

**JLPH:**
**Journal of Law, Politic
and Humanities**

E-ISSN: 2962-2816
P-ISSN: 2747-1985

<https://dinastires.org/JLPH> dinasti.info@gmail.com +62 811 7404 455

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.38035/jlph.v6i1>
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

The Legal Implications of Music Royalty Dispute Resolution Through Mediation: A Case Study of Mie Gacoan-LMK Selmi

Nadyne Althea Alandia Towoliu^{1*}, Momoko Mori², Gumilang Chandra Shasmita Haningati³, Resita Rachmadani⁴.

¹Universitas Airlangga, Jawa Timur, Indonesia, nadyne.althea.alandia-2025@fh.unair.ac.id.

²Universitas Airlangga, Jawa Timur, Indonesia, momoko.mori-2025@fh.unair.ac.id.

³Universitas Airlangga, Jawa Timur, Indonesia, gumilang.chan.asmita-2025@fh.unair.ac.id.

⁴Universitas Airlangga, Jawa Timur, Indonesia, resita.rachmadani-2025@fh.unair.ac.id.

*Corresponding Author: nadyne.althea.alandia-2025@fh.unair.ac.id¹

Abstract: Copyright over songs and/or music constitutes an exclusive right inherent to the author and related rights holders, particularly economic rights in the form of royalty payments for every commercial use. Such provisions are explicitly regulated under Law No. 28 of 2014 on Copyright and Government Regulation No. 56 of 2021 on the Management of Copyright Royalties for Songs and/or Music. This research aims to analyze the legal implications of resolving royalty disputes between the National Collective Management Organization (LMKN) and PT Mitra Bali Sukses, the owner of the Mie Gacoan trademark, through mediation. Employing a normative juridical method with statutory and case approaches, the findings indicate that mediation produced an agreement stipulating royalty payments of approximately IDR 2.2 billion and a license valid until the end of 2025. The legal implications include the creation of a new legally binding obligation (settlement agreement), the elimination of potential lawsuits as long as the parties comply with the agreement, and the assurance of fulfilling authors' economic rights through royalty distribution by LMKN. Nonetheless, issues remain in the form of weak public dissemination, negative public perceptions, and potential overlaps of authority between LMK and LMKN. Accordingly, mediation can be considered an effective mechanism for resolving copyright disputes, yet it still requires oversight, transparency, and institutional harmonization to realize legal certainty and optimal protection for authors.

Keyword: Copyright, Music Royalties, Mediation, LMKN.

INTRODUCTION

Copyright law grants creators and copyright holders exclusive rights to their work, including the right to derive commercial benefit from it (Maramis, 2014: 117). In the context of music, these rights include the ability to reproduce, distribute, and publicly perform songs. This results in an obligation to pay royalties as compensation (Dirkareshza, 2024: 358). Music royalties are a way to show financial appreciation to creators when their songs are used

commercially by others (Nadya, 2023: 145). The royalty scheme aims to balance the interests of creators and users by ensuring that creators receive fair compensation and that users have the right to legally use music (Asihatka, 2024: 117). Collective Management Organizations (LMK) were established to facilitate the licensing and royalty collection process and represent thousands of creators in an organized manner (Felani, 2017: 161). Thus, the normative framework of copyright affirms that using songs or music in a commercial environment is not merely free entertainment; it is closely related to the economic rights of creators that are guaranteed by law.

Indonesia has a comprehensive legal framework regarding the obligation to pay royalties for songs and/or music. According to Law No. 28 of 2014 on Copyright, any party that uses songs for commercial purposes must pay royalties to the creator or rights holder. This obligation is enforced by the National Collective Management Organization (LMKN) or the relevant LMK authorized to collect such royalties. To clarify the implementation process, the government issued Government Regulation No. 56 of 2021 on the Management of Royalties for Song and/or Music Copyright. This regulation establishes procedures for collecting royalties and outlines the creation of an integrated Song and/or Music Data Center. It also classifies public services required to pay royalties. Regulation No. 9 of 2022 by the Minister of Law and Human Rights further elaborates on this regulation. It confirms the LMKN's role as the central administrator, regulates licensing procedures, and mandates the use of the Song and/or Music Information System (SILM) as a database to ensure transparency. Together, these three regulations form a clear legal framework for royalty obligations in Indonesia. Businesses must obtain licenses, pay fees according to government standards, and report their use of music. Violations of these obligations are considered infringements of creators' economic rights and are subject to criminal penalties, meaning there is no legal vacuum.

