



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](tel:+628117404455)

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.38035/jlph.v6i3>
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

The Effectiveness of Elektronik Hearings on Civil Case Proceedings at the Tanjung Karang District Court

Riski Widodo^{1*}, Nadia Resky², Eka Antonia Saputri³, Sri Zanariah⁴

¹Sang Bumi Ruwajurai University, Bandar Lampung, Indonesia, widodorizky1@gmail.com.

²Sang Bumi Ruwajurai University, Bandar Lampung, Indonesia, nadiaretsky1412@gmail.com

³Sang Bumi Ruwajurai University, Bandar Lampung, Indonesia, saputriekaantonia@gmail.com

⁴Sang Bumi Ruwajurai University, Bandar Lampung, Indonesia, sri.zanariah@gmail.com

*Corresponding Author: widodorizky1@gmail.com

Abstract: The implementation of electronic trials in civil cases is part of the judicial modernization agenda that aims to realize the principles of simple, fast, and low-cost justice. This study analyzes the effectiveness of electronic trials on civil case proceedings at the Tanjung Karang District Court from the perspective of civil procedural law. The research method used is normative-empirical legal research with a legislative, conceptual, and case approach. Data was obtained through literature study and field research in the form of interviews and observations of electronic trial practices. The results of the study show that the implementation of e-court and e-litigation at the Tanjung Karang District Court has normatively supported the realization of case administration efficiency, particularly at the registration and response stages. However, this effectiveness is not yet fully uniform, especially in terms of access to justice for those seeking justice who have limited digital literacy and are not accompanied by legal counsel. In addition, the evidence stage remains a crucial issue due to doubts about the authenticity and strength of electronic evidence, which in practice often requires verification of physical documents. This study concludes that the effectiveness of electronic trials is not only determined by the availability of regulations and technology, but also by the readiness of human resources, the legal culture of society, and the active role of judges in maintaining procedural justice. Therefore, strengthening digital literacy, legal assistance, and improving the legal framework for evidence are important prerequisites for optimizing electronic trials in civil cases.

Keywords: Electronic Court Proceedings; E-Court; Civil Procedure Law; Access To Justice; Tanjung Karang District Court

INTRODUCTION

The implementation of electronic trials in civil cases is a progressive and innovative step taken by the Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia in order to respond to the challenges of modernizing the judicial system in the digital age (Agung, M. 2018). This policy is implemented through Supreme Court Regulation No. 1 of 2019 concerning Electronic Case Administration and Court Proceedings, which was subsequently refined through Perma No. 7

of 2022 (Agung, M. 2022). Conceptually, regulations on electronic trials are intended to transform the judicial system, which has often been perceived as slow, costly, and unresponsive to the needs of those seeking justice. This transformation is in line with the doctrine of access to justice, which emphasizes that the judicial system must be accessible to all citizens in an effective, efficient, and non-discriminatory manner (Cappelletti, 1978). By utilizing information technology, electronic trials are expected to accelerate proceedings, reduce case costs, and increase the transparency and accountability of civil courts.

Normatively, the main objective of implementing electronic trials is to realize the principles of simple, fast, and low-cost justice as mandated in Article 2 paragraph (4) of Law Number 48 of 2009 concerning Judicial Authority. From a civil procedure law perspective, the principles of simplicity, speed, and affordability not only serve as ethical guidelines for judicial administrators, but also as evaluative standards for assessing the effectiveness of a procedural mechanism in achieving procedural justice. This principle serves as a benchmark for determining whether a judicial system is capable of minimizing unnecessary formalities, expediting the resolution of disputes, and reducing the costs borne by the parties (Mertokusumo, 2009). The presence of e-court and e-litigation is normatively designed to address these issues through the digitization of case registration processes, advance fee payments, summons of parties, and online question and answer stages, as stipulated in Supreme Court Regulation Number 1 of 2019 in conjunction with Perma Number 7 of 2022. Theoretically, this mechanism can reduce administrative barriers, geographical limitations, and legal transaction costs that have been inherent in conventional court procedures (Agung, M. 2018). However, the normative effectiveness does not always align with empirical reality in the field. Various studies show that the implementation of electronic trials still faces structural and cultural obstacles, such as digital literacy gaps among parties, limited technological infrastructure, and resistance from judicial officials to procedural changes, which ultimately have the potential to undermine the principles of simplicity, speed, and affordability (Asshiddiqie, 2016; Susanti, 2021). Ultimately has the potential to undermine the very principles of simplicity, speed, and low cost.

