

EFFECTIVENESS OF THE EARLY CASE DETECTION SYSTEM (SDDP) IN PREVENTING DISPARITY IN DECISIONS AND SUPPORTING THE PRINCIPLE OF JUDICIAL TRILOGY IN THE BALIGE DISTRICT COURT

Pearl Princila Br. Manurung, Rachmi Sulistyarini, Hamidi Masykur

Program Magister Ilmu Hukum, Universitas Brawijaya PSDKU Jakarta

E-mail: manurungpearl@mail.com, rachmirini@yahoo.com, hamidi@ub.ac.id

Received : 01 October 2025

Published : 24 December 2025

Revised : 15 October 2025

DOI : <https://doi.org/10.54443/ijerlas.v5i6.4669>

Accepted : 29 November 2025

Link Publish : <https://radjapublika.com/index.php/IJERLAS>

Abstract

This study analyzes the effectiveness of the Early Case Detection System (SDDP) integrated into the Case Tracking Information System (SIPP) as an instrument to prevent disparity in decisions in civil cases in the general court environment. The focus of the study is directed at the implementation of SDDP at the Balige District Court as a representation of the implementation of electronic court technology (*e-court*) in the case handling process. This study uses a juridical-empirical method with a sociological approach to examine the relationship between the electronic court system and the objectives of the court in the Trilogy of Justice: simple, fast, and low cost. The research results indicate that the SDDP has not been effective. This is due to the absence of regulations mandating its use, low technical understanding among judicial officials, and the suboptimal quality of data in the SIPP, which hinders the ability to detect cases with similar subjects, objects, and legal relationships. This study concludes that the SDDP has significant potential to increase legal certainty and prevent conflicting decisions, but regulatory improvements, technical competency, and system updates are needed to achieve maximum effectiveness.

Keywords: *Disparity in Decisions, Legal Effectiveness, Ne Bis In Idem , Early Case Detection System, Trilogy of Justice.*

INTRODUCTION

Advances in information technology have brought significant changes to public administration, including in the judicial sector. The Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia, as the judicial authority, has initiated various digital innovations, one of which is the integration of the Case Tracking Information System (SIPP) as a national database of cases in district courts. SIPP not only contains administrative case information but has also evolved into a supporting instrument for more modern law enforcement processes.¹ One of the latest innovations in SIPP is the Early Case Detection System (SDDP), a feature that can identify data similarities between new and previous cases based on certain parameters, such as the identities of the parties, the object of the dispute, and the description of the posita. The main goal of SDDP is to prevent disparities in decisions, avoid the risk of *ne bis in idem* , and minimize the emergence of repeat cases that can burden the justice system.

In practice, the phenomenon of disparity in decisions is still frequently found in civil cases, including at the Balige District Court. Several decisions indicate conflicting issues over the same disputed object, ultimately leading to difficulties in execution and a decline in public trust in the judiciary. This is relevant to research considering that the effectiveness of SDDP is highly dependent on regulations, the capacity of the apparatus, and the adequacy of digital infrastructure. The problems in this research are formulated as follows: first, how is the implementation of SDDP at the Balige District Court? Second, what obstacles arise in the implementation of SDDP as seen from the Trilogy of Justice? Then, third, what optimization steps can be taken to improve the effectiveness of SDDP? This study aims to evaluate the implementation of SDDP, identify empirical constraints, and offer recommendations for improvement based on field findings and a study of the theory of legal effectiveness.

¹Amran Suadi. (2022). Digital Transformation of the Judicial Supervision System in Indonesia. Rajagrafindo Persada. Depok. p. 134.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The implementation of the Early Case Detection System (SDDP) is one of the Supreme Court's innovations designed to prevent disparities in decisions while supporting a simple, fast, and low-cost judicial trilogy. To understand the position and effectiveness of SDDP in the judicial system, this literature review consolidates previous research, presents a relevant theoretical framework, particularly the theory of legal effectiveness, the principle of judicial trilogy, and the principle of *ne bis in idem*, and maps the normative and empirical issues that shape the context of SDDP use.² This compilation aims to logically direct readers to the research gap to be filled through a field study at the Balige District Court. The theory of legal effectiveness serves as the main framework in assessing the extent to which SDDP functions as an instrument capable of influencing the behavior of legal subjects, especially judges, to achieve regulatory goals of certainty, justice, and benefit. Legal effectiveness is determined by three factors: the quality of clear and non-multi-interpretable norms, the capacity of law enforcement, and the availability of enforcement tools, including information technology.³ In the context of SDDP, this theory provides an analytical basis for evaluating whether the feature is capable of functioning as a legal communication tool that promotes consistency in decisions and reduces disparities, or is hampered by structural and technical factors.

