ownership in certain businesses, then KPPU will not sue it. Even Article 51 of the Law justifies SOEs controlling strategic sectors as respected natural monopolies, provided they do not abuse them. The same thing is also done if the law or the government issues an upper limit or even closes on foreign ownership, the KPPU will always respect it as long as it is consistently regulated. If this happens, KPPU will guarantee fair competition between domestic business actors without discrimination. As a result, fair competition is the identity of the Indonesian people. It contains a stimulant to compete towards a business structure that is not monopolistic. Ideally, fair competition is aimed at

increasing consumer and producer welfare by reducing deadweight loss (economic inefficiency factor).

6. Conclusion

Law No. 5 of 1999 was formulated to the principle of balancing interests, namely the balance between the interests of business actors with the public interest. The formulation of the principle of balance can be found in the considerations, explanations and articles in Law No. 5 of 1999. In this context, business actors are prohibited from entering into agreements with other business actors to jointly control the production and or marketing of goods and or services which may result in monopolistic practices and or unfair business competition.

In the realization, of the principle of balance of interest in Law No. 5 of 1999 does not yet reflect proportional equity to carry out the role of the economy and control of resources and economic activities, so that it has not fully implemented the principle of economic democracy by taking into account the balance of interests. The principle of balance includes the balance between business people and the public interest. For this reason, the balance which was conducted by KPPU must refer to the laws and regulations with values of justice that are recognized in society. In applying balance, the judge in the decision is based on the principles, aims and objectives of Law No. 5 of 1999, namely maintaining public interest and increasing national economic efficiency as an effort to improve people's welfare. Lastly, the conclusion mainly highlight that Competition Law is a synthesis of two diametric points, namely free fight liberalism which adheres to unlimited competition and statism which prioritizes state ownership and control in the economy. Competition law is a bridge that guarantees competition in regulatory corridors, and in Indonesia, this role was conducted by KPPU to oversee the monopolistic practices and unfair business competition.

References

- Encyclopædia Britannica. (2017). *Service industry*. Retrieved from <https://www.britannica.com/topic/service-industry>, February 25, 2017.
- Harahap, M. Y. 1995. Development of Permanent Jurisprudence. *Mimbar Hukum* 16(5).
- Hartono, S. R. (2007). *Indonesian Economic Law*. Bayumedia Pub.
- Hübner, R. (2007). *Strategic supply chain management in process industries: An application to specialty chemicals production network design* (Vol. 594). Springer Science & Business Media.
- Iwantono, S. (2003, October). Economic Crisis and Cartel Development in Indonesia. In *5th International Cartels Workshop* (pp. 1-3).
- Kagramanto, B. L. (2007). Implementation of Law No. 5 of 1999 by KPPU. *Jurnal Ilmu Hukum Justitia*.
- Lee, A. (2015). Onwards and upwards for Indonesian antitrust. *International Financial Law Review*.
- Maarif, S. (2004). Competition Law in Indonesia: experience to be taken for the development of Competition Law in China. *Wash. U. Global Stud. L. Rev.*, 3, 333.

- Nakanishi, N. (2009). Successive Expansion and Stability of Network Integration in International Trade. In *International Trade and Economic Dynamics* (pp. 161-185). Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.
- Putri, P. K., & Prananingtyas, P. (2020). Supervision of kppu on the action of mergers done by mining companies. *Diponegoro Law Review*, 5(1), 108-123.
- Risnain, M. (2018). Eksistensi Lembaga Quasi Judisial Dalam Sistem Kekuasaan Kehakiman Di Indonesia: Kajian Terhadap Komisi Pengawas Persaingan Usaha. *Jurnal Hukum dan Peradilan*, 3(1), 49-58.
- Shimomura, K. (2009). *International trade and economic dynamics: essays in memory of Koji Shimomura*. Springer
- Simbolon, A. (2019). Prevention of monopolistic practices and unfair Business Competition through business Competition Supervision. *Journal of Legal, Ethical and Regulatory Issues* 22(1).
- Toha, K., & Retnaningsih, S. (2020). Legal policy granting status of fresh start to the individual bankrupt debtor in developing the bankruptcy law in Indonesia. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, 9(2), 157-161.
- Wahyuningtyas, S. Y. (2014). Challenges in Combating Cartels, 14 Years After the Enactment of Indonesian Competition Law. *Yearbook of Antitrust and Regulatory Studies (YARS)*, 7(10), 279-306.
- Wahyuningtyas, S. Y. (2016). The online transportation network in Indonesia: A pendulum between the sharing economy and ex ante regulation. *Competition and Regulation in Network Industries*, 17(3-4), 260-280.
- Wattegama, C., Soehardjo, J., & Kapugama, N. (2008). Telecom Regulatory and Policy Environment in Indonesia Results and Analysis of the 2008 TRE Survey. *Available at SSRN 1554762*.
- Wibowo, Y. S., Luddin, M. R., & Sari, E. (2019). Understanding Organizational Commitments in the Public Sector: A Case Study of Commissioners and Investigators at The Business Competition Supervisory Commission (KPPU). *Policy & Governance Review*, 3(3), 208-224.
- Widiyanti, R., Hidayat, N. N., Setianto, N. A., Mastuti, S., & Muatip, K. (2019, November). Vertical Integration of Broiler Industries in Indonesia (Analysis of Case Decisions No. 02/KPPU-I/2016). In *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science* (Vol. 372, No. 1, p. 012005). IOP Publishing.



Reviewer comments :

Please use the correct word: commercial court, not commercial

Done, It has been corrected

Did you mean Number? please write as is, do not abbreviate it

Done, **Number** of the postponement of debt payment obligations and bankruptcy cases

We prefer to use 'of' rather than year in writing the time of enactment

Done, Law No. 22 of 2001 regarding Oil and Gas

The term of GBHN was mentioned first here, please explain the meaning.

Done. It was rephrased with **Economic Policy Direction**:

However, when examined further, it appears that the desire to have instruments and policies that are pro-healthy competition and anti-conglomerate business structures was actually declared 10 years earlier by the people through the MPR as in the 1988 regulated Economic Policy Direction which outlines:

Use more sources from international journal to justify the findings

We have added these reference:

Juwana, H. (2002). An Overview of Indonesia's Antimonopoly Law. *Wash. U. Global Stud. L. Rev.*, 1, 185.

Roisah, K., Utama, Y.J., Saraswati, R., & Whidari, Y. (2018). Status and contemporary development of employee inventions ownership in G-20 countries. *European Research Studies Journal*, 21(2), 214–224.

Pangestu, M., Aswicahyono, H., Anas, T., & Ardyanto, D. (2002). The evolution of competition policy in Indonesia. *Review of Industrial Organization*, 21(2), 205-224.

Fox, E. M. (2000). Equality, discrimination, and competition law: Lessons from and for South Africa and Indonesia. *Harv. Int'l. LJ*, 41, 579.

Restructure the conclusion by mentioning the findings, practical and theoretical implications

Done,

The results of the study show that Law No. 5/1999 is formulated on the principle of a balance of interests, namely the balance between the interests of business actors and the public interest. The formulation of the principle of balance can be found in considerations, explanations and articles in Law Number 5 of 1999. In this context, business actors are prohibited from entering into agreements with other business actors to jointly control the

production and or marketing of their products and/or marketing. goods and or services that may result in monopolistic practices and or unfair business competition.

In the realization, of the principle of balance of interest in Law No. 5 of 1999 does not yet reflect proportional equity to carry out the role of the economy and control of resources and economic activities, so that it has not fully implemented the principle of economic democracy by taking into account the balance of interests. The principle of balance includes the balance between business people and the public interest. For this reason, the balance which was conducted by KPPU must refer to the laws and regulations with values of justice that are recognized in society. As a practical implication, in applying balance, the judge in the decision is based on the principles, aims and objectives of Law No. 5 of 1999, namely maintaining public interest and increasing national economic efficiency as an effort to improve people's welfare. Lastly, the conclusion mainly highlight that Competition Law is a synthesis of two diametric points, namely free fight liberalism which adheres to unlimited competition and statism which prioritizes state ownership and control in the economy. Competition law is a bridge that guarantees competition in regulatory corridors, and in Indonesia, this role was conducted by KPPU to oversee the monopolistic practices and unfair business competition.

If this is relevant, please cite this source:

Done. It was cited here:

If the KPPU sees that a sector is too strategic to be released from competition, due to technological reasons or the high concentration of product characteristics due to the lack of investment, the KPPU will advise the government to regulate it (Faujura et al., 2021).

Faujura, R.P., Gultom, E., & Sudjana, S. (2021). The Monopoly Practice and Unfair Business Competition in the Technology Transfer Activity Through the Foreign Patent in Indonesia. UUM Journal of Legal Studies 12(2), 69-91.

Prohibition of Monopolistic Practices and Unfair Business Competition in Indonesia: A Legal Mechanism to Balance the Public Interest



Abstract

The study is to explore the legal mechanism of prohibition of monopolistic practices and unfair business competition in Indonesia by looking at the role of Business Competition Supervisory Commission (KPPU). This study was conducted using the empirical normative method. In this context, the regulatory reference used is Law No. 5 of 1999 (Anti-Monopoly Law). Other regulations are Article 34 of Law No. 5 of 1999 and Presidential Decree No. 75 of 1999 and named the Business Competition Supervisory Commission (KPPU). Several KPPU decisions analyzed were in the cities of Medan, Semarang, Surabaya, Makassar and Central Jakarta. The results showed that Law No. 5 of 1999 regarding Prohibition of Monopolistic Practices and Unfair Business Competition in Indonesia was formulated to the principle of balancing interests, namely the balance between the interests of business actors with the public interest. The formulation of the principle of balance can be found in the considerations, explanations and articles in Law No. 5 of 1999.

Keywords: Monopolistic Practices, Legal Procedures, Unfair Competition, Business Competition, Balance Principle.