However, practical experience shows that there is a gap between the norm and its implementation. Many new businesses only became aware of their royalty obligations after the government intensified enforcement of the rules, even though these provisions had been in place for a long time (Windarsari, 2025: 135). LMKN acknowledges that the regulations are "very comprehensive," but compliance remains low because enforcement requires significant time and resources (Syaharani et al., 2023: 182). Only after 2022, following the issuance of PP 56/2021 and Permenkumham 9/2022, did law enforcement improve through inspections and crackdowns. This caused many negligent business owners to panic in the face of the threat of sanctions. This situation has caused concern among musicians and entrepreneurs alike.

A concrete example of this situation is the music royalty dispute between the Mie Gacoan restaurant chain and LMK Sentra Lisensi Musik Indonesia (SELMI). LMK SELMI filed a report with the Bali Regional Police in August 2024, alleging that Mie Gacoan outlets were playing music without paying royalties. The dispute developed into a criminal investigation of PT Mitra Bali Sukses's management for alleged violations of songwriters' economic rights. However, the dispute was successfully resolved on August 8, 2025, through mediation facilitated by the Minister of Law and Human Rights at the Bali Regional Office of the Ministry of Law and Human Rights. During the mediation, the parties agreed that Mie Gacoan would pay royalties amounting to Rp2.2 billion for the period 2022–2025.

The Mie Gacoan case highlights several issues that continue to hinder the enforcement of music royalties in Indonesia. First, the lack of socialization of regulations means businesses often do not understand their obligations, causing them to view long-standing regulations as new. Second, the LMK and LMKN overlap in their authority to collect and distribute royalties, causing confusion for music users regarding which party is authorized. Third, the transparency of tariff determination and royalty distribution is still being questioned by business operators, who feel that the tariffs are burdensome, and by musicians, who criticize the slow distribution of funds. Some musicians have expressed deep disappointment. Fourth, although the mediation

in the Mie Gacoan case effectively ended the dispute, the agreement is legally weak because it was not formalized as a peace agreement with executory power. Thus, its validity depends heavily on voluntary compliance.

Given this issue, there is an urgent need to examine the legal implications of resolving music royalty disputes through mediation. Although the Mie Gacoan case shows that mediation has the potential to set an important precedent and open up new discourse in intellectual property rights practice, there have been few academic studies that specifically examine the effectiveness of mediation in the context of copyright disputes in Indonesia. This research is relevant for two reasons: first, it assesses the position of mediation in the legal system; second, it identifies weaknesses in royalty collection governance, particularly regarding LMK–LMKN coordination and the transparency of the collection mechanism.

Based on the background description above, the main issue that this study focuses on is: What are the legal implications of resolving music royalty disputes through mediation in the Mie Gacoan case?

Problem Statement

- a. What are the legal provisions regarding music royalty payment obligations and mediation mechanisms for resolving copyright disputes in Indonesia?
- b. What are the legal implications of resolving music royalty disputes through mediation in the Mie Gacoan–LMK SELMI case for the parties involved and the governance of music royalty enforcement in Indonesia?

METHOD

This study employs a legal-normative research method, which is based on the analysis of written legal norms in legislation, doctrine, and relevant legal literature to identify the legal concepts and principles underlying the research problem (Marzuki, 2023: 47). The study focuses on examining how legal provisions regarding music royalties and dispute resolution mechanisms through mediation are regulated in the Indonesian legal system and assessing their implications through relevant case studies. The primary legal materials explained in this study include:

- a. Primary legal materials in the form of legislation, such as Law 28/2014, Government Regulation 56/2021, and Minister of Law and Human Rights Regulation 9/2022; court decisions related to copyright disputes; and official documents resulting from mediation by the Ministry of Law and Human Rights between Mie Gacoan and LMK SELMI/LMKN.
- b. Primary legal materials in the form of legislation, such as Law 28/2014, Government Regulation 56/2021, and Minister of Law and Human Rights Regulation 9/2022; court decisions related to copyright disputes; and official documents resulting from mediation by the Ministry of Law and Human Rights between Mie Gacoan and LMK SELMI/LMKN. Secondary legal materials are in the form of legal literature, textbooks, scientific articles, and academic publications relevant to music royalties and mediation mechanisms.
- c. Tertiary legal materials in the form of legal dictionaries, encyclopedias, and Black's Law Dictionary for legal terminology references.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Legal Provisions Regarding Music Royalty Payment Obligations and Mediation Mechanisms as an Alternative to Copyright Dispute Resolution in Indonesia