In practice, the implementation of electronic trials still faces various structural and cultural obstacles. In terms of institutional readiness, not all judicial work units have optimal technological infrastructure, whether in terms of internet availability, hardware, or other support systems. Research by Retnaningsih and Ulfanora shows that disparities in infrastructure readiness between courts are a major factor affecting the effectiveness of e-court and e-litigation implementation (Retnaningsih, 2020; Ulfanora, 2022). This condition has a direct impact on the smooth running of electronic court proceedings, especially when technical disruptions occur that hinder the uploading of documents or access to the e-court system. From a civil procedure law perspective, these technical disruptions have the potential to raise issues of legal certainty and procedural justice, especially if such delays or technical failures have implications for the rights of the parties to submit their responses, replies, or rejoinders in a timely manner (Purwanti, 2021).

In addition to institutional factors, human resources are also a significant challenge. Judicial officials, including judges and court clerks, are required not only to have a substantive understanding of civil procedure law, but also to have the technical competence to operate electronic court systems. Musfa emphasizes that the successful implementation of Perma No. 1 of 2019 is highly dependent on the technical capacity and understanding of court officials regarding the legal implications of using electronic systems (Musfa, 2025). On the other hand, people seeking justice, especially those who are not represented by lawyers, often find it difficult to understand the mechanisms for registering cases, creating e-court accounts, uploading documents, and electronic summonses. This digital literacy gap has the potential to

create inequality in access to justice, where those with better technological capabilities gain procedural advantages over those who are less digitally literate (Azyyati, 2023; Hakim, 2024).

From a legal culture perspective, the implementation of electronic trials also requires a change in mindset among those seeking justice and legal practitioners. Until now, conventional trials with physical presence in the courtroom have been perceived as the ideal representation of the judicial process. The transition to electronic trials requires social acceptance that justice is not solely measured by physical presence, but rather by the fulfillment of the procedural and substantive rights of the parties. Jabłońska-Bonca and Boulanger-Bonnely emphasized that without changes in legal culture, online trials risk being viewed merely as an administrative formality, rather than as a substantive instrument for ensuring justice (Jabłońska, 2022; Boulanger, 2022).

Thus, the effectiveness of electronic trials in civil cases cannot be measured solely by the existence of progressive regulations. Such effectiveness must be analyzed holistically, taking into account institutional readiness, human resource competence, and the legal culture of the community seeking justice. Without the support of these three aspects, the goal of realizing a simple, fast, and low-cost judiciary as mandated in the Judicial Authority Law risks not being optimally achieved (Azyyati, 2023).

The issue of access to justice has become a major concern in the implementation of electronic trials at the Tanjung Karang District Court. In theory, the e-court and e-litigation systems are designed to expand public access to the courts by removing geographical barriers, reducing legal costs, and speeding up the resolution of cases. Ocarina and Sanjaya noted that during the Covid-19 pandemic, e-courts played an important role in maintaining the continuity of judicial functions while increasing time and cost efficiency. However, Prabawati's research shows that at the Tanjung Karang District Court, these benefits have not been felt equally by all levels of society (Prabawati, 2021). The main obstacles lie in the digital literacy gap and limited legal assistance. Many people seeking justice who are not represented by lawyers experience difficulties from the initial stage of case registration to following the electronic court proceedings. This situation has the potential to create a new form of procedural exclusion for groups of people who are less educated in technology, as also found in Judge's research.

Similar problems are seen in various civil cases handled by the Tanjung Karang District Court, including breach of contract cases, disputes between individuals, and industrial relations cases. In the context of evidence, the electronic court system presents its own challenges, particularly regarding the authenticity and evidentiary value of electronic documents. Saragih and Sulaiman point out that although the electronic question-and-answer stage is relatively efficient, serious problems arise at the stage of document evidence, where judges are faced with the dilemma between procedural efficiency and ensuring material truth (Saragih, 2024). This is in line with the findings of Rudy and Mayasari, who emphasize the importance of caution in assessing electronic evidence so as not to sacrifice legal certainty (Rudy, 2021).