This theoretical framework is enriched by the judicial trilogy (the principle of simplicity, speed, and low cost) as stated in Article 2 paragraph (4) of Law Number 48 of 2009 concerning Judicial Power. SDDP was developed to operationalize this principle by accelerating the process of identifying similar cases, simplifying the search for relevant decisions, and reducing potential costs resulting from further legal action arising from disparate decisions. However, there is tension between the application of these principles and the need for judges to remain meticulous in considering the uniqueness of each case. This flow is the point of relevance of SDDP as well as the potential challenges of its implementation. In addition, the principle of *ne bis in idem* is an important basis in the discussion of literature on disparate decisions and legal certainty.⁴ Decisions that are contradictory or concerning the same subject and object have the potential to give rise to execution problems and erode the legitimacy of the court. Normatively, SDDP is expected to be a preventive mechanism to detect potential *ne bis in idem* from the outset, however, studies show that to date there is no binding *dismissal mechanism in general courts to follow up on SDDP findings, so its effectiveness is highly dependent on the judge's initiative*.

The literature review highlights the debate surrounding the mandatory use of SDDP and its implications for judicial independence. Some view technologies like SDDP as tools that enhance decision-making quality through the presentation of relevant data, while others caution against the potential for over-reliance on algorithms that could potentially distort judicial reasoning. On the other hand, while numerous studies within the State Administrative Court (PTUN) have explored the effectiveness of *the dismissal mechanism* in improving efficiency and legal certainty, its application in general courts remains controversial, particularly regarding public access to the courts and the urgency of limiting lawsuits. Integrating SDDP results with the *dismissal mechanism* in the civil procedure system also requires more in-depth juridical-constitutional study. Overall, the literature appears to focus on normative analysis of e-court policies and case screening mechanisms, while very few combine normative perspectives with empirical evidence from direct users, particularly judges and clerks in district courts. This gap is evident in the absence of studies directly assessing SDDP use at the first level of court, including the frequency of its use, the technical-juridical obstacles that arise, and its impact on the consistency of decisions and their execution. In addition, the literature has not yet described the combination of obstacles ranging from human resource capacity, availability of facilities, to unclear norms and the optional nature of SDDP which impact the effectiveness of its implementation.

The paucity of research addressing the relationship between the SDDP and the potential implementation of an early detection-based *dismissal mechanism* further reinforces the urgency of conducting field research. Although the discourse on *dismissal* has rapidly developed within the study of state administrative justice, its integration into civil procedural law has not been systematically analyzed, particularly regarding its potential role in strengthening legal certainty and reducing the caseload. This situation creates a research gap that this study aims to address. Therefore, research at the Balige District Court is expected to make important contributions in three dimensions. Empirically, this study presents a factual picture of the use of the SDDP by judges, ranging from the intensity of its use, its patterns of use in file examinations, to the technical and legal obstacles that arise in practice. Theoretically, this study tests the relevance of the theory of legal effectiveness in the context of judicial technology, namely by examining how

² Nahrudin, Sufirman Rahman, and Anzar Makkuasa. (2023). Application of the Principle of Ne bis in idem in Civil Cases: Review of Decision Number 352/Pdt. G/2019/PA. Mrs. *Journal of Lex Generalis* (JLG). Volume 4. Number 1. p. 504.

³ Soerjono Soekanto. (2009). Factors Influencing Law Enforcement. Raja Grafindo. Jakarta. p. 20.

⁴ Nurul Hikmah . (2023). Application of the Principle of Ne Bis In Idem in Civil Decisions: (Analytical Study of Supreme Court Decision Number 3320 K/Pdt/2018). Novum: Journal of Law. Volume 10. Number 4. p. 238.

norms, implementers, and digital tools interact to influence the implementation of the SDDP. Policy-wise, this study provides a basis for operational recommendations to strengthen the use of the SDDP, including the possibility of developing guidelines for mandatory early examinations or integrating it with a more structured *dismissal mechanism*. In summary, the literature review indicates that although the normative basis for the use of SDDP is increasingly strong, empirical literature assessing its effectiveness at the first instance remains very limited. The debate over the mandatory status of SDDP, the limitations of technology use on judicial independence, and the unclear nature of case screening mechanisms further emphasize the need for research that combines normative analysis with field findings. Therefore, this study aims to answer the main questions regarding the extent to which SDDP is effectively used in practice at the Balige District Court, the factors that hinder its implementation, and how optimizing SDDP can contribute to the achievement of a more concrete judicial trilogy.

