



Administrative Criminal Law Enforcement of Public Order Violations in Batam: Effectiveness, Compliance, And Regulatory Synchronization

Greesen Hart¹, Indra Sakti², Dwi Afni Maileni³, Rizki Tri Anugrah Bhakti⁴

¹Faculty of Law, Universitas Riau Kepulauan, Batam, Indonesia, greesenaritonang@gmail.com

²Faculty of Law, Universitas Riau Kepulauan, Batam, Indonesia, indrasakti12680@gmail.com

³Faculty of Law, Universitas Riau Kepulauan, Batam, Indonesia, dwi.afni.maileni@gmail.com

⁴Faculty of Law, Universitas Riau Kepulauan, Batam, Indonesia, rizki.tri.ab@gmail.com

Corresponding Author: rizki.tri.ab@gmail.com⁴

Abstract: This study examines administrative criminal law enforcement in relation to public order violations in Batam, with particular emphasis on sanction effectiveness, public compliance, and regulatory synchronization. The study employs a normative juridical method, complemented by a limited empirical reading of statutory instruments, institutional documents, and scholarly literature. The findings indicate that Batam has established a layered sanction framework through the combined use of administrative and criminal sanctions, supported by a relatively comprehensive institutional enforcement structure. Nevertheless, its substantive effectiveness remains constrained by limited public legal awareness, socio-economic pressures, constrained enforcement capacity, and incomplete synchronization among local regulations, implementing rules, standard operating procedures, and enforcement practices. Performance documents of the Civil Service Police Unit indicate a high case-completion rate for recorded violations; however, this administrative achievement does not, by itself, demonstrate the emergence of stable and internalized public compliance. This study argues that effective enforcement must be gradual, responsive, and procedurally lawful, integrating guidance, supervision, sanctioning, and reporting innovation within a coherent enforcement system.

Keywords: Administrative Criminal Law, Public Order, Civil Servant Police Unit, Compliance, Regulatory, Synchronization, Batam

INTRODUCTION

Public order enforcement is one of the most concrete manifestations of the rule of law, as it enables the government to maintain order in public spaces, protect the public interest, and ensure that socio-economic activities remain within legally defined boundaries. In the context of Indonesian local government, this function is assigned to the Civil Service Police Unit (Satpol PP), a local government apparatus responsible for enforcing local regulations and regional head regulations, maintaining public order and public tranquility, and providing

community protection (Government Regulation Number 16 of 2018 on the Civil Service Police Unit; Batam Regional Regulation Number 9 of 2021 concerning the Amendment to Batam Regional Regulation Number 16 of 2007 on Public Order; Batam Mayor Regulation Number 26 of 2023 concerning the Main Duties, Functions, Job Descriptions, and Work System within the Civil Service Police Unit of Batam).

In Batam, this normative framework receives more specific articulation through Batam Regional Regulation Number 9 of 2021 concerning the Amendment to Batam Regional Regulation Number 16 of 2007 on Public Order and Batam Mayor Regulation Number 26 of 2023 concerning the duties, functions, and work procedures of the Civil Service Police Unit (Minister of Home Affairs Regulation Number 16 of 2023 concerning Standard Operating Procedures for the Civil Service Police Unit and the Code of Ethics for Civil Service Police Officers; Minister of Home Affairs Regulation Number 26 of 2020 concerning the Implementation of Public Order, Public Tranquility, and Community Protection). Accordingly, public order enforcement in Batam is not merely a routine administrative practice, but part of a local legal design that positions Satpol PP as a frontline institution for regulating public conduct in urban space.

Nevertheless, public order enforcement at the local level does not operate within a simple legal framework. Many public order violations arise from administrative norms, yet their formulation is accompanied by custodial penalties or fines, thereby producing the character of administrative criminal law. Within this construction, criminal sanctions do not stand independently as the primary regime; rather, they reinforce the effectiveness of administrative norms when ordinary administrative instruments are considered insufficient (Harahap, 2016; Prasetyo, 2009).