Furthermore, the issue of standards of proof and the synchronization of efficiency with substantive justice are also crucial issues. Although e-courts increase efficiency, the quality of case examination and the protection of procedural rights must not be reduced. In this context, civil procedure law must remain positioned as a means of achieving justice, not merely a technical procedure oriented solely toward speed (Boroi, 2015). A similar problem was also seen in the special civil case of industrial relations (PHI) *Setiyo Budi v. PT Japfa Comfeed Indonesia, Tbk.* This case involved a labor dispute that normatively required a quick and simple process. However, in the practice of electronic trials, workers who have limited understanding of the e-court system face obstacles in submitting documents and following the online trial process. This shows that even in PHI cases, which should favor the protection of workers' rights, the digitization of procedures still requires support and assistance so as not to weaken the position of parties who are structurally more vulnerable.

Although electronic trials at the Tanjung Karang District Court are nominally intended to expand access to justice, in practice they still pose serious problems related to inclusivity. The crucial question that arises is whether electronic trials truly fulfill their promise as an instrument for democratizing access to justice, or whether they have the potential to create new forms of exclusion for people who lack digital literacy. These findings confirm that the effectiveness of e-courts depends not only on technological sophistication and comprehensive regulations, but also on social readiness, legal assistance, and affirmative policies that guarantee equal access to justice for all citizens.

Within the legal framework, legal certainty and due process of law are very important elements. In civil procedure law, the principle of *audi et alteram partem*, which means hearing both sides, is a fundamental basis. However, Purwantini revealed that e-litigation can lead to debates regarding the validity of court proceedings and judges' decisions, especially when technical obstacles related to the internet network hinder the timely delivery of response documents (Purwantini, 2021). At the Tanjung Karang District Court, in a civil case of default, the defendant was late in uploading their response due to internet network disruptions, causing the panel of judges to consider whether the delay could be tolerated. This shows that the effectiveness of electronic trials requires more than just speed of process; the legal system must also be able to guarantee the procedural rights of all parties to ensure fairness in proceedings.

Another important aspect in the electronic court process is evidence in civil cases, which historically and normatively occupies a central position in Indonesian civil procedural law. The civil evidence system still relies on classical evidence as stipulated in Article 1866 of the Civil Code, namely documentary evidence, witnesses, presumptions, admissions, and oaths. Among these types of evidence, documentary evidence plays a dominant role because it is considered to be the most capable of providing legal certainty regarding the civil law relationships between the parties. In the context of electronic trials, the mechanism of documentary evidence has undergone a significant transformation, as documents are no longer physically presented in the courtroom, but are uploaded in digital form through the e-litigation system.

Furthermore, the issue of standards of proof is crucial in electronic trials. The fundamental question that arises is whether uploaded electronic documents can be equated with original written documents, and to what extent technology can guarantee the integrity and authentication of these documents. Although the Electronic Information and Transactions Law Recognizes electronic documents as valid evidence, its application in the context of civil procedure law still requires consistent interpretation and clear technical guidelines. Without clarity on the standard of proof and mechanisms for verifying electronic documents, electronic trials face the risk of legal uncertainty, which could ultimately undermine public confidence in the electronic civil justice process.

Moving on to a more complex issue, namely the synchronization between efficiency and substantive justice. Handayani pointed out that e-courts in the pandemic and post-pandemic era contribute significantly to judicial efficiency. However, this efficiency cannot compromise the quality of case examination. For example, at the Tanjung Karang District Court, although electronic trials facilitate the speed of the question-and-answer process, there are concerns that limited interaction between judges and parties could reduce the depth of case examination, especially in complex cases. From a progressive legal perspective, the effectiveness of a trial cannot only be measured by the speed of the process, but also by the court's ability to produce decisions that are fair and socially just.

Although efforts to implement electronic trials in Indonesia, particularly in the Tanjung Karang District Court, appear promising, there are still many challenges to be faced. From unequal access to justice to the readiness of officials and complex evidence, every element of the system affects the entire judicial process. Therefore, the active involvement of all parties,

including policymakers, judicial officials, and the community itself, is necessary to ensure that the ultimate goal achieving substantive justice is not just a slogan, but also a reality that can be felt by every individual in the legal process.