a. Royalty Payment Obligations and Licensing Channels

According to Law No. 28 of 2014 on Copyright, any commercial use of a song requires permission (license) from the creator or copyright holder. Article 9 of Law 28/2014

emphasizes that creators and copyright holders have exclusive economic rights to their creations, including the rights to reproduce, distribute, perform, publish, and communicate songs (Wicaksono, 2023: 6300). Anyone who wishes to carry out these actions must obtain permission and is prohibited from reproducing or using the song commercially without permission (Rais, 2023: 93). In other words, using songs in public places for commercial purposes (e.g., playing them in cafés, hotels, at concerts, on the radio, etc.) requires an official license, which typically involves paying royalties to the copyright holder. Royalties are a form of economic compensation for use of a song and are a manifestation of the creator/copyright holder's economic rights (Saputra et al., 2023:13663).

To implement these licensing obligations, the government issued Government Regulation (PP) No. 56 of 2021, which concerns the management of royalties for song and/or music copyright (Laili et al., 2023:146). PP 56/2021 establishes a centralized mechanism for collecting song royalties. According to Article 3, Paragraph 1 of PP 56/2021, "Everyone may use songs and/or music commercially in public services by paying royalties to the creator, copyright holder, and/or related rights owner through LMKN." This provision emphasizes the central role of the LMKN (National Collective Management Organization) as a licensing channel; anyone who plays or uses music commercially must pay royalties through the LMKN. PP 56/2021 outlines the types of commercial public services required to pay royalties. These include restaurants, cafes, bars, discotheques, concerts, public transportation, exhibitions, cinemas, telephone hold music, offices, shopping centers, TV/radio broadcasts, hotels, and karaoke businesses. Under this system, businesses only need to obtain one centralized license from LMKN to use all managed songs, eliminating the need to negotiate with each creator separately. The royalties paid will be forwarded to the creators/rights holders in proportion to the use of their songs.

The Ministry of Law and Human Rights issued Regulation No. 9 of 2022, a technical implementing regulation concerning the implementation of Government Regulation No. 56 of 2021. This regulation provides operational guidelines for the new scheme and details the LMKN's duties and authorities, as well as the procedures for collecting and distributing royalties. The regulation establishes a single point of collection for royalties through the LMKN, replacing the previous system in which each LMK (collective management organization) managed its own royalties. In other words, since the enactment of PP 56/2021 and Permenkumham 9/2022, the LMKN has centralized royalty collection, while the LMKs function in a supporting role under LMKN coordination. Permenkumham 9/2022 also establishes a daily implementation team consisting of LMK representatives to carry out licensing and royalty collection tasks efficiently and transparently.

In this new legal framework, it is important to understand the difference between LMKN and LMK's roles. LMK is a collective management organization established by creators or rights holders to collectively manage their economic rights. LMKs are authorized by their members (creators, artists, and music producers) to collect and distribute royalties for the use of their works (Maharani & Tarina, 2024: 881-888). Each LMK usually represents a specific group, such as pop songwriters, traditional musicians, or singers. LMKN, in accordance with Law 28/2014, is a government-formed institution that functions as a national coordinator for all LMKs in the field of music and has a non-state budget. LMKN is authorized to centrally collect, pool, and distribute song royalties, as well as manage the economic rights of creators and related rights holders at the national level. According to the Copyright Law, two LMKNs must be established to represent the interests of creators and related rights holders separately. However, both are coordinated by a single LMKN structure. In practice, the licensing and distribution mechanism works as follows: Song users (e.g., café or event organizers) apply for a license through the LMKN and pay the specified royalties. The LMKN then distributes the royalties to creators, copyright

holders, and related artists through their respective LMKs. LMKN distributes royalties based on song usage data recorded in the Song and Music Information System (SILM) to each LMK. Then, each LMK pays royalties to creators/rights holders who are members of that LMK (Latuasan, 2023: 24). If royalties are earned from songs owned by creators who are not yet LMK members, the LMKN temporarily holds the royalties while announcing that the creators should register with an LMK to receive their royalties (Hikmawati : 113). This integrated scheme is supported by the Song/Music Data Center at the Directorate General of Intellectual Property. The Center contains a database of registered songs, providing LMKN and LMK with the same data reference. Legally, this model ensures that all commercial users of music fulfill their obligation to pay royalties and that creators receive their economic rights proportionally through a single, government-regulated national licensing channel.