Problems arise when local regulations do not clearly define the relationship between administrative and criminal sanctions, or when enforcement officers face uncertainty over when guidance, warnings, administrative fines, minor-offense proceedings, or judicial processes should be applied (Aritonang, 2021; Setiyono, 2016). Existing scholarship indicates that sanction formulation and criminalization in local legal products may generate problems of proportionality, disharmony, and potential overcriminalization when they are not grounded in clear regulatory synchronization and well-defined limits of authority (Muslimin et al., 2024; Safitri, 2024).

Under such conditions, the effectiveness of law enforcement cannot be explained solely by the presence or absence of sanctions. Effectiveness is substantially shaped by how norms are applied by frontline officers, how citizens understand and respond to threatened sanctions, and whether enforcement is perceived as fair and legitimate. Studies on procedural justice and regulatory compliance show that regulatory compliance is influenced not only by fear of punishment, but also by perceptions of consistency, impartiality, and the correctability of enforcement processes (Makkai & Braithwaite, 1996; Parker, 2006).

Responsive regulation further demonstrates that enforcement strategies relying exclusively on deterrence may become trapped in a compliance trap, whereas approaches that combine persuasion, administrative instruments, and coercive measures in a graduated manner are more likely to generate sustained compliance commitments (May & Winter, 2009; Parker, 2013). In the domain of implementation, studies on street-level bureaucrats emphasize that the behavior, enforcement styles, and discretionary space of frontline officers directly shape policy outcomes, levels of citizen compliance, and the legitimacy of enforcement institutions (de Boer, 2021; May & Winter, 2009).

This issue becomes particularly important in the context of Batam. Batam is characterized by intense urban dynamics, dense economic activity, high human mobility, and highly competitive use of public space. These conditions make public order violations closely intersect with economic interests, livelihoods, the use of public facilities, occupation of road

space, and business activities that often operate at the margins of compliance. In practice, Satpol PP Batam not only confronts technical violations, but also social resistance, the need for cross-agency coordination, and demands that enforcement actions continue to respect legality, proportionality, and rights protection.

The Batam Government has also introduced local instruments to support enforcement, including SIAP GARDA, an application for reporting violations of local regulations and regional head regulations launched in 2023. However, the 2024 Work Plan of the Batam Civil Service Police Unit also acknowledges that low public awareness, potential social conflict, limited enforcement personnel, and inadequate facilities remain major challenges in public order enforcement.

Within this landscape, compliance becomes a central question. Public order compliance does not always emerge from established legal awareness; in many circumstances, it is situational and depends on the presence of enforcement officers, the consistency of supervision, and citizens' perceptions of the legitimacy of enforcement actions (Harahap, 2016; Novikasari, 2023). Harsh sanctions will not be effective if the enforcement process is perceived as disproportionate, while well-designed administrative sanctions may lose their coercive force if they are not supported by consistent enforcement mechanisms and synchronized regulations (Abd. Rasyid et al., 2022; Fathani et al., 2022; Parker, 2013).

Several studies have examined sanction arrangements in local regulations, rights-based enforcement by Satpol PP, and regulatory synchronization (Astariyani et al., 2024; Rahmadanita & Nurrahman, 2022). However, substantial analytical space remains for an integrated examination of the relationship among sanction effectiveness, public compliance, and regulatory synchronization in the context of administrative criminal law enforcement against public order violations in Batam.

Against this background, this study analyzes administrative criminal law enforcement against public order violations in Batam by focusing on three principal issues: sanction effectiveness, compliance, and regulatory synchronization. The study is theoretically important because it strengthens the discussion of administrative criminal law at the local level by linking sanction design, enforcement implementation, and compliance behavior within a single analytical framework. It is also practically important because it provides an evaluative basis for the Batam Government and Satpol PP to strengthen enforcement mechanisms that are more lawful, proportional, consistent, and effective.

METHODS

This study employs a normative juridical method complemented by a limited empirical reading of documents related to the implementation of public order enforcement in Batam. This method was selected because the issue under examination administrative criminal law enforcement against public order violations requires analysis not only of written legal norms, but also of how those norms are operationalized within local government institutions (Aritonang, 2021). Accordingly, the study does not stop at an inventory of rules; it evaluates the coherence between sanction design, enforcement patterns, and compliance conditions as reflected in official local enforcement documents.