This study aims to analyze and examine in depth the effectiveness of implementing electronic trials in civil proceedings, particularly at the Tanjung Karang District Court, from the perspective of civil procedural law. This study seeks to assess the extent to which electronic trials, as regulated in Supreme Court Regulation Number 1 of 2019 and its amendment in Perma Number 7 of 2022, are able to realize the principles of simple, fast, and inexpensive trials, while also guaranteeing legal certainty, procedural justice, and the protection of the rights of the parties.

In addition, this study aims to identify various legal issues and practical obstacles that arise in the implementation of electronic trials, whether they originate from normative, institutional, human resource, or legal culture aspects of the community seeking justice. This study also aims to examine the effectiveness of the evidence mechanism in electronic trials, particularly regarding the position, authenticity, and evidentiary value of electronic documents in complex civil cases.

Furthermore, this study aims to provide an empirical description of electronic court practices at the Tanjung Karang District Court through an analysis of civil cases heard electronically, so that the gap between normative provisions and their implementation in the field can be identified. Ultimately, this study is expected to formulate legal and practical recommendations for strengthening the electronic court system, so that it can function effectively as an instrument of civil justice modernization that guarantees access to justice, procedural efficiency, and the quality of judicial decisions.

METHOD

This study uses a normative-empirical legal research method (socio-legal research) that combines normative legal studies with empirical analysis of the practice of electronic trials in civil cases at the Tanjung Karang District Court. This approach was chosen because the issues studied are not only related to written legal norms, but also concern their implementation and effectiveness in judicial practice. This research is descriptive-analytical in nature, with the aim of systematically describing the implementation of e-court and e-litigation and analyzing the legal issues that arise in the trial process, particularly in realizing the principles of simple, fast, and inexpensive justice and ensuring legal certainty and procedural justice for the parties.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results of the study show that the implementation of electronic trials at the Tanjung Karang District Court is normatively in line with the main objective of Supreme Court Regulation Number 1 of 2019, as amended by Perma Number 7 of 2022, namely to realize the principles of simple, fast, and low-cost justice. Through the e-court system, the initial stages of the trial process, such as case registration, payment of court fees, and summoning of the parties, can be carried out online without the need to be physically present in court. This condition significantly reduces bureaucratic procedures that have been considered complicated and time-consuming, while also reducing the costs incurred by the parties, especially transportation and accommodation costs. These findings confirm the results of research by Ocarina and Sanjaya, which states that e-court contributes significantly to the efficiency of the judicial process, particularly in terms of saving time and litigation costs (Ocarina, 2021).

In terms of procedural simplicity, electronic trials at the Tanjung Karang District Court allow parties to monitor case developments transparently through an integrated information system. Court schedules, case documents, and procedural stages can be accessed in real time, reducing reliance on manual communication and the potential for administrative errors. This

reflects concrete efforts to simplify civil court mechanisms without compromising the substance of case examinations. However, this simplicity has not been fully felt by all levels of society seeking justice, especially by parties who do not have legal assistance or adequate technological skills.

From the perspective of speed, electronic trials are relatively capable of accelerating the resolution of cases, especially at the administrative and question-and-answer stages. Delays in hearings due to the absence of parties can be minimized because documents are submitted electronically within a specified time limit. However, in practice at the Tanjung Karang District Court, the speed of this process is sometimes hampered by technical obstacles, such as network disruptions or system errors, which have the potential to delay the next stage of the trial. This condition shows that the speed of electronic trials is highly dependent on the readiness of adequate technological facilities and infrastructure.

From the perspective of legal effectiveness theory as proposed by Soerjono Soekanto, the success of a legal rule is determined not only by the substance of its norms, but also by factors such as law enforcement, facilities and infrastructure, society, and legal culture. In the context of the Tanjung Karang District Court, although the legal substance and e-court system are in place, the effectiveness of electronic trials still faces challenges in terms of society and legal culture (Soekanto, 1983). Parties who are not represented by lawyers often experience technical difficulties in using the e-court system, from creating accounts to uploading documents. As a result, the principles of simplicity and low cost have not been fully realized by all those seeking justice. Therefore, although normatively electronic trials have fulfilled the principles of simple, fast, and low-cost justice, empirically, continuous efforts are still needed to improve digital literacy and legal assistance so that these benefits can be felt inclusively.