METHOD

This study uses a juridical-empirical design with a socio-legal approach that combines legal norm analysis with empirical findings⁵ regarding the implementation of the Early Case Detection System (SDDP) at the Balige District Court. This approach was chosen to assess the effectiveness of the SDDP as an instrument to prevent disparity in decisions and as a supporter of the Trilogy of Justice in first-instance court practice. The research series was designed through three main stages, starting with a normative study through *desk research* on regulations such as Supreme Court Regulation Number 7 of 2022 concerning Amendments to Supreme Court Regulation Number 1 of 2019 concerning Electronic Administration of Cases and Trials in Court and the Letter of the Secretary of the Supreme Court Number 3748/SEK/TI1.1.1.1/IX/2024 concerning Notification of Updates to the First-Instance SIPP Application version 5.6.0 and the e-Court Application version 6.0.0, as well as literature on legal effectiveness, the principle of *ne bis in idem*, and the concept of disparity in decisions. This normative stage provides a strong legal foundation for assessing the conformity between regulations and practice in the field. The next stage is empirical research conducted through observations of the use of SDDP at the Balige District Court and interviews with judges, clerks, and court leaders. Through this stage, the research seeks to explore actual practices as well as the technical, administrative, and legal obstacles faced by implementers. After data collection, the evaluation and analysis stage is carried out using descriptive-qualitative methods through the theory of legal effectiveness to assess the gap between what is regulated in the norm (*das sollen*) and what occurs in practice (*das sein*). This analysis also serves as the basis for formulating relevant policy recommendations for optimizing the implementation of SDDP.

The design of the research activities allowed for triangulation between norms, practices, and perceptions of implementers, resulting in more comprehensive research results. The target audience was selected through *purposive sampling*, taking into account functional proximity to the use of SDDP. Therefore, two judges who actively handle civil cases and have the potential to use SDDP in file readings, the Clerk of the Balige District Court, and the Chief Justice of the Balige District Court were selected as research subjects. These informants are parties directly involved in the operation, utilization, and supervision of SDDP, so the information provided is considered accurate and relevant to the research objectives. The research data were sourced from legal materials in the form of laws and regulations, case documents such as lawsuit files, decisions, and SIPP data from the Balige District Court, as well as various scientific literature. The research tools used included the SIPP application and SDDP features to directly observe the identical case detection mechanism, the level of case similarity, and search results, as well as interview instruments to explore the understanding, experiences, and obstacles of SDDP users. The interview instrument was designed semi-structured to allow for in-depth exploration while maintaining consistency across research variables, with a focus on judges' level of understanding, frequency of SDDP use, technical and legal barriers, identification of *ne bis in idem*, and the SDDP's influence on accelerating the judicial process.

The instrument's performance was measured by its ability to generate consistent, reliable, and in-depth data from each informant. In addition to interviews, observation instruments were used to directly observe the operational flow of the SDDP within the SIPP, the duration of the search process, the accuracy in identifying similar or identical cases, and the relevance of the output to the case facts. The productivity of the observation instrument was demonstrated by its ability to assess the technical effectiveness of the SDDP, including response speed, the accuracy of the similarity index, and the suitability of the search results. All data were analyzed using descriptive-qualitative techniques with three main steps. First, data reduction was carried out by grouping information based on variables such as SDDP implementation, technical and legal obstacles, relevance to the judicial trilogy, and its relationship to

⁵Suteki and Galang Taufani. (2018). Legal Research Methodology (Philosophy, Theory and Practice). Rajagrafindo Persada. Jakarta p. 30.

the theory of legal effectiveness. Second, the data were presented thematically to facilitate interpretation. Third, a normative-empirical analysis was conducted by comparing Supreme Court provisions with SDDP practices at the Balige District Court to assess the suitability of the implementation with the objectives of establishing the SDDP, its effectiveness in the context of judicial technology, and the potential for implementing the *dismissal process mechanism* in the general judicial system. The final step was drawing conclusions containing analytical results regarding the effectiveness of the SDDP along with policy recommendations to improve its implementation.⁶ This entire research is based on the theory of legal effectiveness which serves as an evaluative framework in assessing the extent to which SDDP functions as a legal instrument that is not only normatively designed, but is also able to operate effectively in judicial practice.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Implementation of the Early Case Detection System (SDDP) at the Balige District Court