1. Introduction

In the era of globalization and free trade as it is today, economic activity is becoming increasingly intense and broad reaching all parts of the world and has a broad scope of human activity wherever located, distance and time are no longer a barrier to economic activity (Nakanishi, 2009; Shimomura, 2009). Economic globalization activities are manifested in various forms: liberalization of trade in goods and services, increasing migration temporarily or permanently, foreign direct investment by multinational companies, and standardization of various regulations. Furthermore, advances in communication and network technology provide faster and greater means of transporting goods, are easier to provide services, and are faster and clearer in conveying information. In the perspective of fair competition, economic activity is basically a series of activities that are simultaneous, comprehensive and continuous (Hartono, 2007; Toha & Retnaningsih, 2020). Those who carry out economic activities are called economic actors, both individuals and groups or business entities. In general, economic activities can be classified into two main activities, namely producing goods and/or services. In general, all economic activities are divided into 2 categories, namely goods and services. Production of goods, including agriculture, mining, manufacturing, construction, etc. Each of these sectors produces material products. The service industry includes banking, communication, computer software development, etc. (Encyclopædia Britannica, 2017), and activities to distribute goods and/or services from producers,

intermediaries to consumers (Hübner, 2007). Furthermore, these two main activities can be reduced to various other fields of activity that are more detailed.

It must be recognized that economic activities cannot be separated from competition between business actors. This is a requirement for the implementation of a market economy. Moreover, in the global era that demands a free market economic system, so that competition between business actors will be more open. Sometimes the business competition is fair competition, but on the contrary, business actors can conduct unfair competition in order to get the maximum profit. With regard to business competition law, in Law No. 5 of 1999 has established a body or commission called the Business Competition Supervisory Commission (KPPU) which is given such broad authority ranging from receiving reports on alleged monopolistic practices and or unfair business competition, summoning business actors, to deciding cases and imposing sanctions on businessmen), bearing in mind the provisions of procedural law that are specific in handling business competition cases. Furthermore, in the case of business competition as regulated in Law No. 5 of 1999 loaded with economic legal content, being on the same side of the judiciary as an institution that carries out the functions of the judiciary power is required to provide justice and legal certainty for all parties and furthermore the judge's decision must be able to provide balance and benefit for all parties, then in law enforcement business competition Judges are required to be able to understand the principles of economic law and general legal principles while at the same time creating balance through their decisions.

2. Literature Review

In the era of globalization, the demands and interests of the protection of members of the community in realizing the ideals of welfare state require an increasingly extensive legislation regulation. In Neo-classical theory, demands for economic transformation are no longer merely pursuing growth, but furthermore the transformation demanded and pursued is a scope of life that concerns the basic needs of global, regional and national societies that have dimensions (Harahap, 1995). The first is justice by developing patterns that are able to sustain the balance between too much and too little to consume the earth's power source. Thus, the equitable distribution will be realized in the role of the economy as well as the control of resources and economic activities that are evenly distributed across all levels of society. Economic power is not concentrated centrally in the hands of a handful of people which creates inequality that destroys the ideals of the economic order of the self government enterprise or a shared economy.

The second is the sustainability by increasing economic production results do not arbitrarily deplete the earth's resources and the ability of ecosystems. However, what is desired is that each generation recognizes the obligation to preserve the earth's resources and ecosystems as rights that must be maintained for the next generation. The third is the coverage by giving and opening opportunities as wide as possible for all levels of society to participate in the role of economic life to achieve welfare

improvement. It is not just giving opportunities to small groups that are centralistic, which will cause social inequality and conflict.

The aspirations towards building a just, sustainable economy and the coverage demanded by the values of globalization require a variety of laws and regulations that are fast, in line with the very rapid changes in the global economy. In general, the law aims to create a balance of interests in the form of legal certainty so that proportional justice is born in a prosperous society (Hartono, 2007). The balance function also includes the structure of the economic life of the community in order to meet their needs. The balance order is very important to be realized in the economic order in the form of laws and regulations. For Indonesia, the legal order must be based on the values of the Pancasila and the 1945 Constitution as a basic norm which serves as the highest source of law. These principles of law should be absorbed and placed in the provisions of the laws and regulations in Indonesia, both directly stated in the articles, as well as the principles and objectives of these regulations. Thus, it can be expected that the law will be able to function in realizing a just and prosperous society, or at least achieving a balance of interests in society.

3. Method

This study was conducted using the empirical normative method. Normative-empirical legal research (applied law research) is a research that uses normative-empirical legal case studies in the form of legal behavior products. This study analyzes regulations related to monopolistic practices and unfair business competition in Indonesia, and analyzes various KPPU decisions related to monopolistic practices in several cities in Indonesia.

This normative-empirical legal research method is basically a combination of the normative legal approach with the addition of various empirical elements. In this normative-empirical research method it is also about the implementation of normative legal provisions (laws) in their actions in every particular legal event in a society. In this context, the regulatory reference used is Law No. 5 of 1999 (Anti-Monopoly Law). Other regulations are Article 34 of Law No. 5 of 1999 and Presidential Decree No. 75 of 1999 and named the Business Competition Supervisory Commission (KPPU). Several KPPU decisions analyzed were in the cities of Medan, Semarang, Surabaya, Makassar and Central Jakarta. The data analysis technique was carried out using descriptive analytical methods by referring to various reports and secondary data regarding cases handled by KPPU and bankruptcy. The analysis is also based on examples of data regarding the pricing of basic needs in the form of gas by the state gas company. Therefore, the judicial case study approach is used as an analysis in this study as a legal case study in the context of anti-monopoly and sound business practices. This is because of the conflict so that it will involve the interference of courts and the anti-monopoly commission in Indonesia to be able to provide resolution decisions regarding cases of monopoly, bankruptcy, pricing and fair competition.

4. Results

Regarding KPPU's role in enforcing Competition Law in Indonesia is that it is to oversee the implementation of Law No. 5 of 1999 (Anti-Monopoly Law) where the Commission was formed. This establishment is based on Article 34 of Law No. 5 of 1999 which instructed that the formation of the organizational structure, duties and functions of the commission be determined through a Presidential Decree. This

commission was then formed based on Presidential Decree No. 75 of 1999 and named the Business Competition Supervisory Commission (KPPU).

Therefore, Anti-Monopoly law enforcement and business competition is under the authority of the KPPU (Putri & Prananingtyas, 2020; Lee, 2015; Maarif, 2004; Wahyuningtyas, 2016). However, this does not mean that there are no other institutions authorized to handle monopoly and business competition matters. The District Court and the Supreme Court were also given the authority to settle the case. The District Court was given the authority to handle objections to the KPPU's decision and deal with violations of competition law which became a criminal case because KPPU's decisions were not carried out permanently. The Supreme Court is authorized to settle cases of violation of competition law in the case of an appeal against the district court decision. As an independent institution, it can be said that the authority possessed by KPPU is very large which includes the authority possessed by the judiciary. This authority includes investigations, prosecutions, consultations, examining, adjudicating, and deciding cases.

Table 1. Postponement of Debt Payment Obligations and Bankruptcy Cases

Commercial Court	Postponement		Bankruptcy		In
	Semester I 2019	Semester I 2020	Semester I 2019	Semester I 2020	
Medan	14	14	3	3	
Semarang	7	16	12	16	
Surabaya	24	36	16	4	
Makassar	6	1	2	2	
Central Jakarta	112	182	43	22	
Total	163	249	76	47	

the context of constitutional law, KPPU is a state auxiliary organ that has the authority under Law No. 5 of 1999 to enforce business competition law. In a simple state auxiliary organ is a state institution formed outside the Constitution and is an institution that helps carry out the duties of the main state institutions (executive, legislative, and judiciary) which are often also referred to as quasi-independent state institutions (Risnain, 2018). The role of a quasi-independent state institution becomes important as a responsive effort for countries that are transitioning from authoritarianism to democracy (Kagramanto, 2007).




Figure 1. Number of the postponement of debt payment obligations and bankruptcy cases

KPPU's position in fuel subsidies can be an example in this context (Iwantono, 2003). As understood, Law No. 22 of 2001 regarding Oil and Gas amended by the Constitutional Court ordered the government to regulate prices not limited to subsidized fuel. KPPU is in a position to support subsidies while asking that the government set limits on the price of non-subsidized fuel, so that the competitive landscape is that subsidized fuel is available, while non-subsidized fuel is affordable. Business actors compete for the market (tenders to become subsidized fuel suppliers) and in the market (head-to-head competition) in the range below the upper limit price for non-subsidized fuel. In other words, KPPU is not anti-subsidized. However, it has a hard position when subsidies are used as weapons to blackmail people with the mode of reducing subsidized goods. The aim is to condition the people to buy non-subsidized goods which are first reduced by volume and raised in price. It is very clear that if nationalism is interpreted as the spirit of subsidies to help the people's low purchasing power, then KPPU is one of the pillars of this (Widiyanti et al., 2019; Wahyuningtyas, 2014; Simbolon, 2019; Wattegama et al., 2008). As a role of KPPU in providing fair pricing, the findings of this study showed the adjustments to the Decree of the Board of Directors of PT Perusahaan Gas Negara (Persero) Tbk. No. 006904.K/HK.00.01/UT/2013 dated July 31, 2015 concerning Gas Prices in Business Entity Certificate in Distribution Region III for Service and Commercial Industry Customers as well as Manufacturing and Power Generation Industry Customers are in Table 2.