From the perspective of access to justice theory, electronic trials have significant potential to expand the reach of judicial services and bring court institutions closer to the community. The concept of access to justice is not only interpreted as the formal right to file a case in court, but also includes the real ability of each individual to use legal mechanisms effectively without disproportionate obstacles. In this context, Indrayani, Lemes, and Sena emphasize that the implementation of e-courts can, in principle, improve the accessibility of the judiciary through the use of information technology, particularly by reducing geographical, time, and cost barriers, which have been major obstacles for those seeking justice (Indrayani, 2023).

The results of the study show that the implementation of electronic trials at the Tanjung Karang District Court provides tangible benefits for parties who reside outside the city or have limited time and mobility. During the Question and answer stage, for example, the parties are no longer required to be physically present in the courtroom, so they can submit their legal arguments and case documents online according to a predetermined schedule. This situation directly contributes to time efficiency and reduced litigation costs, while also strengthening the principle of access to justice in a practical sense. For lawyers and legal entities, electronic trials also provide greater flexibility in case management, enabling more effective case handling.

However, the effectiveness of access to justice through electronic trials is relative and not entirely equitable. According to Argintaru, access to justice must be effective and inclusive, meaning that every individual must have the same opportunity to utilize judicial mechanisms without discrimination (Argintaru, 2023). In practice at the Tanjung Karang District Court, the digital literacy gap and limited access to technological devices have become new obstacles for some justice seekers, especially those who are not represented by lawyers or who come from certain socio-economic groups. Difficulties in operating the e-court system, understanding electronic procedures, or uploading case documents have the potential to reduce the effectiveness of their right to a fair trial.

This situation creates a legal paradox, whereby the digitization of the judiciary, which is intended to facilitate and expand access, has the potential to create a new form of procedural exclusion. Therefore, the results of this study reinforce Musfa's findings, which emphasize that the effectiveness of electronic trials cannot be separated from the support of non-normative policies. Technical assistance, legal education, and improving digital literacy among those seeking justice are essential prerequisites for electronic trials to truly function as an instrument for realizing substantive access to justice, rather than merely formal access to the judicial system.

The results of the study show that the question-and-answer stage, which includes the submission of answers, replies, and rejoinders, is the most effective stage in the implementation of electronic trials at the Tanjung Karang District Court. At this stage, the e-litigation mechanism allows the parties to submit written legal arguments through an electronic system without having to be physically present in the courtroom. The document upload process generally runs relatively smoothly, the schedule for submitting documents can be monitored systematically, and the potential for trial delays due to the absence of the parties can be significantly minimized. These conditions show that the digitization of court procedures can improve administrative efficiency while providing certainty of time in the trial stage.

The findings of this study are consistent with the results of research by Saragih and Sulaiman, which state that electronic trials are highly effective in procedural stages that are administrative and argumentative in nature. In this context, the question-and-answer stage does indeed place greater emphasis on the exchange of legal documents and written arguments, making it highly compatible with the electronic court system. The existence of clear time limits in the e-litigation system also encourages the parties to be more disciplined in preparing and submitting documents, thereby making the proceedings more structured and predictable.

From the perspective of judicial efficiency theory, as proposed by Roşu, simplifying procedures and utilizing information technology are important instruments for accelerating the resolution of civil cases without compromising the main function of the judiciary. The implementation of electronic trials at the question-and-answer stage at the Tanjung Karang District Court reflects the implementation of this theory, as it reduces the administrative burden on the court and speeds up communication between the panel of judges and the parties. This efficiency also has a positive impact on overall case management, particularly in reducing the accumulation of pending cases due to non-substantive factors.