The study applies statutory, conceptual, and implementation-oriented approaches. The statutory approach is used to examine the normative structure governing public order and the enforcement authority of Satpol PP, ranging from Government Regulation Number 16 of 2018 on the Civil Service Police Unit; Minister of Home Affairs Regulation Number 26 of 2020 concerning the Implementation of Public Order, Public Tranquility, and Community Protection; Minister of Home Affairs Regulation Number 16 of 2023 concerning Standard Operating Procedures for the Civil Service Police Unit and the Code of Ethics for Civil Service

Police Officers; to Batam Regional Regulation Number 9 of 2021 and Batam Mayor Regulation Number 26 of 2023.

The conceptual approach is used to interpret administrative criminal law, sanction proportionality, regulatory compliance, procedural justice, and responsive regulation as analytical lenses for the legal findings. Meanwhile, the implementation-oriented approach is used to assess whether the normative design is supported by available programs, indicators, and institutional enforcement instruments within the Batam Civil Service Police Unit.

The primary legal materials in this study consist of statutory instruments relevant to public order enforcement and the authority of Satpol PP. Secondary legal materials include journal articles, books, and previous studies concerning the relationship between administrative and criminal sanctions, local regulation enforcement, due process, responsive enforcement, and the behavior of frontline bureaucracies (Grimmelikhuijsen, 2012; Grimmelikhuijsen & Meijer, 2014; Pei, 2026). Non-legal materials used as empirical support include planning and institutional documents, particularly the 2024 Work Plan of the Batam Civil Service Police Unit and official publications regarding SIAP GARDA as an innovation in reporting violations. These documents were selected because they are relevant for identifying performance indicators, implementation problems, and enforcement strategies adopted by the local government.

The materials were collected through literature review and official document tracing. All materials were then inventoried, classified, and organized according to three analytical focuses: sanction effectiveness, compliance, and regulatory synchronization. At this stage, the study first mapped the sanction norms in Batam Regional Regulation, both those with criminal and administrative characteristics, and then compared them with operational enforcement instruments, institutional performance indicators, and implementation problems acknowledged by Satpol PP Batam. This step prevents the analysis from remaining purely textual and enables it to show the relationship among norms, institutions, and policy outcomes.

Data analysis was conducted qualitatively through systematic legal interpretation, vertical and horizontal synchronization, and content analysis of institutional documents. Vertical synchronization was used to assess the consistency of Batam Regional Regulation with higher-level regulations. Horizontal synchronization was used to examine the coherence among local regulations, mayoral regulations, SOPs, and regional implementation instruments. Content analysis was used to read performance indicators, supervision targets, violation handling, PPNS development, and service problems listed in the 2024 Work Plan of Satpol PP Batam.

In addition, the study applies document triangulation by comparing legal norms, performance documents, and scholarly literature so that conclusions are not based on a single type of source. This approach was chosen to sharpen the analysis of the gap between legal design and enforcement practice. The results are presented descriptively and analytically to answer whether the prevailing sanction regime is sufficiently effective, whether enforcement has generated substantive compliance, and the extent to which regulatory synchronization supports legal certainty and consistency in law enforcement actions in Batam.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The findings show that administrative criminal law enforcement against public order violations in Batam is built upon a dual-sanction regime. Batam Regional Regulation Number 9 of 2021 provides for custodial sanctions and fines for several violations, while also establishing graduated administrative sanctions, including oral warnings, written warnings, social work, administrative fines, temporary suspension of business activities, and revocation of business licenses. This structure confirms that public order law in Batam is not framed

merely as pure administrative law, but as a mixed regime that uses criminal sanctions to strengthen the coercive force of administrative norms.

The first finding concerns the differentiation of subjects, types of violations, and levels of sanction escalation. The Regional Regulation distinguishes violations committed by individuals from those committed by business actors or managers of public facilities. For individuals, the available administrative sanctions tend to be simpler, whereas business actors are subject to a broader spectrum of sanctions, including temporary suspension of activities and license revocation. This differentiation reflects an orientation toward proportionality, but it also opens interpretive space at the field level regarding when guidance, administrative fines, or minor-offense proceedings should be used.