b. The Position of Mediation in the Copyright Regime

Mediation plays an important role in settling copyright disputes in Indonesia. According to Law No. 28 of 2014 on Copyright, mediation is a prerequisite to criminal law enforcement in certain copyright infringement cases (Surono, 2018: 121). According to Article 95(4), except in cases of piracy, if the parties to the dispute are located in Indonesia, they must first attempt to resolve the dispute through mediation before pursuing criminal charges. Thus, this provision establishes mediation as the initial step for copyright owners in the event of infringement (e.g., unauthorized use of a song), preceding the reporting of the perpetrator to criminal authorities (Yasmine, 2021: 160). The purpose of this mediation requirement is to encourage peaceful and restorative resolutions. With mediation, the parties may reach an agreement (e.g., the perpetrator agrees to pay compensation or outstanding royalties), resolving the conflict without lengthy criminal proceedings (Angrayni, 2016: 99).

The mediation policy in the 2014 Copyright Law aligns with the general provisions of Law No. 30 of 1999 regarding arbitration and alternative dispute resolution. Law 30/1999 recognizes alternative dispute resolution (ADR) outside of court, including negotiation, conciliation, and mediation, as a means of resolving civil disputes through deliberation based on the parties' good faith, thus bypassing litigation (Diah, 2016: 114). According to Law 30/1999, the parties to a civil dispute should first attempt to reach an amicable settlement. The settlement agreement resulting from ADR is final and binding, similar to a contract between the parties. In the context of copyright, mediation is an appropriate form of ADR for resolving infringement claims without going to court or initiating criminal proceedings (Nurahmasari dkk., 2021: 126). It is clear that Indonesian copyright regulations have adopted the spirit of Law 30/1999 by encouraging the use of mediation as the first step in dispute resolution.

With regard to the implementation of mediation, it is necessary to distinguish between non-litigation mediation (outside the court) and litigation mediation (within the court). Non-court mediation refers to mediation voluntarily undertaken by the parties before or without involving judicial institutions (Ramadhani & Kafabilla, 2025: 1046). The process is entirely determined by the parties' agreement, using an independent mediator of their choice (which may be through a mediation institution, an arbitral body, or a certified individual mediator). The outcome of non-litigation mediation is generally set out in a written agreement that is binding on the parties under civil law (contractual in nature) (Mulyana, 2019: 191).

Meanwhile, court-annexed mediation is mediation conducted as an integral part of civil proceedings before the court. The Supreme Court, through Supreme Court Regulation No. 1 of 2016 on Mediation Procedures in Court (PERMA 1/2016), stipulates that every civil case filed in court must first be attempted to be resolved amicably through mediation

(Wiantara, 2018: 464). This rule applies generally, including to copyright disputes filed as civil cases. Under PERMA 1/2016, once a lawsuit is registered, the court appoints a mediator (either a judge or a certified non-judge mediator) and grants the parties a specified period for mediation (generally 30 days, extendable by another 30 days upon agreement). Litigation mediation is mandatory: the parties and their legal representatives are required to attend mediation sessions; failure to appear may result in sanctions (the lawsuit is deemed withdrawn if the plaintiff is absent, or a default judgment is rendered if the defendant fails to attend). The process is more formalized than non-court mediation. If a settlement is reached, the mediator and the parties prepare a deed of settlement (*akta perdamaian*) which is ratified by the presiding judge. This deed has permanent binding legal force and is enforceable as a court judgment. Conversely, if mediation fails, the case proceeds to the ordinary trial process. The principal distinction between court-annexed mediation and non-litigation mediation lies in their formal framework and legal consequences (Dewi, 2022: 88).