The evidence stage is the most problematic aspect in the application of electronic trials in civil cases. The results of the study show that judges at the Tanjung Karang District Court tend to be very cautious in assessing electronic evidence, especially digital documents uploaded through the e-court system. This caution is particularly evident in cases involving land disputes, banking, and high-value civil contracts, which generally involve authentic deeds, land title certificates, or financial documents as primary evidence. Judges' doubts generally focus on the authenticity, integrity, and formal validity of these electronic documents. From the perspective of the theory of legal evidence, as stated by Boroi and Stancu, the main purpose of evidence in civil procedure law is to achieve material truth within the procedural framework determined by law (Boroi, 2015). In this context, evidence is not only assessed based on its form, but also on its probative value in convincing the judge of the disputed facts. Although Law No. 11 of 2008 on Electronic Information and Transactions, as amended, recognizes electronic documents as valid evidence, its application in civil court practice still faces interpretative challenges. This is due to the incomplete integration of classical civil procedural law norms with developments in digital technology.

From the perspective of the principles of legal certainty and simple, swift, and inexpensive justice, these conditions have significant implications. On the one hand, the judge's caution can be understood as an effort to maintain the quality of the verdict and prevent the

manipulation of evidence. However, on the other hand, the obligation to present physical documents has the potential to eliminate the efficiency that is the main objective of electronic trials. Therefore, the issue of evidence in electronic trials at the Tanjung Karang District Court shows that the effectiveness of e-courts is not only determined by technological aspects, but also by the clarity of the legal framework for evidence and the readiness of the judicial apparatus to adapt the paradigm of evidence to the digital system.

The results of the analysis show that the role of judges is a central factor in maintaining the balance of rights and obligations of the parties in electronic trials at the Tanjung Karang District Court. In practice, judges not only function as law enforcers who apply Perma Number 1 of 2019 textually, but also as key actors who ensure that the trial process remains fair and proportional. The research findings show that in certain cases, especially when one of the parties experiences technical difficulties such as network disruptions, document upload errors, or limited digital literacy, the panel of judges tends to grant leniency in the form of time extensions, rescheduling, or additional explanations regarding electronic trial procedures.

This practice reflects the application of the principle of procedural justice, which emphasizes that justice is not only measured by the final outcome of a decision, but also by the process undergone by the parties. In procedural justice theory, as developed in modern procedural law, the legitimacy of a court decision is greatly influenced by the extent to which the parties feel they have been treated fairly, heard, and given an equal opportunity to defend their interests. In the context of electronic trials, the active role of judges becomes even more important because the potential for procedural inequality due to differences in technological capabilities between parties is relatively greater than in conventional trials. This view is in line with progressive legal theory, which views law as a means to achieve substantive justice, rather than an end in itself. Musfa emphasized that the flexibility of judges in applying Perma No. 1 of 2019 is the key to the effectiveness of electronic trials. Such flexibility is necessary to bridge the gap between abstract legal norms and the social realities of those seeking justice. However, Musfa also emphasizes that the flexibility of judges must remain within the corridor of the principles of impartiality and legal certainty, so as not to give the impression of bias or inconsistency in the application of the law.

In practice at the Tanjung Karang District Court, balancing flexibility and legal certainty poses a unique challenge. On the one hand, judges' responsiveness and empathy toward the technical constraints faced by the parties strengthens procedural justice and increases public trust in electronic justice. On the other hand, if tolerance is given without clear standards, there is a risk of disparity in treatment between cases. Therefore, the role of judges in electronic trials is not only individual in nature, but also requires institutional guidelines that can serve as a common reference, so that procedural justice can be consistently realized in every civil case tried electronically. In terms of the quality of decisions, the results of the study show that the implementation of electronic trials in civil cases at the Tanjung Karang District Court does not directly reduce the quality of judges' legal considerations. The panel of judges still compiles decisions based on the facts revealed in court, the evidence submitted by the parties, and the applicable substantive and procedural laws. Thus, normatively and methodologically, the quality of decisions remains within the same judicial standards as conventional trials. This shows that the digitization of court procedures does not necessarily undermine the independence and professionalism of judges in carrying out their judicial functions.

However, this study also found that the limitations of direct interaction in electronic trials have the potential to affect the examination of facts in certain types of cases. In complex civil cases, such as land disputes, unlawful acts, or default with multiple legal relationships, direct interaction between judges and parties often plays an important role in exploring the facts more comprehensively. Electronic trials, which rely more on written documents and

online communication, tend to limit the space for judges to make spontaneous clarifications or explore non-verbal aspects that often arise in face-to-face trials. This condition is in line with Handayani's view that the quality of a judge's decision is greatly influenced by the depth of the case examination, not merely by the speed or efficiency of the trial process.