Table 2. Price Adjustment of Gas by KPPU

No.	Price Classification	Enforcement	Amount	Surcharge provisions
1.	P0	1 August 2015	IDR 7.400/ m ³	120%
2.	P1	1 August 2015	IDR 167.600/MMB TU + IDR770/ m ³	120%
3.	P2	1 August 2015	IDR 167.600/MMB TU + IDR 750/ m ³	120%
4.	General Price	1 August 2015	IDR 167.600/MMB TU + IDR 850/	120%

		m ³	
--	--	----------------	--

Source: Case Decision of No. 09/KPPU-L/2016

President with the approval of the DPR appointed KPPU members in carrying out their duties are responsible to the President. This is in line with practice in USA where the FTC is responsible to the President. This provision is reasonable because KPPU carries out part of the duties of the government, while the highest authority of the government is under the President. Nevertheless, it does not mean that KPPU in carrying out its duties cannot be free from government interference. Independence is still maintained by the involvement of the DPR to participate in determining and controlling the appointment and dismissal of KPPU members. Besides the duties and authority possessed by KPPU which is so important, in reality, KPPU still experiences obstacles in carrying out its duties. These constraints cause KPPU to not be able to carry out their duties optimally. For instance, KPPU has the authority to conduct research and investigation, but KPPU does not have the authority to conduct searches on business actors who are indicated to have violated Law No. 5 of 1999. In conducting research and investigations, KPPU is often constrained by the nature of company confidentiality, so that KPPU cannot obtain data company needed. Although KPPU is authorized to request information from Government agencies, up to now there has not been a good collaboration between KPPU and government agencies in the matter of investigating allegations of unfair business competition. As a result, KPPU often experiences difficulties in carrying out their duties due to lack of supporting data. In addition, KPPU is authorized to summon business actors or witnesses, but KPPU cannot force their presence. The existence of these obstacles resulted in the Commission not being able to optimally exercise its authority. In addition to overcoming the problems above, the challenge that must be answered next is to clarify the institutional status of KPPU in the constitutional system. This is important because the unclear status of the KPPU in the constitutional system makes this Commission vulnerable to debate its existence, especially when this commission carries out its duties and functions.

5. Discussion

Regarding the principle of business competition balance in the framework of Indonesian nationalism, the question that is often raised by the public is, is healthy competition in accordance with the personality of the nation which has a family economic philosophy? Some even think that the competition values as regulated in Law No. 5 Year 1999 concerning Prohibition of Monopolistic Practices and Unfair Business Competition (Competition Law) and the Business Competition Supervisory Commission (KPPU) as their supervisory institutions are entrusted by the IMF, entrusted by neo-liberal, exploitative neoliberal organizations. competition, anti-subsidies and anti-national interests.

This mindset is not wrong if it is related to the time of enactment of Law and KPPU in 1999 which coincides with the early years of the effectiveness of the IMF Letter of Intent (LoI). However, when examined further, it appears that the desire to have instruments and policies that

are pro-healthy competition and anti-conglomerate business structures was actually declared 10 years earlier by the people through the MPR as in the 1988 regulated Economic Policy Direction which outlines: (1) developing a populist economic system that relies on fair market mechanisms with the principles of fair competition; (2) avoiding monopolistic market structures; (3) optimizing the role of government in correcting market imperfections by removing all obstacles that interfere with market mechanisms. This determination was further strengthened by MPR Decree No. 10 of 1998 which was alarming, namely the implementation of the national economy which lacks the mandate of Article 33 of the 1945 Constitution and tends to show a very monopolistic style. This constitutional document shows that competition and KPPU are actually the culmination of the desires of the Indonesian people themselves who were dissatisfied with past business patterns and economic structures. The DPR responded by making the Competition Law the first initiative in the legislation history. So, commitment with the IMF turned out to be only a stimulant that accelerated the realization of this desire.

If nationalism is defined as a determination to protect national interests in the sense of the interests of small businesses and cooperatives, then this law has fulfilled them. Article 50 excludes the Act on small business operators and cooperatives. The law does not exclude business behaviour, but rather excludes its subjects, namely small businesses and cooperatives (Juwana, 2002; Fox, 2000). This can be interpreted as the commitment of the state through the Act, as in Article 3 regarding the objectives, namely to create a conducive business climate through a fair business competition arrangement so as to ensure the certainty of equal business opportunities for large business actors, medium business actors and small business actors. With this exception, the law respects the conditions and efforts of the sustainable small businesses and cooperatives that dominate our national business actors (Roisah et al., 2018; Pangestu et al., 2002).

Competition policy includes enforcement and regulation or government policy (Wibowo et al., 2019). If the KPPU sees that a sector is too strategic to be released from competition, due to technological reasons or the high concentration of product characteristics due to the lack of investment, the KPPU will advise the government to regulate it (Faujura et al., 2021). If a product requires subsidies due to the low purchasing power of the people, the KPPU asks the government to give it. Furthermore, if nationalism is also interpreted as SOE control over the strategic business sector and the maximum limit of foreign ownership in certain businesses, then KPPU will not sue it. Even Article 51 of the Law justifies SOEs controlling strategic sectors as respected natural monopolies, provided they do not abuse them. The same thing is also done if the law or the government issues an upper limit or even closes on foreign ownership, the KPPU will always respect it as long as it is consistently regulated. If this happens, KPPU will guarantee fair competition between domestic business actors without discrimination. As a result, fair competition is the identity of the Indonesian people. It contains a stimulant to compete towards a business structure that is not

monopolistic. Ideally, fair competition is aimed at increasing consumer and producer welfare by reducing deadweight loss (economic inefficiency factor).

6. Conclusion

The results of the study show that Law No. 5/1999 is formulated on the principle of a balance of interests, namely the balance between the interests of business actors and the public interest. The formulation of the principle of balance can be found in considerations, explanations and articles in Law Number 5 of 1999. In this context, business actors are prohibited from entering into agreements with other business actors to jointly control the production and or marketing of their products and/or marketing goods and or services that may result in monopolistic practices and or unfair business competition.

In the realization, of the principle of balance of interest in Law No. 5 of 1999 does not yet reflect proportional equity to carry out the role of the economy and control of resources and economic activities, so that it has not fully implemented the principle of economic democracy by taking into account the balance of interests. The principle of balance includes the balance between business people and the public interest. For this reason, the balance which was conducted by KPPU must refer to the laws and regulations with values of justice that are recognized in society. As a practical implication, in applying balance, the judge in the decision is based on the principles, aims and objectives of Law No. 5 of 1999, namely maintaining public interest and increasing national economic efficiency as an effort to improve people's welfare. Lastly, the conclusion mainly highlight that Competition Law is a synthesis of two diametric points, namely free fight liberalism which adheres to unlimited competition and statism which prioritizes state ownership and control in the economy. Competition law is a bridge that guarantees competition in regulatory corridors, and in Indonesia, this role was conducted by KPPU to oversee the monopolistic practices and unfair business competition.

References

- Encyclopædia Britannica. (2017). *Service industry*. Retrieved from <https://www.britannica.com/topic/service-industry>, February 25, 2017.
- Faujura, R.P., Gultom, E., & Sudjana, S. (2021). The Monopoly Practice and Unfair Business Competition in the Technology Transfer Activity Through the Foreign Patent in Indonesia. *UUM Journal of Legal Studies* 12(2), 69-91.
- Fox, E. M. (2000). Equality, discrimination, and competition law: Lessons from and for South Africa and Indonesia. *Harv. Int'l. LJ*, 41, 579.
- Harahap, M. Y. 1995. Development of Permanent Jurisprudence. *Mimbar Hukum* 16(5).
- Hartono, S. R. (2007). *Indonesian Economic Law*. Bayumedia Pub.
- Hübner, R. (2007). *Strategic supply chain management in process industries: An application to specialty chemicals production network design* (Vol. 594). Springer Science & Business Media.
- Iwantono, S. (2003, October). Economic Crisis and Cartel Development in Indonesia. In *5th International Cartels Workshop* (pp. 1-3).
- Juwana, H. (2002). An Overview of Indonesia's Antimonopoly Law. *Wash. U. Global Stud. L. Rev.*, 1, 185.

- Kagramanto, B. L. (2007). Implementation of Law No. 5 of 1999 by KPPU. *Jurnal Ilmu Hukum Justitia*.
- Lee, A. (2015). Onwards and upwards for Indonesian antitrust. *International Financial Law Review*.
- Maarif, S. (2004). Competition Law in Indonesia: experience to be taken for the development of Competition Law in China. *Wash. U. Global Stud. L. Rev.*, 3, 333.
- Nakanishi, N. (2009). Successive Expansion and Stability of Network Integration in International Trade. In *International Trade and Economic Dynamics* (pp. 161-185). Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.
- Pangestu, M., Aswicahyono, H., Anas, T., & Ardyanto, D. (2002). The evolution of competition policy in Indonesia. *Review of Industrial Organization*, 21(2), 205-224.
- Putri, P. K., & Prananingtyas, P. (2020). Supervision of kppu on the action of mergers done by mining companies. *Diponegoro Law Review*, 5(1), 108-123.
- Risnain, M. (2018). Eksistensi Lembaga Quasi Judisial Dalam Sistem Kekuasaan Kehakiman Di Indonesia: Kajian Terhadap Komisi Pengawas Persaingan Usaha. *Jurnal Hukum dan Peradilan*, 3(1), 49-58.
- Roisah, K., Utama, Y.J., Saraswati, R., & Whidari, Y. (2018). Status and contemporary development of employee inventions ownership in G-20 countries. *European Research Studies Journal*, 21(2), 214-224.
- Shimomura, K. (2009). *International trade and economic dynamics: essays in memory of Koji Shimomura*. Springer
- Simbolon, A. (2019). Prevention of monopolistic practices and unfair Business Competition through business Competition Supervision. *Journal of Legal, Ethical and Regulatory Issues* 22(1).
- Toha, K., & Retnaningsih, S. (2020). Legal policy granting status of fresh start to the individual bankrupt debtor in developing the bankruptcy law in Indonesia. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, 9(2), 157-161.
- Wahyuningtyas, S. Y. (2014). Challenges in Combating Cartels, 14 Years After the Enactment of Indonesian Competition Law. *Yearbook of Antitrust and Regulatory Studies (YARS)*, 7(10), 279-306.
- Wahyuningtyas, S. Y. (2016). The online transportation network in Indonesia: A pendulum between the sharing economy and ex ante regulation. *Competition and Regulation in Network Industries*, 17(3-4), 260-280.
- Wattegama, C., Soehardjo, J., & Kapugama, N. (2008). Telecom Regulatory and Policy Environment in Indonesia Results and Analysis of the 2008 TRE Survey. *Available at SSRN 1554762*.
- Wibowo, Y. S., Luddin, M. R., & Sari, E. (2019). Understanding Organizational Commitments in the Public Sector: A Case Study of Commissioners and Investigators at The Business Competition Supervisory Commission (KPPU). *Policy & Governance Review*, 3(3), 208-224.
- Widiyanti, R., Hidayat, N. N., Setianto, N. A., Mastuti, S., & Muatip, K. (2019, November). Vertical Integration of Broiler Industries in Indonesia (Analysis of Case Decisions No. 02/KPPU-I/2016). In *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science* (Vol. 372, No. 1, p. 012005). IOP Publishing.