Table 1. Sanction Construction in Batam Regional Regulation Number 9 of 2021

Normative Aspect	Main Provision	Type of Sanction	Enforcement Implication
Article 24 paragraph (1)	Violations of several specified articles	Imprisonment for a maximum of 3 months or a fine of up to IDR 5,000,000	Criminal sanction for general violations
Article 24 paragraph (2)	Violations in certain categories considered more serious	Imprisonment for a maximum of 3 months or a fine of up to IDR 25,000,000	Differentiation according to violation severity
Article 24A paragraph (2) letter a	Violations committed by individuals	Oral/written warning, 120 minutes of social work, or an administrative fine of IDR 250,000	Graduated administrative approach
Article 24A paragraph (2) letter b	Violations committed by business actors/managers of public facilities	Warning, temporary suspension for 3-7 days, administrative fine of IDR 500,000-IDR 4,000,000, up to license revocation	Escalated approach based on recurrence

The second finding shows that the institutional enforcement architecture in Batam has been comprehensively developed. The national framework established through Government Regulation Number 16 of 2018 and Minister of Home Affairs Regulation Number 26 of 2020 provides Satpol PP with the authority to enforce local regulations, maintain public order, and coordinate with other institutions. Minister of Home Affairs Regulation Number 16 of 2023 adds SOP and ethical dimensions, thereby requiring enforcement not only to be legally authorized, but also to be procedurally orderly. At the regional level, Regional Regulation Number 9 of 2021 and Mayor Regulation Number 26 of 2023 complete this framework by providing the local basis for public order substance and Satpol PP's institutional functions.

Table 2. Enforcement Architecture and Implementation Instruments in Batam

Instrument/Program	Form of Intervention	Main Finding	Implication
Government Regulation No. 16 of 2018	Legal basis for Satpol PP authority	Satpol PP is authorized to enforce local regulations and regional head regulations	Institutional legality is established
Minister of Home Affairs Regulation No. 26 of 2020	Implementation of public order, public tranquility, and community protection	Emphasizes stages of implementation and coordination	Supports a preventive approach
Minister of Home Affairs Regulation No. 16 of 2023	SOP and code of ethics	Enforcement must comply with procedures and ethics	Mitigates the risk of arbitrary action
Batam Mayor Regulation No. 26 of 2023	Duties and functions of Satpol PP Batam	Clarifies the division of organizational functions	Supports consistency in work procedures
2024 Work Plan of Satpol PP Batam	Socialization, handling, supervision, and PPNS development	Enforcement design is not solely repressive	Enforcement combines prevention and sanctioning

The third finding relates to the official performance indicators of the Batam Civil Service Police Unit. The 2024 Work Plan records that, in 2022, the percentage of resolved disturbances to public order and public tranquility reached 100%, with all 618 recorded cases declared completed. In the same year, enforcement of local regulations and regional head regulations was also recorded at 100%, with all 853 documented cases completed. In addition, all affected citizens recorded under service indicators were declared to have received services. Administratively, these data indicate the organization's capacity to follow up recorded cases. Substantively, however, these figures should be read as indicators of reported-case completion rather than as conclusive evidence that violations in the field have declined.

Table 3. Official Enforcement Indicators of Satpol PP Batam

Indicator	Official Data	Source	Analytical Meaning
Resolved disturbances to public order and public tranquility	618 of 618 cases (100%) in 2022	2024 Work Plan of Satpol PP Batam	Resolution capacity for recorded cases
Enforcement of local regulations/regional head regulations	853 of 853 cases (100%) in 2022	2024 Work Plan of Satpol PP Batam	Administrative performance in handling cases
Affected citizens receiving services	4 of 4 cases (100%) in 2022	2024 Work Plan of Satpol PP Batam	Post-enforcement service is documented
Follow-up on local regulation violations	Target of 100% in 2024	2024 Work Plan of Satpol PP Batam	Institutional orientation toward comprehensive follow-up

The fourth finding indicates that enforcement in Batam does not merely emphasize sanctioning. The 2024 local regulation enforcement program is supported by sub-activities that include the socialization of local regulations and regional head regulations, the handling of violations in accordance with SOPs, supervision of compliance, and the development of Civil Servant Investigators (PPNS). This finding shows that Satpol PP Batam is moving toward a graduated model consisting of socialization, supervision, handling, and PPNS strengthening.