From the perspective of decision quality theory, the depth of case examination is an important prerequisite for the realization of substantive justice. The procedural efficiency generated by electronic trials must be balanced with adaptive examination strategies, for example by selectively combining electronic trials and face-to-face trials according to the characteristics of the case. Thus, electronic trials are not understood as an absolute substitute for conventional trials, but rather as a flexible instrument in the modern judicial system. Regarding public trust, the results of the study show that acceptance of electronic trials at the Tanjung Karang District Court tends to be higher among lawyers and parties who have adequate digital literacy. For this group, e-court is seen as an innovation that simplifies the trial process and increases efficiency. However, among the general public, especially those who are not familiar with technology, the level of trust in electronic trials still needs to be strengthened. This shows that the effectiveness of electronic trials cannot be measured instantly, but must be understood as a gradual process that requires continuous evaluation, increased user capacity, and institutional commitment to ensure that judicial modernization is truly oriented towards justice and the interests of those seeking justice.

Based on the results and discussion above, it can be concluded that the implementation of electronic trials in civil cases at the Tanjung Karang District Court has basically shown a fairly good level of effectiveness, particularly in terms of administration and efficiency in resolving cases. The e-court and e-litigation systems have proven to be capable of simplifying case registration procedures, speeding up the question and answer stages, and reducing the indirect costs that must be borne by the parties, so that normatively they are in line with the principles of simple, fast, and low-cost justice as mandated by law.

The findings of this study confirm the views of Julisman, Rahmayani, and Nazar, who state that the effectiveness of e-courts is contextual and highly dependent on the readiness of the judicial system and service users. Thus, electronic trials at the Tanjung Karang District Court cannot be assessed solely on the basis of the success of their normative implementation, but must be understood as an ongoing process that requires evaluation, strengthening of the capacity of the judicial apparatus, public education, and refinement of the legal framework for evidence. Without these steps, the main objective of judicial modernization to achieve effective, inclusive justice that is oriented towards the interests of those seeking justice may not be optimally achieved.

CONCLUSION

The implementation of electronic trials in civil cases at the Tanjung Karang District Court has been quite effective, particularly in simplifying case administration, speeding up the Question and answer stage, and reducing costs and time spent on proceedings. Normatively, the implementation of e-court and e-litigation has been in line with the principles of simple, fast, and low-cost justice as mandated in Supreme Court Regulation Number 1 of 2019 as amended by Perma Number 7 of 2022. However, the effectiveness of electronic trials has not been fully optimized and evenly distributed. This study found obstacles in terms of access to justice for those seeking justice who have limited digital literacy, as well as in the evidence stage, particularly regarding the authenticity and strength of electronic documents as evidence. Therefore, the effectiveness of electronic trials is not only determined by regulations and technology, but also by the readiness of human resources, the legal culture of society, and the role of judges in maintaining procedural justice. Strengthening digital literacy, legal assistance,

and improving evidence mechanisms are important prerequisites for optimizing electronic trials in civil cases.