Prohibition of Monopolistic Practices and Unfair Business Competition in Indonesia: A Legal Mechanism to Balance the Public Interest

Ni Luh Made Mahendrawati*



Affiliation required. ???

Abstract: The study is to explore the legal mechanism of prohibition of monopolistic practices and unfair business competition in Indonesia by looking at the role of the Business Competition Supervisory Commission (KPPU). This study was conducted using the empirical normative method. In this context, the regulatory reference used is Law No. 5 of 1999 (Anti-Monopoly Law). Other regulations are Article 34 of Law No. 5 of 1999 and Presidential Decree No. 75 of 1999 and named the Business Competition Supervisory Commission (KPPU). Several KPPU decisions analyzed were in the cities of Medan, Semarang, Surabaya, Makassar and Central Jakarta. The results showed that Law No. 5 of 1999 regarding the Prohibition of Monopolistic Practices and Unfair Business Competition in Indonesia was formulated to the principle of balancing interests, namely the balance between the interests of business actors with the public interest. The formulation of the principle of balance can be found in the considerations, explanations and articles in Law No. 5 of 1999.

Keywords: Monopolistic Practices, Legal Procedures, Unfair Competition, Business Competition, Balance Principle.

1. INTRODUCTION

In the era of globalization and free trade as it is today, economic activity is becoming increasingly intense and broad-reaching all parts of the world and has a broad scope of human activity wherever located, distance and time are no longer a barrier to economic activity (Nakanishi, 2009; Shimomura, 2009). Economic globalization activities are manifested in various forms: liberalization of trade in goods and services, increasing migration temporarily or permanently, foreign direct investment by multinational companies, and standardization of various regulations. Furthermore, advances in communication and network technology provide faster and greater means of transporting goods, are easier to provide services, and are faster and clearer in conveying information. In the perspective of fair competition, economic activity is a series of activities that are simultaneous, comprehensive and continuous (Hartono, 2007; Toha & Retnaningsih, 2020). Those who carry out economic activities are called economic actors, both individuals and groups or business entities. In general, economic activities can be classified into two main activities, namely producing goods and/or services. In general, all economic activities are divided into 2 categories, namely goods and services. Production of goods, including agriculture, mining, manufacturing, construction, etc. Each of these sectors produces material products. The service industry includes banking, communication,

computer software development, etc. (Encyclopædia Britannica, 2017), and activities to distribute goods and/or services from producers, intermediaries to consumers (Hübner, 2007). Furthermore, these two main activities can be reduced to various other fields of activity that are more detailed.

It must be recognized that economic activities cannot be separated from competition between business actors. This is a requirement for the implementation of a market economy. Moreover, in the global era that demands a free market economic system, so that competition between business actors will be more open. Sometimes the business competition is fair competition, but on the contrary, business actors can conduct the unfair competition in order to get the maximum profit. With regard to business competition law, in Law No. 5 of 1999 has established a body or commission called the Business Competition Supervisory Commission (KPPU) which is given such broad authority ranging from receiving reports on alleged monopolistic practices and or unfair business competition, summoning business actors, to deciding cases and imposing sanctions on businessmen), bearing in mind the provisions of procedural law that are specific in handling business competition cases. Furthermore, in the case of business competition as regulated in Law No. 5 of 1999 loaded with economic legal content, being on the same side of the judiciary as an institution that carries out the functions of the judiciary power is required to provide justice and legal certainty for all parties and the judge's decision must be able to provide balance and benefit

*Address correspondence to this author at the Affiliation required, ???; Tel: ?????????????????; Fax: ?????????????????; E-mail: mahendrawati.warmadewa@gmail.com

for all parties, then in law enforcement business competition Judges are required to be able to understand the principles of economic law and general legal principles while at the same time creating balance through their decisions.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

In the era of globalization, the demands and interests of the protection of members of the community in realizing the ideals of the welfare state require an increasingly extensive legislation regulation. In Neo-classical theory, demands for economic transformation are no longer merely pursuing growth, but furthermore, the transformation demanded and pursued is a scope of life that concerns the basic needs of global, regional and national societies that have dimensions (Harahap, 1995). The first is justice by developing patterns that can sustain the balance between too much and too little to consume the earth's power source. Thus, equitable distribution will be realized in the role of the economy as well as the control of resources and economic activities that are evenly distributed across all levels of society. Economic power is not concentrated centrally in the hands of a handful of people which creates inequality that destroys the ideals of the economic order of the self-government enterprise or a shared economy.

The second is the sustainability by increasing economic production results do not arbitrarily deplete the earth's resources and the ability of ecosystems. However, what is desired is that each generation recognizes the obligation to preserve the earth's resources and ecosystems as rights that must be maintained for the next generation. The third is the coverage by giving and opening opportunities as wide as possible for all levels of society to participate in the role of economic life to achieve welfare improvement. It is not just giving opportunities to small groups that are centralistic, which will cause social inequality and conflict.

The aspirations towards building a just, sustainable economy and the coverage demanded by the values of globalization require a variety of laws and regulations that are fast, in line with the very rapid changes in the global economy. In general, the law aims to create a balance of interests in the form of legal certainty so that proportional justice is born in a prosperous society (Hartono, 2007). The balance function also includes the structure of the economic life of the community in order to meet their needs. The balance order is very

important to be realized in the economic order in the form of laws and regulations. For Indonesia, the legal order must be based on the values of the Pancasila and the 1945 Constitution as a basic norm that serves as the highest source of law. These principles of law should be absorbed and placed in the provisions of the laws and regulations in Indonesia, both directly stated in the articles, as well as the principles and objectives of these regulations. Thus, it can be expected that the law will be able to function in realizing a just and prosperous society or at least achieving a balance of interests in society.

3. METHOD

This study was conducted using the empirical normative method. Normative-empirical legal research (applied law research) is research that uses normative-empirical legal case studies in the form of legal behavior products. This study analyzes regulations related to monopolistic practices and unfair business competition in Indonesia and analyzes various KPPU decisions related to monopolistic practices in several cities in Indonesia.

This normative-empirical legal research method is basically a combination of the normative legal approach with the addition of various empirical elements. This normative-empirical research method, it is also about the implementation of normative legal provisions (laws) in their actions in every particular legal event in society. In this context, the regulatory reference used is Law No. 5 of 1999 (Anti-Monopoly Law). Other regulations are Article 34 of Law No. 5 of 1999 and Presidential Decree No. 75 of 1999 and named the Business Competition Supervisory Commission (KPPU). Several KPPU decisions analyzed were in the cities of Medan, Semarang, Surabaya, Makassar and Central Jakarta. The data analysis technique was carried out using descriptive-analytical methods by referring to various reports and secondary data regarding cases handled by KPPU and bankruptcy. The analysis is also based on examples of data regarding the pricing of basic needs in the form of gas by the state gas company. Therefore, the judicial case study approach is used as an analysis in this study as a legal case study in the context of anti-monopoly and sound business practices. This is because of the conflict so that it will involve the interference of courts and the anti-monopoly commission in Indonesia to be able to provide resolution decisions regarding cases of monopoly, bankruptcy, pricing and fair competition.

4. RESULTS

Regarding KPPU's role in enforcing Competition Law in Indonesia is that it is to oversee the implementation of Law No. 5 of 1999 (Anti-Monopoly Law) where the Commission was formed. This establishment is based on Article 34 of Law No. 5 of 1999 which instructed that the formation of the organizational structure, duties and functions of the commission be determined through a Presidential Decree. This commission was then formed based on Presidential Decree No. 75 of 1999 and named the Business Competition Supervisory Commission (KPPU).

Therefore, Anti-Monopoly law enforcement and business competition are under the authority of the KPPU (Putri & Prananingtyas, 2020; Lee, 2015; Maarif, 2004; Wahyuningtyas, 2016). However, this does not mean that there are no other institutions authorized to handle monopoly and business competition matters. The District Court and the Supreme Court were also

given the authority to settle the case. The District Court was given the authority to handle objections to the KPPU's decision and deal with violations of competition law which became a criminal case because KPPU's decisions were not carried out permanently. The Supreme Court is authorized to settle cases of violation of competition law in the case of an appeal against the district court decision. As an independent institution, it can be said that the authority possessed by KPPU is very large which includes the authority possessed by the judiciary. This authority includes investigations, prosecutions, consultations, examining, adjudicating, and deciding cases.

In the context of constitutional law, KPPU is a state auxiliary organ that has the authority under Law No. 5 of 1999 to enforce business competition law. A simple state auxiliary organ is a state institution formed outside the Constitution and is an institution that helps carry out the duties of the main state institutions (executive, legislative, and judiciary) which are often also referred to as quasi-independent state institutions

Table 1: Postponement of Debt Payment Obligations and Bankruptcy Cases

Commercial Court	Postponement		Bankruptcy	
	Semester I 2019	Semester I 2020	Semester I 2019	Semester I 2020
Medan	14	14	3	3
Semarang	7	16	12	16
Surabaya	24	36	16	4
Makassar	6	1	2	2
Central Jakarta	112	182	43	22
Total	163	249	76	47




Figure 1: Number of the postponement of debt payment obligations and bankruptcy cases.

(Risnain, 2018). The role of a quasi-independent state institution becomes important as a responsive effort for countries that are transitioning from authoritarianism to democracy (Kagramanto, 2007).