However, the findings also show that this formal effectiveness remains overshadowed by substantive constraints. The 2024 Work Plan of Satpol PP Batam explicitly identifies the continuing high level of public order and public tranquility violations, the high number of violations of local regulations, low public awareness, the influence of economic pressure, limited quality of human resources among enforcement personnel, and inadequate facilities. In other words, the central enforcement problem in Batam lies not in the absence of rules, but in weak compliance-supporting conditions and limited implementation capacity.

Table 4. Main Enforcement Problems and Their Legal Implications

Problem Finding	Documentary Evidence	Legal Implication
Low public awareness	Public understanding of local regulations remains limited	Compliance tends to be situational
Economic and welfare pressures	Recognized as a root cause of violations	Enforcement can collide with citizens' livelihood needs
Limited personnel capacity	The quality and capacity of enforcement personnel remain limited	Risk of inconsistency and uneven discretion
Limited facilities and infrastructure	Acknowledged in the Work Plan	Reduces capacity for supervision and follow-up
Regulatory-operational gap	SOP, coordination, and PPNS development remain necessary	Synchronization between norms and implementation remains incomplete

The fifth finding can be observed from the SIAP GARDA innovation launched by Satpol PP Batam in 2023. The application for reporting minor-offense violations of local regulations and regional head regulations indicates that the local government recognizes the importance of faster detection, reporting, and response systems. However, this digital innovation will become effective only if supported by clear follow-up procedures, adequate personnel capacity, and consistent sanction choices. Overall, Batam has established a strong legal and institutional construction, but its substantive effectiveness remains limited by low public awareness, socio-economic pressures, constrained enforcement capacity, and underdeveloped operational synchronization.

The findings confirm that administrative criminal law enforcement in Batam operates at the intersection between the need to maintain public order and the requirement that the use of sanctions remain proportional. In terms of design, Batam Regional Regulation Number 9 of 2021 provides a more layered sanction spectrum than criminal punishment alone. This is important because public order law is generally more effective when it provides room for graduated responses, beginning with correction, guidance, and supervision before moving toward more coercive measures when non-compliance recurs.

From this perspective, Batam's sanction structure can be assessed as moving toward a more modern model than a single-track criminalization pattern. Nevertheless, the validity of sanction design cannot be assessed solely by its variety, but also by the orderly relationship among different types of sanctions and the clarity of criteria governing their use. Sanction arrangements in local regulations must comply with the principles of harmonization, hierarchy, and material-formal validity so as not to generate uncertainty at the implementation level. This is where Batam's problem emerges: sanction norms are available, but the transition pathway from guidance to administrative sanctions and then to criminal measures is not yet fully articulated as an explicit enforcement pyramid.

In terms of effectiveness, the officially reported 100% case-completion rate in the Work Plan document cannot be immediately interpreted as substantive enforcement success. This measure more accurately reflects the administrative capacity of the organization to close cases that have entered the system, rather than an actual decline in violations or the internalization of public compliance. This reading is consistent with studies showing that the existence of clear regulations and authority does not automatically resolve public order problems when facilities, incentives, and implementing capacity remain limited. Thus, enforcement effectiveness in Batam is better understood as case-handling effectiveness than as full compliance effectiveness. This explains why completion rates are high, while the Satpol PP Work Plan continues to acknowledge low public awareness, persistent violations, limited personnel capacity, and inadequate facilities and infrastructure.

The finding on low public awareness indicates that compliance with public order in Batam has not yet been fully grounded in legal consciousness, but remains strongly influenced by the intensity of supervision and the presence of enforcement officers. Procedural justice theory suggests that more durable compliance tends to emerge when citizens perceive enforcement as consistent, impartial, and accountable.

Accordingly, an enforcement orientation that relies excessively on punishment risks producing shallow and situational compliance. Recent work by Grimmelikhuijsen suggests that enforcement style does not always strengthen public trust in a linear manner; a tougher approach does not automatically increase public trust, and its effects are highly contextual. For Batam, the implication is clear: firmness remains necessary, but enforcement that foregrounds coercion without adequate communication and clear justification may weaken legitimacy.