The Legal Implications of Resolving Music Royalty Disputes through Mediation in the Mie Gacoan–LMK SELMI Case: Impacts on the Parties and on the Governance of Music Royalty Enforcement in Indonesia

a. Facts and Application in the Mie Gacoan Case

This music copyright dispute originated from a public complaint concerning the unauthorized use of songs at one of the Mie Gacoan restaurant outlets in Denpasar, Bali. The complaint was followed up by the Collective Management Organization (Lembaga Manajemen Kolektif/LMK) Sentra Lisensi Musik Indonesia (SELMI), which filed an official report with the Bali Regional Police (Polda Bali) on 26 August 2024, based on findings that the outlet in question had played commercial music without paying royalties to the copyright holders. In response to this report, the police initiated an investigation into the management of Mie Gacoan. During the course of the investigation, the Director of PT Mitra Bali Sukses, as the operator of the Mie Gacoan network in Bali, I Gusti Ayu Sasih Ira Pramita, was even designated as a suspect in the alleged copyright infringement. On 8 August 2025, a mediation effort was facilitated by the Regional Office of the Ministry of Law and Human Rights (Kanwil Kemenkumham) Bali to resolve the dispute. The mediation was attended by the Minister of Law and Human Rights of the Republic of Indonesia, Supratman Andi Agtas, who witnessed the signing of a settlement agreement between the parties. In this meeting, the Director of PT Mitra Bali Sukses, I Gusti Ayu Sasih Ira Pramita, signed a peace agreement together with the legal representative of LMK SELMI, Ramsudin Manulang. The signing of this agreement signified that Mie Gacoan agreed to fulfill its obligations regarding music royalties through an amicable settlement outside the judicial process (non-litigation). The mediation agreement stipulated that Mie Gacoan would pay royalties amounting to IDR 2.2 billion to LMK SELMI. This amount covered a blanket license for the use of the entire catalog of songs under SELMI's management during the period of 2022 to 2025 across the entire Mie Gacoan restaurant network (a total of 65 outlets located in Bali, Java, Sumatra, and Lombok). The calculation of the royalty value was determined in accordance with the applicable statutory provisions, taking into account the number of outlets, seating capacity, and the duration of unauthorized music use (adm_ntt, 2025).

After the royalty payment was agreed upon and the settlement deed signed, SELMI agreed to withdraw the police report that had been filed and issued a letter of reconciliation to support the application of restorative justice in this case. Through the achievement of this amicable settlement, the criminal process handled by the Bali Regional Police could be discontinued and redirected to a restorative justice mechanism in accordance with the

directive of the Minister of Law and Human Rights (MAO, 2025). Mie Gacoan thereby obtained legal certainty to resume playing music across all of its outlets until the end of December 2025, based on the license that had been paid (adm_ntt, 2025). The resolution of the dispute through mediation successfully prevented the case from proceeding to court and served as an example that copyright disputes over music can indeed be resolved through mediation.

b. Recipients of Royalty Payments

Initial media reports stated that the royalty payment by Mie Gacoan was made directly to LMK SELMI as the complainant in the case. However, official statements and information from the government clarified that the royalty payment was channeled through LMKN (the National Collective Management Organization) as the official body designated under the mediation agreement (humas_kalteng, 2025). This discrepancy created uncertainty regarding who was in fact the rightful recipient of the royalty payment in this case.

Based on Circular Letter No. SE.06.LMKN.VIII-2025 concerning the Revocation of Delegated Authority to Collective Management Organizations for the Collection and Aggregation of Song and/or Music Royalties, it is stipulated that the collection and aggregation of music royalties for commercial use must be carried out centrally through LMKN. This provision is in line with Government Regulation No. 56 of 2021, which establishes LMKN as the central “single gateway” for the collection of royalties from all commercial uses of musical works (Karim, 2021: 70). The unified single-channel system of royalty collection and distribution is intended to simplify the process of transferring royalties from users to rights holders, to prevent multiple collections by different parties, and to ensure that the management of music royalties is conducted in a professional, transparent, fair, and efficient manner (Karim, 2021: 69).

Furthermore, Article 14 paragraph (3) of Government Regulation No. 56 of 2021 provides that royalties collected by LMKN shall subsequently be distributed to Authors, Copyright Holders, and Related Rights Holders through the respective Collective Management Organizations (LMKs). In other words, LMKN functions as the national royalty aggregator, which then channels the collected royalties to each LMK (including SELMI) in accordance with their respective entitlements.

c. The Legal Implications of Mediation

1. Implications for Law Enforcement

The mediation mechanism plays a strategic role as the preliminary stage in enforcing copyright law in cases of non-piracy infringements. Law No. 28 of 2014 on Copyright explicitly provides that before pursuing criminal proceedings, efforts at civil dispute resolution such as mediation must first be undertaken (Mustafa, 2022: 15). Article 95(4) of the Copyright Law stipulates that criminal charges for copyright infringement (other than piracy) may only be brought once mediation has been attempted. This provision underscores the principle of *ultimum remedium* in the enforcement of intellectual property rights, namely that criminal law is to be used as a last resort (Surbakti, 2017: 26).