KPPU's position in fuel subsidies can be an example in this context (Iwantono, 2003). As understood, Law No. 22 of 2001 regarding Oil and Gas amended by the Constitutional Court ordered the government to regulate prices not limited to subsidized fuel. KPPU is in a position to support subsidies while asking that the government set limits on the price of non-subsidized fuel so that the competitive landscape is that subsidized fuel is available, while non-subsidized fuel is affordable. Business actors compete for the market (tenders to become subsidized fuel suppliers) and in the market (head-to-head competition) in the range below the upper limit price for non-subsidized fuel. In other words, KPPU is not anti-subsidized. However, it has a hard position when subsidies are used as weapons to blackmail people with the mode of reducing subsidized goods. The aim is to condition the people to buy non-subsidized goods which are first reduced by volume and raised in price. It is very clear that if nationalism is interpreted as the spirit of subsidies to help the people's low purchasing power, then KPPU is one of the pillars of this (Widiyanti *et al.*, 2019; Wahyuningtyas, 2014; Simbolon, 2019; Wattegama *et al.*, 2008). As a role of KPPU in providing fair pricing, the findings of this study showed the adjustments to the Decree of the Board of Directors of PT Perusahaan Gas Negara (Persero) Tbk. No. 006904.K/HK.00.01/UT/2013 dated July 31, 2015, concerning Gas Prices in Business Entity Certificate in Distribution Region III for Service and Commercial Industry Customers as well as Manufacturing and Power Generation Industry Customers are in Table 2.

President with the approval of the DPR appointed KPPU members in carrying out their duties are responsible to the President. This is in line with practice in the USA where the FTC is responsible to the President. This provision is reasonable because KPPU

carries out part of the duties of the government, while the highest authority of the government is under the President. Nevertheless, it does not mean that KPPU in carrying out its duties cannot be free from government interference. Independence is still maintained by the involvement of the DPR to participate in determining and controlling the appointment and dismissal of KPPU members. Besides the duties and authority possessed by KPPU which is so important, in reality, KPPU still experiences obstacles in carrying out its duties. These constraints cause KPPU to not be able to carry out their duties optimally. For instance, KPPU has the authority to conduct research and investigation, but KPPU does not have the authority to conduct searches on business actors who are indicated to have violated Law No. 5 of 1999. In conducting research and investigations, KPPU is often constrained by the nature of company confidentiality, so that KPPU cannot obtain data the company needed. Although KPPU is authorized to request information from Government agencies, up to now there has not been a good collaboration between KPPU and government agencies in the matter of investigating allegations of unfair business competition. As a result, KPPU often experiences difficulties in carrying out their duties due to lack of supporting data. In addition, KPPU is authorized to summon business actors or witnesses, but KPPU cannot force their presence. The existence of these obstacles resulted in the Commission not being able to optimally exercise its authority. In addition to overcoming the problems above, the challenge that must be answered next is to clarify the institutional status of KPPU in the constitutional system. This is important because the unclear status of the KPPU in the constitutional system makes this Commission vulnerable to debate its existence, especially when this commission carries out its duties and functions.

5. DISCUSSION

Regarding the principle of business competition balance in the framework of Indonesian nationalism,

Table 2: Price Adjustment of Gas by KPPU

No.	Price Classification	Enforcement	Amount	Surcharge provisions
1.	P0	1 August 2015	IDR 7.400/ m ³	120%
2.	P1	1 August 2015	IDR 167.600/MMB TU + IDR770/ m ³	120%
3.	P2	1 August 2015	IDR 167.600/MMB TU + IDR 750/ m ³	120%
4.	General Price	1 August 2015	IDR 167.600/MMB TU + IDR 850/ m ³	120%

Source: Case Decision of No. 09/KPPU-L/2016.

the question that is often raised by the public is, is healthy competition in accordance with the personality of the nation which has a family economic philosophy? Some even think that the competition values as regulated in Law No. 5 the Year 1999 concerning Prohibition of Monopolistic Practices and Unfair Business Competition (Competition Law) and the Business Competition Supervisory Commission (KPPU) as their supervisory institutions are entrusted by the IMF, entrusted by neo-liberal, exploitative neoliberal organizations. competition, anti-subsidies and anti-national interests.

This mindset is not wrong if it is related to the time of enactment of Law and KPPU in 1999 which coincides with the early years of the effectiveness of the IMF Letter of Intent (LoI). However, when examined further, it appears that the desire to have instruments and policies that are pro-healthy competition and anti-conglomerate business structures were actually declared 10 years earlier by the people through the MPR as in the 1988 regulated Economic Policy Direction which outlines: (1) developing a populist economic system that relies on fair market mechanisms with the principles of fair competition; (2) avoiding monopolistic market structures; (3) optimizing the role of government in correcting market imperfections by removing all obstacles that interfere with market mechanisms. This determination was further strengthened by MPR Decree No. 10 of 1998 which was alarming, namely the implementation of the national economy which lacks the mandate of Article 33 of the 1945 Constitution and tends to show a very monopolistic style. This constitutional document shows that competition and KPPU are actually the culmination of the desires of the Indonesian people themselves who were dissatisfied with past business patterns and economic structures. The DPR responded by making the Competition Law the first initiative in the legislation history. So, commitment with the IMF turned out to be only a stimulant that accelerated the realization of this desire.

If nationalism is defined as a determination to protect national interests in the sense of the interests of small businesses and cooperatives, then this law has fulfilled them. Article 50 excludes the Act on small business operators and cooperatives. The law does not exclude business behaviour, but rather excludes its subjects, namely small businesses and cooperatives (Juwana, 2002; Fox, 2000). This can be interpreted as the commitment of the state through the Act, as in Article 3 regarding the objectives, namely to create a

conducive business climate through a fair business competition arrangement so as to ensure the certainty of equal business opportunities for large business actors, medium business actors and small business actors. With this exception, the law respects the conditions and efforts of the sustainable small businesses and cooperatives that dominate our national business actors (Roisah *et al.*, 2018; Pangestu *et al.*, 2002).

Competition policy includes enforcement and regulation or government policy (Wibowo *et al.*, 2019). If the KPPU sees that a sector is too strategic to be released from the competition, due to technical reasons or the high concentration of product characteristics due to the lack of investment, the KPPU will advise the government to regulate it (Faujura *et al.*, 2021). If a product requires subsidies due to the low purchasing power of the people, the KPPU asks the government to give it. Furthermore, if nationalism is also interpreted as SOE control over the strategic business sector and the maximum limit of foreign ownership in certain businesses, then KPPU will not sue it. Even Article 51 of the Law justifies SOEs controlling strategic sectors as respected natural monopolies, provided they do not abuse them. The same thing is also done if the law or the government issues an upper limit or even closes on foreign ownership, the KPPU will always respect it as long as it is consistently regulated. If this happens, KPPU will guarantee fair competition between domestic business actors without discrimination. As a result, fair competition is the identity of the Indonesian people. It contains a stimulant to compete towards a business structure that is not monopolistic. Ideally, fair competition is aimed at increasing consumer and producer welfare by reducing deadweight loss (economic inefficiency factor).


6. CONCLUSION

The results of the study show that Law No. 5/1999 is formulated on the principle of a balance of interests, namely the balance between the interests of business actors and the public interest. The formulation of the principle of balance can be found in considerations, explanations and articles in Law Number 5 of 1999. In this context, business actors are prohibited from entering into agreements with other business actors to jointly control the production and or marketing of their products and/or marketing. goods and or services that may result in monopolistic practices and or unfair business competition.

In the realization, of the principle of balance of interest in Law No. 5 of 1999 does not yet reflect proportional equity to carry out the role of the economy and control of resources and economic activities so that it has not fully implemented the principle of economic democracy by taking into account the balance of interests. The principle of balance includes the balance between business people and the public interest. For this reason, the balance which was conducted by KPPU must refer to the laws and regulations with values of justice that are recognized in society. As a practical implication, in applying balance, the judge in the decision is based on the principles, aims and objectives of Law No. 5 of 1999, namely maintaining public interest and increasing national economic efficiency as an effort to improve people's welfare. Lastly, the conclusion mainly highlights that Competition Law is a synthesis of two diametric points, namely free fight liberalism which adheres to unlimited competition and statism which prioritizes state ownership and control in the economy. Competition law is a bridge that guarantees competition in regulatory corridors, and in Indonesia, this role was conducted by KPPU to oversee the monopolistic practices and unfair business competition.

REFERENCES

- Encyclopædia Britannica. (2017). *Service industry*. Retrieved from <https://www.britannica.com/topic/service-industry>, February 25, 2017.
- Faujura, R.P., Gultom, E., & Sudjana, S. (2021). The Monopoly Practice and Unfair Business Competition in the Technology Transfer Activity Through the Foreign Patent in Indonesia. *UUM Journal of Legal Studies* 12(2), 69-91. <https://doi.org/10.32890/uujls2021.12.1.4>
- Fox, E. M. (2000). Equality, discrimination, and competition law: Lessons from and for South Africa and Indonesia. *Harv. Int'l. LJ*, 41, 579.
- Harahap, M. Y. 1995. Development of Permanent Jurisprudence. *Mimbar Hukum* 16(5).
- Hartono, S. R. (2007). *Indonesian Economic Law*. Bayumedia Pub.
- Hübner, R. (2007). *Strategic supply chain management in process industries: An application to specialty chemicals production network design* (Vol. 594). Springer Science & Business Media. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-72182-6>
- Iwantono, S. (2003, October). Economic Crisis and Cartel Development in Indonesia. In *5th International Cartels Workshop* (pp. 1-3).
- Juwana, H. (2002). An Overview of Indonesia's Antimonopoly Law. *Wash. U. Global Stud. L. Rev.*, 1, 185.
- Kagramanto, B. L. (2007). Implementation of Law No. 5 of 1999 by KPPU. *Jurnal Ilmu Hukum Justitia*.
- Lee, A. (2015). Onwards and upwards for Indonesian antitrust. *International Financial Law Review*.
- Maarif, S. (2004). Competition Law in Indonesia: experience to be taken for the development of Competition Law in China. *Wash. U. Global Stud. L. Rev.*, 3, 333.
- Nakanishi, N. (2009). Successive Expansion and Stability of Network Integration in International Trade. In *International Trade and Economic Dynamics* (pp. 161-185). Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-78676-4_15
- Pangestu, M., Aswicahyono, H., Anas, T., & Ardyanto, D. (2002). The evolution of competition policy in Indonesia. *Review of Industrial Organization*, 21(2), 205-224. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1019633829374>
- Putri, P. K., & Prananingtyas, P. (2020). Supervision of kppu on the action of mergers done by mining companies. *Diponegoro Law Review*, 5(1), 108-123. <https://doi.org/10.14710/dilrev.5.1.2020.108-123>
- Risnain, M. (2018). Eksistensi Lembaga Quasi Judisial Dalam Sistem Kekuasaan Kehakiman Di Indonesia: Kajian Terhadap Komisi Pengawas Persaingan Usaha. *Jurnal Hukum dan Peradilan*, 3(1), 49-58. <https://doi.org/10.25216/JHP.3.1.2014.49-58>
- Roisah, K., Utama, Y.J., Saraswati, R., & Whidari, Y. (2018). Status and contemporary development of employee inventions ownership in G-20 countries. *European Research Studies Journal*, 21(2), 214-224. <https://doi.org/10.35808/ersj/996>
- Shimomura, K. (2009). *International trade and economic dynamics: essays in memory of Koji Shimomura*. Springer
- Simbolon, A. (2019). Prevention of monopolistic practices and unfair Business Competition through business Competition Supervision. *Journal of Legal, Ethical and Regulatory Issues* 22(1).
- Toha, K., & Retnaningsih, S. (2020). Legal policy granting status of fresh start to the individual bankrupt debtor in developing the bankruptcy law in Indonesia. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, 9(2), 157-161. <https://doi.org/10.36941/ajis-2020-0033>
- Wahyuningtyas, S. Y. (2014). Challenges in Combating Cartels, 14 Years After the Enactment of Indonesian Competition Law. *Yearbook of Antitrust and Regulatory Studies (YARS)*, 7(10), 279-306. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2741622>
- Wahyuningtyas, S. Y. (2016). The online transportation network in Indonesia: A pendulum between the sharing economy and ex ante regulation. *Competition and Regulation in Network Industries*, 17(3-4), 260-280. <https://doi.org/10.1177/178359171601700304>
- Wattegama, C., Soehardjo, J., & Kapugama, N. (2008). Telecom Regulatory and Policy Environment in Indonesia Results and Analysis of the 2008 TRE Survey. Available at SSRN 1554762. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1554762>
- Wibowo, Y. S., Luddin, M. R., & Sari, E. (2019). Understanding Organizational Commitments in the Public Sector: A Case Study of Commissioners and Investigators at The Business Competition Supervisory Commission (KPPU). *Policy & Governance Review*, 3(3), 208-224. <https://doi.org/10.30589/pgr.v3i3.152>
- Widiyanti, R., Hidayat, N. N., Setianto, N. A., Mastuti, S., & Muatip, K. (2019, November). Vertical Integration of Broiler Industries in Indonesia (Analysis of Case Decisions No. 02/KPPU-I/2016). In *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science* (Vol. 372, No. 1, p. 012005). IOP Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/372/1/012005>