In this context, guidance, socialization, and supervision should not be positioned merely as supplements to sanctioning, but as the core of a compliance strategy. This aligns with responsive regulation, which places persuasion and assistance at the lower levels of the

enforcement pyramid, while stronger sanctions are used when violations persist or recur. Responsive enforcement requires regulators to adjust instruments to the behavior of regulated subjects rather than beginning immediately with maximum threats. This framework is particularly relevant for Batam, as many public order violations intersect with informal economic activities, the use of public space, and citizens' everyday livelihood needs. In such contexts, excessively rapid sanction escalation may generate resistance, field-level conflict, and perceptions that enforcement is more repressive than corrective.

The administrative dimension of enforcement personnel is also decisive. Satpol PP is a frontline bureaucracy that interacts directly with citizens in situations that often require rapid decisions. Therefore, enforcement quality is not determined only by legal texts, but also by the interactional style of officers in the field. The enforcement style of street-level bureaucrats can produce unintended effects; approaches perceived as excessive may generate rejection or defiance. Conversely, citizens' perceptions of officers' warmth and competence positively influence their willingness to comply; citizens are more likely to follow rules when officers are perceived as both capable and respectful. In the Batam context, this finding is important because it shows that the legitimacy of enforcement is not built merely through formal authority, but also through communication quality, calmness, and behavioral consistency among officers.

Regulatory synchronization is the next critical issue. The findings show that Batam already has a layered legal basis from national to local levels. However, regulatory completeness is not identical to operational synchronization. The interrelation between administrative and criminal sanctions must be translated into more explicit criteria so that overlapping handling or disproportionate accumulation of sanctions can be avoided. The relationship between administrative fines and criminal sanctions must be managed carefully because it directly relates to proportionality, non-duplication, and legal certainty. In Batam, this need is evident. When the local regulation contains criminal provisions but operational documents emphasize socialization, supervision, and handling in accordance with SOPs, the normative bridge between these domains must be made more explicit. Without such clarity, officers may exercise overly broad discretion, while citizens may struggle to predict the consequences of each stage of violation.

Therefore, the main issue in administrative criminal law enforcement against public order violations in Batam is not the absence of legal instruments, but the need to reorganize the relationship among sanction design, the quality of officer-citizen interaction, and operational synchronization. An effective regime is not necessarily the harshest regime, but the one most capable of transforming violations into stable compliance. To achieve this, Batam requires three simultaneous improvements: clearer criteria for sanction escalation, stronger Satpol PP and PPNS capacity grounded in SOPs and enforcement ethics, and a compliance strategy that positions socialization, supervision, and reporting technology as instruments for building legitimacy, not merely as tools of control. Through these measures, public order enforcement can move beyond case completion toward the formation of a more just, consistent, and effective local legal governance system.

CONCLUSION

This study shows that administrative criminal law enforcement against public order violations in Batam has a relatively adequate normative and institutional foundation, yet its effectiveness continues to face substantive challenges. From a regulatory perspective, Batam already has local legal instruments governing public order, supported by a combination of administrative and criminal sanctions. This construction confirms that public order violations are not merely positioned as ordinary administrative matters, but as a domain of administrative criminal law in which criminal sanctions function as reinforcement for administrative norms.

Conceptually, therefore, Batam's enforcement regime reflects an effort to build public order through a graduated mechanism, ranging from warnings, social work, administrative fines, and temporary suspension of activities to criminal sanctions for certain violations.

However, the findings confirm that the existence of varied sanctions does not automatically generate substantive compliance. The high case-completion rate reported in the performance documents of Satpol PP Batam demonstrates administrative capacity in handling recorded cases, but it is insufficient to prove that public compliance has grown in a stable and sustainable manner. Compliance in the public order context of Batam remains largely situational, strongly influenced by the presence of officers, supervision, and direct enforcement pressure. This condition shows that enforcement effectiveness cannot be measured only by the number of cases acted upon or resolved, but also by the extent to which enforcement encourages legal awareness, reduces recurring violations, and strengthens the legitimacy of rules in the eyes of citizens.