The principle of restorative justice is highly relevant in the resolution of copyright disputes. In the mediation process, authors or rights holders and alleged infringers are encouraged to reach a settlement that emphasizes restoration rather than criminal punishment, where such punishment is unnecessary. The Directorate General of Intellectual Property (DJKI) of the Ministry of Law and Human Rights has emphasized that mediation offers several advantages: it provides a simpler process, requires less cost

and time, and allows flexibility in accommodating the specific needs of the parties. In the context of copyright disputes, which often involve business actors, such amicable settlements also contribute to maintaining business partnerships and fostering a conducive climate for the creative industry (Jamilus, 2020: 37-48).

The success of mediation in copyright disputes can prevent escalation into litigation, whether civil or criminal. Thus, the continuation of criminal law enforcement was no longer necessary. This demonstrates that mediation is effective in creating opportunities for the termination of legal proceedings in the interest of legal certainty and utility, as long as the victim's (author's) interests have been restored. Accordingly, mediation implies a shift in the orientation of intellectual property law enforcement : from a retributive approach to a restorative one, where the restoration of rights and the awareness of the infringer are prioritized over criminal punishment.

2. Implications for the Industry

The resolution of the music royalty dispute through mediation in the Mie Gacoan case has created a positive precedent for the industry. In this case, the Mie Gacoan restaurant chain (through PT Mitra Bali Sukses) ultimately fulfilled its obligation to pay outstanding music royalties, with the agreed amount reaching approximately IDR 2.2 billion (adm_ntt, 2025). The willingness of the business operator to comply with royalty payments following the mediation process not only resolved the dispute with the CMO but was also regarded as an example of legal compliance in the commercial sector.

Another positive impact of this case is the creation of legal certainty regarding the licensing period that was the object of the dispute. In the Mie Gacoan mediation, it was agreed that the IDR 2.2 billion payment would cover a "blanket" license for the use of music from 2022 to 2025 across all Mie Gacoan outlets operated by PT MBS (approximately 65 branches in Bali, Java, Sumatra, and Lombok). This provided an important clarification for other business operators: royalty obligations apply retroactively from the time the centralized system was implemented (in this case, from 2022, following the issuance of Government Regulation No. 56 of 2021). The settlement ensured that Mie Gacoan was licensed for that period, thus shielding the company from future claims. For the industry, certainty regarding the duration and scope of licenses is crucial for business planning. There is now a clear reference point that commercial music licenses can be negotiated comprehensively for a fixed period, enabling business operators to calculate obligations in advance and avoid the accumulation of arrears. On the other hand, authors and copyright holders also benefit from certainty over their economic rights for that period, which are secured at once through the mediation mechanism. The case also produced a deterrent effect: associations of restaurant and café operators began to recognize that the government is serious about enforcing royalty regulations. Following the Mie Gacoan case, LMKN even compiled a list of other "non-compliant users" who had not paid royalties for further follow-up. This created a positive domino effect in the form of increased compliance within the creative industry sector.

The Mie Gacoan case also highlights the importance of transparency in royalty tariffs and access to licensing information for industry players. One of the root causes of the dispute was the lack of understanding among business operators regarding the tariff scheme and licensing procedures for music use. Royalty management must be open, accountable, and fair, leaving no room for opaque practices in the digital era.

CONCLUSION

Conclusion

1. The legal framework governing the obligation to pay music royalties in Indonesia is already clear and comprehensive. Law No. 28 of 2014, Government Regulation No. 56 of 2021, and Minister of Law and Human Rights Regulation No. 9 of 2022 require that all commercial uses of music be licensed through LMKN as the centralized channel. At the same time, mediation is recognized as an alternative mechanism for resolving copyright disputes, both under the Copyright Law and Supreme Court Regulation No. 1 of 2016, thereby constituting a legitimate and effective non-litigation avenue.
2. The resolution of the Mie Gacoan dispute (with LMK SELMI) through mediation resulted in the obligation to pay IDR 2.2 billion in royalties, with the license valid until 2025. Its legal implications include the creation of a new binding contractual obligation between the parties, the termination of potential criminal prosecution through restorative justice, and legal certainty for authors to obtain their economic rights. However, the practice also revealed weaknesses, namely limited public awareness, overlapping authority between LMKs and LMKN, lack of transparency in tariff structures, and the fact that mediation outcomes do not yet carry executorial force unless formalized as a court-sanctioned deed of settlement.