REFERENCE

- Argintaru, Andrei. "Access to Justice in the Digital Age: Constitutional Limits of Digital Judicial Procedures." *Journal of European Constitutional Law* 19, no. 2 (2023): 245–268.
- Asshiddiqie, Jimly. *Introduction to Constitutional Law*. Jakarta: Rajawali Pers, 2016.
- Azyyati, Reni Nur. *A Study of the Principles of Simple, Fast, and Low-Cost Justice in the Electronic Settlement of Cases at the Sleman District Court*. Disertasi, Islamic University of Indonesia, 2023.
- Boroi, Gabriel, dan Mihaela Stancu. *Drept procesual civil*. Bucharest: Editura Hamangiu, 2015.
- Boulanger-Bonnely, Julie. "Public Access to Online Hearings." *Dalhousie Law Journal* 45 (2022): 303–327.
- Căpăţină, Oana. "Digitalization of Civil Justice and Procedural Guarantees in European Legal Systems." *Romanian Journal of Comparative Law* 12, no. 1 (2021): 87–104.
- Cappelletti, Mauro, dan Bryant Garth. *Access to Justice: The Worldwide Movement to Make Rights Effective*. Milan: Giuffrè, 1978.
- Hakim, Syarif, Anisa Maharani, Bunga Ayu Putri, Dimas Kurniawan, Fajar Al Khairi, dan T. H. M. Kautsar. "Analysis of the Ineffectiveness of E-Court Implementation in the Court System." *Indonesian Research Journal on Education* 4, no. 3 (2024): 665–671.
- Indrayani, Intan, Rinaldo Lemes, dan Fernando Sena. "The Implementation of E-Court and Improving Access to Justice in the Judicial System in the Digital Era." *Journal of Law and Justice* 12, no. 2 (2023): 215–232.
- Jabłońska-Bonca, Jolanta. "Remote Hearings and Judicial Symbolism." *Krytyka Prawa* 14, no. 2 (2022): 235–254.
- Julisman, Randi, Nita Rahmayani, dan Jefri Nazar. "The Effectiveness of the E-Court System at the Lubuk Basung District Court." *Collegium Studiosum Journal* 6, no. 2 (2023): 548–554.
- Les, Ioana, dan Cristina Stoica. "Civil Procedure in the Era of Digital Transformation: Efficiency versus Procedural Fairness." *International Journal of Procedural Law* 12, no. 3 (2022): 401–423.
- Mertokusumo, Sudikno. *Indonesian Civil Procedure Law*. Yogyakarta: Liberty, 2009.
- Musfa, Ahmad. "Implementation of Perma Number 1 of 2019 and Implications for Judicial Apparatus Competence." *Journal of Judicial Law* 7, no. 1 (2025): 45–62.
- Ocarina, Mega Febriani, dan Rudi Sanjaya. "The Existence of E-Court in the Indonesian Judicial System." *Syntax Transformation Journal* 2, no. 4 (2021): 496–507.
- Prabawati, Tri, Nila Duadji, dan Indah Prihantika. "The Effectiveness of Implementing the E-Court Application at the Tanjung Karang District Court." *Administrativa Journal* 3, no. 1 (2021): 37–51.
- Purwantini, Endang. "E-Litigation and the Challenges of Due Process of Law." *Ius Quia Iustum Law Journal* 28, no. 2 (2021): 310–329.
- Retnaningsih, Sri, D. L. S. Nasution, R. A. Velentina, dan K. Manthovani. "Implementation of E-Court and E-Litigation in District Courts." *Journal of Law & Development* 50, no. 1 (2020): 124–144.
- Roşu, Andrei, Maria Popescu, dan Daniel Ionescu. "E-Justice and Civil Proceedings: Challenges and Perspectives in European Courts." *European Review of Private Law* 30, no. 4 (2022): 589–612.

- Rudy, Dewa Gede, dan I. D. A. D. Mayasari. "The Validity of Documentary Evidence in Electronic Trials." *Undiksha Journal of Civic Education* 9, no. 1 (2021): 167–174.
- Saragih, M. J. P., dan Sulaiman. "The Effectiveness of Electronic Trials in Civil Cases." *Suloh: Journal of the Faculty of Law, Malikussaleh University* 12, no. 2 (2024): 421–447.
- Soekanto, Soerjono. *Factors Affecting Law Enforcement*. Jakarta: Rajawali Pers, 1983.
- Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia. *Blueprint for the Renewal of the Indonesian Judicial System 2010–2035*. Jakarta: Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia, 2018.
- Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia. *Supreme Court Regulation Number 7 of 2022 concerning Amendments to Supreme Court Regulation Number 1 of 2019 concerning Electronic Case Administration and Court Proceedings*.
- Susanti, Dyah Ochtorina. *Civil Procedure Law and Its Development in the Digital Age*. Yogyakarta: FH UII Press, 2021.
- Tanjung Karang District Court. *Decision on Special Civil Case on Industrial Relations between Setiyo Budi and PT Japfa Comfeed Indonesia, Tbk*.
- Ulfanora, Ulfa, Dinda Amelia, dan H. A. Aziz. "The Application of Electronic Trials in the District Court of West Sumatra." *Bonum Commune Business Law Journal* 5, no. 1 (2022): 84–97.