This study also finds that enforcement quality depends heavily on the relationship among legal norms, implementing officers, and citizens as regulated subjects. In practice, Satpol PP does not only perform a coercive function, but also carries the responsibility of maintaining the legitimacy of state action in public space. Accordingly, effective enforcement must rest on clear procedures, proportional sanction application, consistent enforcement style, and non-arbitrary conduct. At this point, Batam's main challenge is not the absence of rules, but the suboptimal synchronization among local regulations, implementing rules, enforcement SOPs, personnel capacity, and community guidance strategies.

Thus, the main issue in administrative criminal law enforcement against public order violations in Batam lies in the need to strengthen sanction effectiveness through implementation governance that is more synchronized, adaptive, and oriented toward long-term compliance. Enforcement that relies only on criminal threats or temporary control operations will not be sufficient to create sustainable public order. What is needed is a gradual, responsive, and procedurally lawful enforcement model that integrates guidance, socialization, supervision, and sanctioning into a coherent system.

On this basis, the study recommends that the Batam Government clarify the criteria for sanction escalation between administrative and criminal measures, strengthen the capacity of Satpol PP and PPNS, and enhance synchronization among regulations, SOPs, technology-based supervision innovations, and socialization strategies that reach the communities and business actors most frequently interacting with public space. These steps are essential so that public order enforcement is not only formally firm, but also effective in building public compliance, ensuring legal certainty, and realizing more just, proportional, and legitimate local legal governance.

REFERENCE

- Abd. Rasyid, S. B., Purnomo, E. P., Salsabila, L., & Fathani, A. T. (2022). Discourse Analysis of Online News on Green Economy and Blue Economy for Sustainable Development : The Case in Indonesia. *Fronteiras: Journal of Social, Technological and Environmental Science*, 11(1), 165-180. <https://doi.org/DOI> <http://dx.doi.org/10.21664/2238-8869.2022v11i1>
- Aritonang, D. M. (2021). Kompleksitas Penegakan Hukum Administrasi dan Pidana di Indonesia. *Jurnal Legislasi Indonesia*, 18(1), 45-58. <https://doi.org/10.54629/jli.v18i1.729>
- Astariyani, N. L. G., Hattori, M., & Hanum, W. N. (2024). The Validity of Sanctions Arrangements in Regional Regulations. *Journal of Human Rights, Culture and Legal System*, 4(3), 682-705. <https://doi.org/10.53955/jhcls.v4i3.313>