Recommendations

1. The government and LMKN need to enhance public awareness and outreach regarding royalty obligations so that business operators understand the rules from the outset.
2. The relationship and coordination between LMKs and LMKN must be improved to ensure that the “single gateway” mechanism functions effectively and does not create confusion.
3. Transparency and accountability in the royalty system should be strengthened, for instance through the optimization of the Song and Music Information System (SILM) and the publication of proportional official tariff guidelines.

REFERENCE

- Angrayni, L. (2016). Kebijakan mediasi penal dalam penyelesaian perkara tindak pidana ringan perspektif restorative justice. *Jurnal Hukum Respublica*, 16(1), 88–102.
- Asihatka, P. T. M. A. R. (2024). Lisensi royalti penggunaan hak cipta lagu untuk kepentingan yang bersifat komersial. *Borneo Law Review*, 8(2), 113–126.
- Asma, K. (2021). Kepastian hukum LMKN sebagai lembaga terpadu satu pintu penghimpun dan pendistribusi royalti hak cipta dan hak terkait bidang musik dan lagu. *Jurnal Hukum*, 13(1), 70.
- Dewi, N. M. T. (2022). Penyelesaian sengketa non litigasi dalam penyelesaian sengketa perdata. *Jurnal Analisis Hukum*, 5(1), 81–89.
- Diah, M. M. (2016). Prinsip dan bentuk-bentuk alternatif penyelesaian sengketa di luar pengadilan. *Jurnal Ilmiah Hukum dan Dinamika Masyarakat*, 5(2), 111–122.
- Dirkareshza, R. (2024). Hak ekonomi dalam hak cipta lagu: Analisis kasus kontroversial antara band dan partai politik. *Iblam Law Review*, 4(1), 353–362.
- Felani, H. (2017). Pemungutan royalti hak cipta oleh lembaga manajemen kolektif. *Voice Justisia: Jurnal Hukum dan Keadilan*, 1(2), 159–185.
- Hikmawati, P. (n.d.). Memperjelas kedudukan LMKN dalam pengelolaan royalti penggunaan ciptaan lagu dan musik. *Parliamentary*, 61–119.
- Jamilus. (2020). Optimalisasi mediasi kekayaan intelektual di Kementerian Hukum dan HAM. *De Jure: Jurnal Penelitian Hukum*, 20(1), 37–48. <https://doi.org/10.30641/dejure.2020.V20.37-48>
- Laili, S. E. N., Sulastris, S., & Wardani, W. Y. (2023). Implementasi Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 56 Tahun 2021 tentang pengelolaan royalti hak cipta lagu dan/atau musik terhadap pelaku usaha di Indonesia. *Unira Law Journal*, 1(2), 143–152.