The implementation of the Early Case Detection System (SDDP) at the Balige District Court demonstrates that the court has integrated the SIPP version 5.6.0 update as required by Sekma 3748/2024.⁷ Structurally, all judges have access to SIPP and SDDP features; in fact, most judges use personal devices, such as laptops, to access the system. Field data shows that 11 of the 12 judges use laptops, while one judge uses an office computer, demonstrating that basic infrastructure support is relatively adequate. In practice, SDDP is used in the initial stages when the panel of judges reviews the files before the first hearing. Judges can open case details in SIPP and run the Early Detection feature to find similar cases based on similarities in objects, subjects, and the history of previously decided cases. The SDDP output, a list of identical cases with similarity scores, helps judges identify potential *ne bis in idem* cases, the reasonableness of previous decisions, and prevent disparities between decisions.

Interviews indicate that most judges at the Balige District Court understand the basic function of SDDP as a tool for detecting similar or identical cases. However, technical understanding of the algorithm's limitations, data matching methods, and the urgency of using SDDP to prevent disparities in decisions remains variable. Court clerks and IT staff understand the SDDP mechanism within the SIPP, but some acknowledge limitations in data maintenance and system updates, as reflected in findings regarding the importance of improving infrastructure and human resources within the court environment.

Table 1. Judges' Understanding of SDDP

Understanding Category	Percentage of Field Findings
Understanding the basic functions of SDDP	Tall
Understanding how the algorithm technically works	Low
Assessing SDDP is mandatory	Low
Assessing SDDP as an effective tool	Currently
Understanding the SDDP– <i>ne bis in idem</i> relationship	Currently

obtained based on the respondent Judge of Balige District Court

Observations indicate that the use of SDDP has not been consistently implemented in every case submitted. Judges tend to use SDDP only when there is an initial indication of similarity in the case or when there is potential for recurring disputes. Time constraints, workload, and the lack of normative obligations are factors why SDDP use is not integrated into the standard examination process.

Figure 1. Practical Flow of Judge SDDP Use



⁶Meray Hendrik Mezak. (2006). Types, Methods, and Approaches in Legal Research. Law Review: Faculty of Law, Pelita Harapan University. Volume V. Number 3. p. 88.

⁷ Letter of the Secretary of the Supreme Court Number 3748/SEK/TI1.1.1.1/IX/2024 concerning Notification of Updates to the First Level SIPP Application version 5.6.0 and the e-Court Application version 6.0.0 (Secretary of the Supreme Court 3748/2024).

However, research findings indicate that judges' use of the SDDP has not been consistent. Some judges examine cases manually without utilizing electronic searches, even though the SDDP can provide a faster overview of similar cases. This inconsistent use of the SDDP has resulted in cases with conflicting decisions, including cases where the decision results in non-executable status due to a previous binding decision governing the same matter. From a legal effectiveness perspective, this situation indicates that the SDDP is readily available as a law enforcement tool, but its effectiveness is determined by the extent to which it is utilized by judicial officials. Normatively, the SDDP is capable of strengthening legal certainty and preventing disparities in decisions; however, empirically, this success has not been achieved due to factors such as officer behavior (knowledge, understanding, work preferences), as well as the absence of a normative obligation for judges to use the SDDP before deciding cases. Thus, the implementation of SDDP at the Balige District Court can be concluded to have been running, but has not been effective in accordance with the objectives of the Supreme Court in Supreme Court Regulation Number 7 of 2022 concerning Amendments to Supreme Court Regulation Number 1 of 2019 concerning Electronic Administration of Cases and Trials in Courts to realize a professional, transparent, effective, efficient, and modern judiciary.⁸