- de Boer, N. (2021). The (un)intended effects of street-level bureaucrats' enforcement style: Do citizens shame or obey bureaucrats? *Public Policy and Administration*, 36(4), 452-475. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0952076720905005>
- de Boer, N., Eshuis, J., & Klijn, E. (2018). Does Disclosure of Performance Information Influence Street-level Bureaucrats' Enforcement Style? *Public Administration Review*, 78(5), 694-704. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12926>
- Fathani, A. T., Pribadi, U., Suling, C. F., & Azmi, N. A. (2022). Pemanfaatan Sistem Informasi Desa (SID) terhadap Peningkatan Pelayanan Publik di Desa Dlingo, Bantul, Yogyakarta. *Jurnal Sistem Dan Teknologi Informasi*, 10(1), 92-97. <https://doi.org/10.26418/justin.v10i1.44347>
- Grimmelikhuijsen, S. (2012). Linking transparency, knowledge and citizen trust in government: an experiment. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 78(1), 50-73. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0020852311429667>
- Grimmelikhuijsen, S. G., & Meijer, A. J. (2014). Effects of Transparency on the Perceived Trustworthiness of a Government Organization: Evidence from an Online Experiment. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 24(1), 137-157. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mus048>
- Harahap, Z. (2016). Pengaturan tentang ketentuan sanksi dalam peraturan daerah. *Jurnal Hukum Ius Quia Iustum*, 13(1). <https://doi.org/10.20885/iustum.vol13.iss3>
- Jadidah, F. (2023). The Principle of Ultimum Remedium in Criminal Tax Matters. *Iblam Law Review*, 3(3), 124-137. <https://doi.org/10.52249/ilr.v3i3.193>
- Mahmud, A. (2024). Penegakan Hukum Pungutan Liar di Jawa Barat dalam Pelayanan Publik Pasca Covid-19. *Jurnal Hukum Ius Quia Iustum*, 31(1), 99-127. <https://doi.org/10.20885/iustum.vol31.iss1.art5>
- Makkai, T., & Braithwaite, J. (1996). Procedural justice and regulatory compliance. *Law and Human Behavior*, 20(1), 83-98. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01499133>
- May, P. J., & Winter, S. C. (2009). Politicians, Managers, and Street-Level Bureaucrats: Influences on Policy Implementation. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 19(3), 453-476. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mum030>
- Muslimin, M. K., Khair, A., & M. Saleh. (2024). Kriteria Pengenaan Besaran Sanksi Administrasi dalam Produk Hukum Daerah. *Jurnal Diskresi*, 3(1). <https://doi.org/10.29303/diskresi.v3i1.5008>
- Novikasari, S. R. (2023). Kewenangan Pemerintah Pusat dan Daerah dalam Kerangka Green Tax Reform. *Jurnal Hukum Ius Quia Iustum*, 30(3), 497-514. <https://doi.org/10.20885/iustum.vol30.iss3.art2>
- Parker, C. (2006). The "Compliance" Trap: The Moral Message in Responsive Regulatory Enforcement. *Law & Society Review*, 40(3), 591-622. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5893.2006.00274.x>
- Parker, C. (2013). Twenty years of responsive regulation: An appreciation and appraisal. *Regulation & Governance*, 7(1), 2-13. <https://doi.org/10.1111/rego.12006>
- Pei, Z. (2026). Is Warmth More Persuasive? The Effects of Street-Level Bureaucrats' Warmth and Competence on Citizens' Compliance During Pandemic Emergencies. *Regulation & Governance*, 20(2), 722-733. <https://doi.org/10.1111/rego.70006>
- Peraturan Daerah Kota Batam Nomor 9 Tahun 2021 tentang Perubahan atas Peraturan Daerah Kota Batam Nomor 16 Tahun 2007 tentang Ketertiban Umum.
- Peraturan Menteri Dalam Negeri Nomor 16 Tahun 2023 tentang Standar Operasional Prosedur Satuan Polisi Pamong Praja dan Kode Etik Polisi Pamong Praja.
- Peraturan Menteri Dalam Negeri Nomor 26 Tahun 2020 tentang Penyelenggaraan Ketertiban Umum dan Ketenteraman Masyarakat serta Pelindungan Masyarakat.
- Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 16 Tahun 2018 tentang Satuan Polisi Pamong Praja.

- Peraturan Wali Kota Batam Nomor 26 Tahun 2023 tentang Tugas Pokok, Fungsi, Uraian Tugas dan Sistem Kerja di Lingkungan Satuan Polisi Pamong Praja Kota Batam.
- Prasetyo, T. (2009). Kebijakan Kriminalisasi dalam Peraturan Daerah dan Sinkronisasi dengan Hukum Pidana Kodifikasi. *JURNAL HUKUM IUS QUIA IUSTUM*, 16(1), 18-33. <https://doi.org/10.20885/iustum.vol16.iss1.art2>
- Rahmadanita, A., & Nurrahman, A. (2022). Penyelenggaraan Fungsi Pemeliharaan Ketenteraman dan Ketertiban Umum oleh Satuan polisi Pamong Praja di Kota Bogor. *Jurnal Tatapamong*, 113-127. <https://doi.org/10.33701/jurnaltatapamong.v4i2.3014>
- Safitri, S. (2024). Safitri SS. Interrelasi denda administratif dan pidana dalam pelanggaran hukum lingkungan hidup pasca Perppu Cipta Kerja. *Jurnal Hukum Lingkungan Indonesia*, 9(2), 279-304. <https://doi.org/10.38011/jhli.v9i2.590>
- Setiyono, J. (2016). Human Rights Based Law Enforcement for the Violation of Local Regulation by Civil Service Police of Semarang Municipality. *Diponegoro Law Review*, 1(1), 61. <https://doi.org/10.14710/dilrev.1.1.2016.61-80>
- Weyembergh, A., & Joncheray, N. (2016). Punitive Administrative Sanctions and Procedural Safeguards: A Blurred Picture That Needs to Be Addressed. *New Journal of European Criminal Law*, 7(2), 190-209. <https://doi.org/10.1177/203228441600700208>