- Latuasan, T. M. (2023). Pelaksanaan pendistribusian royalti performing right menggunakan teknologi blockchain. *Collegium Studiosum Journal*, 6(1), 20–28.
- Maramis, R. L. (2014). Perlindungan hukum hak cipta atas karya musik dan lagu dalam hubungan dengan pembayaran royalti. *Lex Privatum*, 2(2), 117.
- Maharani, V. N., & Tarina, D. D. Y. (2024). Wewenang dan tanggung jawab Lembaga Manajemen Kolektif Nasional (LMKN) dalam perlindungan hak ekonomi musisi Indonesia. *Jurnal Interpretasi Hukum*, 5(1), 881–888.
- Marzuki, P. M. (2023). Penelitian hukum (Edisi Revisi, 8th ed.). Kencana Prenada Media Group.
- Mulyana, D. (2019). Kekuatan hukum hasil mediasi di dalam pengadilan dan di luar pengadilan menurut hukum positif. *Jurnal Wawasan Yuridika*, 3(2), 177–198.
- Nadya, A. P. (2023). Kekuatan Lembaga Manajemen Kolektif Nasional dalam penarikan royalti. *Jaksa: Jurnal Kajian Ilmu Hukum dan Politik*, 1(4), 142–149.
- Nurahmasari, R., Amirulloh, M., & Afriana, A. (2021). Mediasi sebagai kewajiban penyelesaian sengketa perdata pelanggaran paten di Indonesia demi kepastian dan kemanfaatan hukum. *Acta Diurnal: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum Kenotariatan*, 5(1), 123–138.
- Rais, R. (2023). Perlindungan hukum terhadap hak cipta lagu yang digandakan tanpa izin dihubungkan dengan Undang-Undang Nomor 28 Tahun 2014 tentang Hak Cipta. *Jurnal Kebaruan*, 1(1), 65–72.
- Ramadhani, S., & Kafabilla, Z. F. (2025). Penyelesaian sengketa perbankan syariah jalur non pengadilan. *Jurnal Cakrawala Akademika*, 2(1), 1044–1053.
- Saputra, E. R., Fahmi, F., & Daeng, Y. (2022). Mekanisme pembayaran royalti untuk kepentingan komersial berdasarkan Undang-Undang Nomor 28 Tahun 2014 tentang Hak Cipta. *Jurnal Pendidikan Tambusai*, 6(3), 13658–16378.*
- Salsabilla, H. (2025). Penyelesaian sengketa melalui mediasi dalam hukum acara perdata. *Jejak Digital: Jurnal Ilmiah Multidisiplin*, 1(1), 15–23.
- Sudaryono, N. S. (2017). *Hukum pidana: Dasar-dasar hukum pidana berdasarkan KUHP dan RUU KUHP*. Muhammadiyah University Press.
- Surono, D. C. (2018). Penegakan hukum terhadap pembajakan karya seni musik menurut Undang-Undang Nomor 28 Tahun 2014 tentang Hak Cipta. *Lex Privatum*, 6(2), 121–128.
- Syahrani, N. M. P., Praja, C. B. E., & Hakim, H. A. (2023). Studi kepatuhan musisi dan penyedia layanan berbasis komersial dalam membayar royalti. *Borobudur Law and Society Journal*, 2(4), 176–187.*
- Wiantara, I. K. (2018). Penyelesaian perkara perdata di pengadilan berdasarkan Peraturan Mahkamah Agung Republik Indonesia Nomor 1 Tahun 2016. *Jurnal Magister Hukum Udayana (Udayana Master Law Journal)*, 7(4), 456–467.*
- Wicaksono, A. B. (2023). Perlindungan hak cipta dalam kasus penggunaan lagu SKJ88 tanpa izin oleh O Shop (Studi kasus putusan nomor 991/Pdt. Sus-HKI/2022). *UNES Law Review*, 6(2), 6297–6311.*
- Windarsari, W. R. (2025). Musik, royalti, dan konsumen: Analisis kualitatif pengaruh kebijakan hak cipta di pusat perbelanjaan. *Jurnal Akuntansi Pajak dan Manajemen*, 8(2), 131–138.*
- Yasmine, M. A. (2021). Kewajiban mediasi sebelum gugatan ganti rugi perdata atas pelanggaran hak cipta di Indonesia. *Repertorium: Jurnal Ilmiah Hukum Kenotariatan*, 10(2), 157–172.*
- Marzuki, P. M. (2023). *Penelitian hukum* (Edisi Revisi, 8th ed.). Kencana Prenada Media Group.
- Mustafa, M. E., & SH, M. (2022). *Aneka penegakan hukum hak cipta, paten, merek, dan indikasi geografis*. Penerbit Alumni.

- Sudaryono, N. S. (2017). *Hukum pidana: Dasar-dasar hukum pidana berdasarkan KUHP dan RUU KUHP*. Muhammadiyah University Press.
- adm_ntt. (2025, Agustus 8). Mie Gacoan dan LMK Selmi sepakat damai soal pembayaran royalti. *Kantor Wilayah Kemenkum RI Nusa Tenggara Timur*. <https://ntt.kemenkum.go.id/berita-utama/mie-gacoan-dan-lmk-selmi-sepakat-damai-soal-pembayaran-royalti>
- humas_kalteng. (2025, Agustus 8). Menkum mediasi sengketa royalti, Mie Gacoan dan Selmi sepakat damai terkait pembayaran royalti. *Kantor Wilayah Kemenkum RI Provinsi Kalimantan Tengah*. <https://kalteng.kemenkum.go.id/berita-utama/menkum-mediasi-sengketa-royalti-mie-gacoan-dan-selmi-sepakat-damai-terkait-pembayaran-royalti>
- MAO. (2025, Agustus 8). Royalti Rp 2,2 miliar dibayarkan, Mie Gacoan dan LMK Selmi sepakat damai. *Nusabali.com*. <https://www.nusabali.com/berita/198799/royalti-rp-22-miliar-dibayarkan-mie-gacoan-dan-lmk-selmi-sepakat-damai>