[illegible]

AUTHOR'S WARRANTY & COPYRIGHT ASSIGNMENT FORM

This Agreement is made with Lifescience Global ("Publisher"). The Agreement is for the Article submitted by you ("Author") for publication in ("Journal title") declared below and is referred to in this Agreement as "Article".

To enable the publisher to publish the Article in ("Journal title"), the ownership of copyright must be established. Please read and complete the form below (Section A plus Section B as appropriate) and return one copy via email or fax.

The Article cannot be published until this signed Agreement is received by the Journal.

SECTION (A): Author's Warranty (Please complete with your details)

Journal title
(for which manuscript is submitted): International Journal of Criminology and Sociology

Corresponding Author's name: Ni Luh Made Mahendrawati

Complete Mailing Address: Warmadewa University, Bali, Indonesia
Jl. Terompong No. 24, Sumerta Kelod, Denpasar, Bali 80239,
Indonesia

Telephone: _____

Fax: _____

Email: mahendrawati.warmadewa@gmail.com

Article title: Prohibition of Monopolistic Practices and Unfair Business
Competition in Indonesia: A Legal Mechanism to Balance the
Public Interest

Please check any that apply:

- ☐ I am or was a US government employee, and the article is made in that capacity.
- ☐ I am or was a UK, Canadian, or Australian government employee, and the article is made in that capacity

NOTE: If you are or were a US Government employee and the Article is made in that capacity, there is no copyright to assign, but you must sign the form to confirm the author warranties in Section A. If you are or were a UK Crown servant, or a Canadian or Australian government employee, and the Article is made in that capacity, the Article must be submitted for clearance by the Permanent Head of the Department concerned, and you must sign the form to confirm the author warranties in Section A. If the Article is determined to be copyrightable at a later date, then copyright and all rights included in this will be transferred to LIFESCIENCE GLOBAL and its assignees, and are deemed to have been automatically transferred at the date the copyrights arose or the date the author's agreement was signed, whichever is later.

In consideration of the publication of the Article in ("JOURNAL TITLE"), I hereby warrant and undertake:|

- a) that this Article is an original work, has not been published before and is not being considered for publication. The article is/will not be submitted to any other journal for publication while in consideration for publication with Lifescience Global.
- b) elsewhere in its final form either in printed or electronic form.
- c) that I have acknowledged the source of all material reproduced in the Article for which the copyright is not owned by me;

- d) that I have obtained written permission from the copyright holder to reproduce in the Article (in all medianow or later developed, including print and electronic form) all material whose copyright is not owned by the Author, and that I have attached to this document true copies of each such permission that I have obtained;
- e) that this Article contains no violation of any existing copyright or other third party right or any material of an obscene, indecent, libellous or otherwise unlawful nature and that to the best of my knowledge this Article does not infringe the rights of others;
- f) that I will indemnify and keep indemnified the Editors and Lifescience Global against all claims and expenses (including legal costs and expenses) arising from any plagiarism complaints, any breach of this warranty and the other warranties on my behalf in this Agreement;
- g) that in the case of a multi-authored Article I have obtained copyright assignment from all co-authors, in writing, including consent to enter into this Agreement on their behalf and to bind them to it and to any modifications of it, and that all co-authors have read and agreed to the above warranties and undertakings, including the accompanying Notes.

SECTION (B): Copyright Assignment

- In consideration of the publication of the Article in Journal that follows subscription/ pay to view model, I hereby assign to the Lifescience global the copyright for the full period of copyright and all renewals, extensions, revisions and revivals together with all accrued rights of action throughout the world in any form and in any language (including all media, both now known or later developed). LIFESCIENCE GLOBAL may assign its rights under this Agreement. Notwithstanding the above, I retain all proprietary rights to the information disclosed in the Article, such as patent and trade mark rights and rights to any process or procedure described in the Article. Full detail regarding the assignment of copyright, the management of permissions, and what rights are granted back to the authors can be found on the accompanying Notes, which are fully incorporated into, and form part of, this Agreement.
- If the article is published in OPEN ACCESS, copyrights remain with the author and the rules in [Creative Commons Attribution License](#) will apply.

AGREED:

Author Name:
Ni Luh Made Mahendrawati

Signature: Mahendrawati

Date:
May 7, 2021

In signing this form, the signee warrants that any authors not signing have granted the signee the power of attorney to do so on their behalf, that a copy of this power of attorney is attached, that the manuscript submitted has been approved by these authors in the form in which it has been submitted, and that the warranties given above have been read and agreed by all authors.

**PLEASE RETURN A SIGNED COPY OF THIS FORM TO THE PRODUCTION OFFICE:
(An email with scanned attachment or fax is acceptable)**

Production Office – Lifescience Global

Suite #1, Ground Floor, R-552, Sector 15/A-2
Bufferzone, Karachi
Pakistan
Tel: +92-21-36965952
Email: info-pk@lifescienceglobal.com

Head Office – Lifescience Global

728 States Street,
Mississauga, Ontario, L5R0B6
Canada
Email: info-na@lifescienceglobal.com

Prohibition of Monopolistic Practices and Unfair Business Competition in Indonesia: A Legal Mechanism to Balance the Public Interest

Ni Luh Made Mahendrawati*

Warmadewa University, Bali, Indonesia

Abstract: The study is to explore the legal mechanism of prohibition of monopolistic practices and unfair business competition in Indonesia by looking at the role of the Business Competition Supervisory Commission (KPPU). This study was conducted using the empirical normative method. In this context, the regulatory reference used is Law No. 5 of 1999 (Anti-Monopoly Law). Other regulations are Article 34 of Law No. 5 of 1999 and Presidential Decree No. 75 of 1999 and named the Business Competition Supervisory Commission (KPPU). Several KPPU decisions analyzed were in the cities of Medan, Semarang, Surabaya, Makassar and Central Jakarta. The results showed that Law No. 5 of 1999 regarding the Prohibition of Monopolistic Practices and Unfair Business Competition in Indonesia was formulated to the principle of balancing interests, namely the balance between the interests of business actors with the public interest. The formulation of the principle of balance can be found in the considerations, explanations and articles in Law No. 5 of 1999.

Keywords: Monopolistic Practices, Legal Procedures, Unfair Competition, Business Competition, Balance Principle.

1. INTRODUCTION

In the era of globalization and free trade as it is today, economic activity is becoming increasingly intense and broad-reaching all parts of the world and has a broad scope of human activity wherever located, distance and time are no longer a barrier to economic activity (Nakanishi, 2009; Shimomura, 2009). Economic globalization activities are manifested in various forms: liberalization of trade in goods and services, increasing migration temporarily or permanently, foreign direct investment by multinational companies, and standardization of various regulations. Furthermore, advances in communication and network technology provide faster and greater means of transporting goods, are easier to provide services, and are faster and clearer in conveying information. In the perspective of fair competition, economic activity is a series of activities that are simultaneous, comprehensive and continuous (Hartono, 2007; Toha & Retnaningsih, 2020). Those who carry out economic activities are called economic actors, both individuals and groups or business entities. In general, economic activities can be classified into two main activities, namely producing goods and/or services. In general, all economic activities are divided into 2 categories, namely goods and services. Production of goods, including agriculture, mining, manufacturing, construction, etc. Each of these sectors produces material products. The service industry includes banking, communication,

computer software development, etc. (Encyclopædia Britannica, 2017), and activities to distribute goods and/or services from producers, intermediaries to consumers (Hübner, 2007). Furthermore, these two main activities can be reduced to various other fields of activity that are more detailed.

It must be recognized that economic activities cannot be separated from competition between business actors. This is a requirement for the implementation of a market economy. Moreover, in the global era that demands a free market economic system, so that competition between business actors will be more open. Sometimes the business competition is fair competition, but on the contrary, business actors can conduct the unfair competition in order to get the maximum profit. With regard to business competition law, in Law No. 5 of 1999 has established a body or commission called the Business Competition Supervisory Commission (KPPU) which is given such broad authority ranging from receiving reports on alleged monopolistic practices and or unfair business competition, summoning business actors, to deciding cases and imposing sanctions on businessmen), bearing in mind the provisions of procedural law that are specific in handling business competition cases. Furthermore, in the case of business competition as regulated in Law No. 5 of 1999 loaded with economic legal content, being on the same side of the judiciary as an institution that carries out the functions of the judiciary power is required to provide justice and legal certainty for all parties and the judge's decision must be able to provide balance and benefit

*Address correspondence to this author at the Warmadewa University, Bali, Jl. Terompong No. 24, Sumerta Kelod, Denpasar, Bali 80239, Indonesia;
E-mail: mahendrawati.warmadewa@gmail.com

for all parties, then in law enforcement business competition Judges are required to be able to understand the principles of economic law and general legal principles while at the same time creating balance through their decisions.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

In the era of globalization, the demands and interests of the protection of members of the community in realizing the ideals of the welfare state require an increasingly extensive legislation regulation. In Neo-classical theory, demands for economic transformation are no longer merely pursuing growth, but furthermore, the transformation demanded and pursued is a scope of life that concerns the basic needs of global, regional and national societies that have dimensions (Harahap, 1995). The first is justice by developing patterns that can sustain the balance between too much and too little to consume the earth's power source. Thus, equitable distribution will be realized in the role of the economy as well as the control of resources and economic activities that are evenly distributed across all levels of society. Economic power is not concentrated centrally in the hands of a handful of people which creates inequality that destroys the ideals of the economic order of the self-government enterprise or a shared economy.

The second is the sustainability by increasing economic production results do not arbitrarily deplete the earth's resources and the ability of ecosystems. However, what is desired is that each generation recognizes the obligation to preserve the earth's resources and ecosystems as rights that must be maintained for the next generation. The third is the coverage by giving and opening opportunities as wide as possible for all levels of society to participate in the role of economic life to achieve welfare improvement. It is not just giving opportunities to small groups that are centralistic, which will cause social inequality and conflict.

The aspirations towards building a just, sustainable economy and the coverage demanded by the values of globalization require a variety of laws and regulations that are fast, in line with the very rapid changes in the global economy. In general, the law aims to create a balance of interests in the form of legal certainty so that proportional justice is born in a prosperous society (Hartono, 2007). The balance function also includes the structure of the economic life of the community in order to meet their needs. The balance order is very

important to be realized in the economic order in the form of laws and regulations. For Indonesia, the legal order must be based on the values of the Pancasila and the 1945 Constitution as a basic norm that serves as the highest source of law. These principles of law should be absorbed and placed in the provisions of the laws and regulations in Indonesia, both directly stated in the articles, as well as the principles and objectives of these regulations. Thus, it can be expected that the law will be able to function in realizing a just and prosperous society or at least achieving a balance of interests in society.

3. METHOD

This study was conducted using the empirical normative method. Normative-empirical legal research (applied law research) is research that uses normative-empirical legal case studies in the form of legal behavior products. This study analyzes regulations related to monopolistic practices and unfair business competition in Indonesia and analyzes various KPPU decisions related to monopolistic practices in several cities in Indonesia.

This normative-empirical legal research method is basically a combination of the normative legal approach with the addition of various empirical elements. This normative-empirical research method, it is also about the implementation of normative legal provisions (laws) in their actions in every particular legal event in society. In this context, the regulatory reference used is Law No. 5 of 1999 (Anti-Monopoly Law). Other regulations are Article 34 of Law No. 5 of 1999 and Presidential Decree No. 75 of 1999 and named the Business Competition Supervisory Commission (KPPU). Several KPPU decisions analyzed were in the cities of Medan, Semarang, Surabaya, Makassar and Central Jakarta. The data analysis technique was carried out using descriptive-analytical methods by referring to various reports and secondary data regarding cases handled by KPPU and bankruptcy. The analysis is also based on examples of data regarding the pricing of basic needs in the form of gas by the state gas company. Therefore, the judicial case study approach is used as an analysis in this study as a legal case study in the context of anti-monopoly and sound business practices. This is because of the conflict so that it will involve the interference of courts and the anti-monopoly commission in Indonesia to be able to provide resolution decisions regarding cases of monopoly, bankruptcy, pricing and fair competition.

4. RESULTS

Regarding KPPU's role in enforcing Competition Law in Indonesia is that it is to oversee the implementation of Law No. 5 of 1999 (Anti-Monopoly Law) where the Commission was formed. This establishment is based on Article 34 of Law No. 5 of 1999 which instructed that the formation of the organizational structure, duties and functions of the commission be determined through a Presidential Decree. This commission was then formed based on Presidential Decree No. 75 of 1999 and named the Business Competition Supervisory Commission (KPPU).

Therefore, Anti-Monopoly law enforcement and business competition are under the authority of the KPPU (Putri & Prananingtyas, 2020; Lee, 2015; Maarif, 2004; Wahyuningtyas, 2016). However, this does not mean that there are no other institutions authorized to handle monopoly and business competition matters. The District Court and the Supreme Court were also

given the authority to settle the case. The District Court was given the authority to handle objections to the KPPU's decision and deal with violations of competition law which became a criminal case because KPPU's decisions were not carried out permanently. The Supreme Court is authorized to settle cases of violation of competition law in the case of an appeal against the district court decision. As an independent institution, it can be said that the authority possessed by KPPU is very large which includes the authority possessed by the judiciary. This authority includes investigations, prosecutions, consultations, examining, adjudicating, and deciding cases.

In the context of constitutional law, KPPU is a state auxiliary organ that has the authority under Law No. 5 of 1999 to enforce business competition law. A simple state auxiliary organ is a state institution formed outside the Constitution and is an institution that helps carry out the duties of the main state institutions (executive, legislative, and judiciary) which are often also referred to as quasi-independent state institutions

Table 1: Postponement of Debt Payment Obligations and Bankruptcy Cases

Commercial Court	Postponement		Bankruptcy	
	Semester I 2019	Semester I 2020	Semester I 2019	Semester I 2020
Medan	14	14	3	3
Semarang	7	16	12	16
Surabaya	24	36	16	4
Makassar	6	1	2	2
Central Jakarta	112	182	43	22
Total	163	249	76	47




Figure 1: Number of the postponement of debt payment obligations and bankruptcy cases.

(Risnain, 2018). The role of a quasi-independent state institution becomes important as a responsive effort for countries that are transitioning from authoritarianism to democracy (Kagramanto, 2007).

KPPU's position in fuel subsidies can be an example in this context (Iwantono, 2003). As understood, Law No. 22 of 2001 regarding Oil and Gas amended by the Constitutional Court ordered the government to regulate prices not limited to subsidized fuel. KPPU is in a position to support subsidies while asking that the government set limits on the price of non-subsidized fuel so that the competitive landscape is that subsidized fuel is available, while non-subsidized fuel is affordable. Business actors compete for the market (tenders to become subsidized fuel suppliers) and in the market (head-to-head competition) in the range below the upper limit price for non-subsidized fuel. In other words, KPPU is not anti-subsidized. However, it has a hard position when subsidies are used as weapons to blackmail people with the mode of reducing subsidized goods. The aim is to condition the people to buy non-subsidized goods which are first reduced by volume and raised in price. It is very clear that if nationalism is interpreted as the spirit of subsidies to help the people's low purchasing power, then KPPU is one of the pillars of this (Widiyanti *et al.*, 2019; Wahyuningtyas, 2014; Simbolon, 2019; Wattegama *et al.*, 2008). As a role of KPPU in providing fair pricing, the findings of this study showed the adjustments to the Decree of the Board of Directors of PT Perusahaan Gas Negara (Persero) Tbk. No. 006904.K/HK.00.01/UT/2013 dated July 31, 2015, concerning Gas Prices in Business Entity Certificate in Distribution Region III for Service and Commercial Industry Customers as well as Manufacturing and Power Generation Industry Customers are in Table 2.

President with the approval of the DPR appointed KPPU members in carrying out their duties are responsible to the President. This is in line with practice in the USA where the FTC is responsible to the President. This provision is reasonable because KPPU

carries out part of the duties of the government, while the highest authority of the government is under the President. Nevertheless, it does not mean that KPPU in carrying out its duties cannot be free from government interference. Independence is still maintained by the involvement of the DPR to participate in determining and controlling the appointment and dismissal of KPPU members. Besides the duties and authority possessed by KPPU which is so important, in reality, KPPU still experiences obstacles in carrying out its duties. These constraints cause KPPU to not be able to carry out their duties optimally. For instance, KPPU has the authority to conduct research and investigation, but KPPU does not have the authority to conduct searches on business actors who are indicated to have violated Law No. 5 of 1999. In conducting research and investigations, KPPU is often constrained by the nature of company confidentiality, so that KPPU cannot obtain data the company needed. Although KPPU is authorized to request information from Government agencies, up to now there has not been a good collaboration between KPPU and government agencies in the matter of investigating allegations of unfair business competition. As a result, KPPU often experiences difficulties in carrying out their duties due to lack of supporting data. In addition, KPPU is authorized to summon business actors or witnesses, but KPPU cannot force their presence. The existence of these obstacles resulted in the Commission not being able to optimally exercise its authority. In addition to overcoming the problems above, the challenge that must be answered next is to clarify the institutional status of KPPU in the constitutional system. This is important because the unclear status of the KPPU in the constitutional system makes this Commission vulnerable to debate its existence, especially when this commission carries out its duties and functions.

5. DISCUSSION

Regarding the principle of business competition balance in the framework of Indonesian nationalism,

Table 2: Price Adjustment of Gas by KPPU

No.	Price Classification	Enforcement	Amount	Surcharge provisions
1.	P0	1 August 2015	IDR 7.400/ m ³	120%
2.	P1	1 August 2015	IDR 167.600/MMB TU + IDR770/ m ³	120%
3.	P2	1 August 2015	IDR 167.600/MMB TU + IDR 750/ m ³	120%
4.	General Price	1 August 2015	IDR 167.600/MMB TU + IDR 850/ m ³	120%

Source: Case Decision of No. 09/KPPU-L/2016.

the question that is often raised by the public is, is healthy competition in accordance with the personality of the nation which has a family economic philosophy? Some even think that the competition values as regulated in Law No. 5 the Year 1999 concerning Prohibition of Monopolistic Practices and Unfair Business Competition (Competition Law) and the Business Competition Supervisory Commission (KPPU) as their supervisory institutions are entrusted by the IMF, entrusted by neo-liberal, exploitative neoliberal organizations. competition, anti-subsidies and anti-national interests.

This mindset is not wrong if it is related to the time of enactment of Law and KPPU in 1999 which coincides with the early years of the effectiveness of the IMF Letter of Intent (LoI). However, when examined further, it appears that the desire to have instruments and policies that are pro-healthy competition and anti-conglomerate business structures were actually declared 10 years earlier by the people through the MPR as in the 1988 regulated Economic Policy Direction which outlines: (1) developing a populist economic system that relies on fair market mechanisms with the principles of fair competition; (2) avoiding monopolistic market structures; (3) optimizing the role of government in correcting market imperfections by removing all obstacles that interfere with market mechanisms. This determination was further strengthened by MPR Decree No. 10 of 1998 which was alarming, namely the implementation of the national economy which lacks the mandate of Article 33 of the 1945 Constitution and tends to show a very monopolistic style. This constitutional document shows that competition and KPPU are actually the culmination of the desires of the Indonesian people themselves who were dissatisfied with past business patterns and economic structures. The DPR responded by making the Competition Law the first initiative in the legislation history. So, commitment with the IMF turned out to be only a stimulant that accelerated the realization of this desire.

If nationalism is defined as a determination to protect national interests in the sense of the interests of small businesses and cooperatives, then this law has fulfilled them. Article 50 excludes the Act on small business operators and cooperatives. The law does not exclude business behaviour, but rather excludes its subjects, namely small businesses and cooperatives (Juwana, 2002; Fox, 2000). This can be interpreted as the commitment of the state through the Act, as in Article 3 regarding the objectives, namely to create a

conducive business climate through a fair business competition arrangement so as to ensure the certainty of equal business opportunities for large business actors, medium business actors and small business actors. With this exception, the law respects the conditions and efforts of the sustainable small businesses and cooperatives that dominate our national business actors (Roisah *et al.*, 2018; Pangestu *et al.*, 2002).

Competition policy includes enforcement and regulation or government policy (Wibowo *et al.*, 2019). If the KPPU sees that a sector is too strategic to be released from the competition, due to technical reasons or the high concentration of product characteristics due to the lack of investment, the KPPU will advise the government to regulate it (Faujura *et al.*, 2021). If a product requires subsidies due to the low purchasing power of the people, the KPPU asks the government to give it. Furthermore, if nationalism is also interpreted as SOE control over the strategic business sector and the maximum limit of foreign ownership in certain businesses, then KPPU will not sue it. Even Article 51 of the Law justifies SOEs controlling strategic sectors as respected natural monopolies, provided they do not abuse them. The same thing is also done if the law or the government issues an upper limit or even closes on foreign ownership, the KPPU will always respect it as long as it is consistently regulated. If this happens, KPPU will guarantee fair competition between domestic business actors without discrimination. As a result, fair competition is the identity of the Indonesian people. It contains a stimulant to compete towards a business structure that is not monopolistic. Ideally, fair competition is aimed at increasing consumer and producer welfare by reducing deadweight loss (economic inefficiency factor).

6. CONCLUSION

The results of the study show that Law No. 5/1999 is formulated on the principle of a balance of interests, namely the balance between the interests of business actors and the public interest. The formulation of the principle of balance can be found in considerations, explanations and articles in Law Number 5 of 1999. In this context, business actors are prohibited from entering into agreements with other business actors to jointly control the production and or marketing of their products and/or marketing. goods and or services that may result in monopolistic practices and or unfair business competition.

In the realization, of the principle of balance of interest in Law No. 5 of 1999 does not yet reflect proportional equity to carry out the role of the economy and control of resources and economic activities so that it has not fully implemented the principle of economic democracy by taking into account the balance of interests. The principle of balance includes the balance between business people and the public interest. For this reason, the balance which was conducted by KPPU must refer to the laws and regulations with values of justice that are recognized in society. As a practical implication, in applying balance, the judge in the decision is based on the principles, aims and objectives of Law No. 5 of 1999, namely maintaining public interest and increasing national economic efficiency as an effort to improve people's welfare. Lastly, the conclusion mainly highlights that Competition Law is a synthesis of two diametric points, namely free fight liberalism which adheres to unlimited competition and statism which prioritizes state ownership and control in the economy. Competition law is a bridge that guarantees competition in regulatory corridors, and in Indonesia, this role was conducted by KPPU to oversee the monopolistic practices and unfair business competition.

REFERENCES

- Encyclopædia Britannica. (2017). *Service industry*. Retrieved from <https://www.britannica.com/topic/service-industry>, February 25, 2017.
- Faujura, R.P., Gultom, E., & Sudjana, S. (2021). The Monopoly Practice and Unfair Business Competition in the Technology Transfer Activity Through the Foreign Patent in Indonesia. *UUM Journal of Legal Studies* 12(2), 69-91. <https://doi.org/10.32890/uujls2021.12.1.4>
- Fox, E. M. (2000). Equality, discrimination, and competition law: Lessons from and for South Africa and Indonesia. *Harv. Int'l. LJ*, 41, 579.
- Harahap, M. Y. 1995. Development of Permanent Jurisprudence. *Mimbar Hukum* 16(5).
- Hartono, S. R. (2007). *Indonesian Economic Law*. Bayumedia Pub.
- Hübner, R. (2007). *Strategic supply chain management in process industries: An application to specialty chemicals production network design* (Vol. 594). Springer Science & Business Media. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-72182-6>
- Iwantono, S. (2003, October). Economic Crisis and Cartel Development in Indonesia. In *5th International Cartels Workshop* (pp. 1-3).
- Juwana, H. (2002). An Overview of Indonesia's Antimonopoly Law. *Wash. U. Global Stud. L. Rev.*, 1, 185.
- Kagramanto, B. L. (2007). Implementation of Law No. 5 of 1999 by KPPU. *Jurnal Ilmu Hukum Justitia*.
- Lee, A. (2015). Onwards and upwards for Indonesian antitrust. *International Financial Law Review*.
- Maarif, S. (2004). Competition Law in Indonesia: experience to be taken for the development of Competition Law in China. *Wash. U. Global Stud. L. Rev.*, 3, 333.
- Nakanishi, N. (2009). Successive Expansion and Stability of Network Integration in International Trade. In *International Trade and Economic Dynamics* (pp. 161-185). Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-78676-4_15
- Pangestu, M., Aswicahyono, H., Anas, T., & Ardyanto, D. (2002). The evolution of competition policy in Indonesia. *Review of Industrial Organization*, 21(2), 205-224. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1019633829374>
- Putri, P. K., & Prananingtyas, P. (2020). Supervision of kppu on the action of mergers done by mining companies. *Diponegoro Law Review*, 5(1), 108-123. <https://doi.org/10.14710/dilrev.5.1.2020.108-123>
- Risnain, M. (2018). Eksistensi Lembaga Quasi Judisial Dalam Sistem Kekuasaan Kehakiman Di Indonesia: Kajian Terhadap Komisi Pengawas Persaingan Usaha. *Jurnal Hukum dan Peradilan*, 3(1), 49-58. <https://doi.org/10.25216/JHP.3.1.2014.49-58>
- Roisah, K., Utama, Y.J., Saraswati, R., & Whidari, Y. (2018). Status and contemporary development of employee inventions ownership in G-20 countries. *European Research Studies Journal*, 21(2), 214-224. <https://doi.org/10.35808/ersj/996>
- Shimomura, K. (2009). *International trade and economic dynamics: essays in memory of Koji Shimomura*. Springer
- Simbolon, A. (2019). Prevention of monopolistic practices and unfair Business Competition through business Competition Supervision. *Journal of Legal, Ethical and Regulatory Issues* 22(1).
- Toha, K., & Retnaningsih, S. (2020). Legal policy granting status of fresh start to the individual bankrupt debtor in developing the bankruptcy law in Indonesia. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, 9(2), 157-161. <https://doi.org/10.36941/ajis-2020-0033>
- Wahyuningtyas, S. Y. (2014). Challenges in Combating Cartels, 14 Years After the Enactment of Indonesian Competition Law. *Yearbook of Antitrust and Regulatory Studies (YARS)*, 7(10), 279-306. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2741622>
- Wahyuningtyas, S. Y. (2016). The online transportation network in Indonesia: A pendulum between the sharing economy and ex ante regulation. *Competition and Regulation in Network Industries*, 17(3-4), 260-280. <https://doi.org/10.1177/178359171601700304>
- Wattegama, C., Soehardjo, J., & Kapugama, N. (2008). Telecom Regulatory and Policy Environment in Indonesia Results and Analysis of the 2008 TRE Survey. Available at SSRN 1554762. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1554762>
- Wibowo, Y. S., Luddin, M. R., & Sari, E. (2019). Understanding Organizational Commitments in the Public Sector: A Case Study of Commissioners and Investigators at The Business Competition Supervisory Commission (KPPU). *Policy & Governance Review*, 3(3), 208-224. <https://doi.org/10.30589/pgr.v3i3.152>
- Widiyanti, R., Hidayat, N. N., Setianto, N. A., Mastuti, S., & Muatip, K. (2019, November). Vertical Integration of Broiler Industries in Indonesia (Analysis of Case Decisions No. 02/KPPU-I/2016). In *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science* (Vol. 372, No. 1, p. 012005). IOP Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/372/1/012005>

Received on 16-03-2021

Accepted on 06-05-2021

Published on 11-05-2021

<https://doi.org/10.6000/1929-4409.2021.10.120>

© 2021 Ni Luh Made Mahendrawati; Licensee Lifescience Global.

This is an open access article licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/>) which permits unrestricted, non-commercial use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the work is properly cited.