B. Obstacles Emerging in the Implementation of SDDP Seen from the Judicial Trilogy

The Trilogy of Justice (simple, fast, and low cost) serves as a benchmark for assessing whether the implementation of the SDDP has improved the quality of the judicial process.⁹ Empirical research reveals several obstacles that reduce the effectiveness of the SDDP, when viewed from each principle within the Trilogy of Justice. Obstacles to the implementation of the Early Case Detection System (SDDP) are evident from both technical and juridical-administrative aspects. From a technical perspective, field findings indicate that internal human resource coordination and readiness still need to be improved. The court clerk emphasized the importance of a better technical understanding of case information systems, including the SDDP, which essentially aligns with the need to improve the quality of human resources and digital infrastructure as outlined in the thesis findings on court facilities. Furthermore, the accuracy of the algorithm and data structure in the SIPP is highly dependent on initial data entry by officers. Inconsistencies in naming disputed objects or identifying parties often reduce the accuracy of search results.¹⁰ These obstacles are exacerbated by network and access limitations, as several judges reported delays when opening the SDDP feature, thus reducing motivation to use the system in case examinations that require speed.

In addition to technical obstacles, there are also legal and administrative constraints that impact the effectiveness of the SDDP. To date, there is no express provision mandating the use of the SDDP, although guidelines have been issued by the Secretary of the Supreme Court. The purely recommendatory nature of the regulation means that its implementation varies among judges. Furthermore, the absence of an integrated *dismissal mechanism*, as is the case in state administrative courts, means that the general court system lacks a binding initial screening system to prevent recurrence of cases.¹¹ The lack of clarity regarding the consequences for judges who do not use the SDDP also prevents the system from being viewed as an integral part of the principle of prudence in deciding cases. Nevertheless, judges acknowledge that the SDDP has the potential to reduce disparities in decisions by identifying similar cases and harmonizing legal considerations for legal certainty. However, this potential has not been realized due to inconsistent use, the lack of a requirement to include SDDP results in decision considerations, and the fact that search results are not always directly relevant to the substance of the dispute being examined.

From a simple perspective, various obstacles also arise. The lack of operational standards and mandatory use leaves all judges with complete discretion to determine whether to use the SDDP. This results in inconsistent proceedings and the SDDP not being positioned as a mandatory step in the initial examination. At the same time, efforts to integrate manual and electronic searches remain difficult, as some judges rely more on personal experience or prior case histories, which in turn prolongs time and increases the risk of error. This obstacle is compounded by a lack of technical training. Although some judges understand how the SDDP works, they lack the ability to interpret similarity scores or master the algorithm's limitations, leading to doubts about using it as

⁸Supreme Court Regulation Number 1 of 2019 concerning Electronic Administration of Cases and Trials in Court.

⁹Law Number 48 of 2009 concerning Judicial Power.

¹⁰ Azizah. (2024). Affirming Commitment on Its 79th Anniversary, the Supreme Court Launches Five Online Applications, <https://mahkamahagung.go.id/id>.

¹¹ Muhammad Amin Putra. (2022). Steps to Optimize the Implementation of Dismissal Processes and Preparatory Examination at the State Administrative Court through Electronic Justice. PERATUN Law Journal. Volume 5. Number 1. p. 70.

the basis for initial case analysis. From a speedy perspective, challenges arise from the backlog of cases, which is not balanced by the *dismissal mechanism* in civil procedural law. Although the SDDP can identify identical cases, judges are still required to fully process them because there are no regulations that allow for initial screening beyond simple claims. When conflicting decisions arise, the parties must pursue lengthy legal remedies, from appeals to second judicial reviews, ultimately hindering the achievement of the speedy principle. Furthermore, the minimal integration of SDDP with administrative stages means that detection results are not automatically recorded as official court documents, thus not making a real contribution to accelerating the identification of repeat cases. From the perspective of the principle of low costs, obstacles are seen when overlapping decisions cause cases that should be *ne bis in idem* to be retried, requiring the parties to incur additional costs. The lengthy process resulting from disparate decisions, including the possibility of legal action up to a second judicial review, further increases the financial burden on justice seekers.¹² This condition confirms that the suboptimal utilization of SDDP contributes to the rising costs of litigation. Overall, these various obstacles indicate that although the SDDP was normatively designed as a supporting instrument for achieving the Trilogy of Justice, its benefits have not yet been significantly felt in empirical practice. Factors such as the behavior of law enforcement, underutilized facilities, and civil procedural provisions that do not yet accommodate a comprehensive case screening mechanism are the main reasons why the SDDP implementation has not been able to provide a substantive impact in preventing disparities in decisions.

C. Optimization Steps That Can Be Taken to Increase SDDP Effectiveness

The implications of this research are evident in both the theoretical, practical, and policy realms. Theoretically, the findings reinforce the argument that the effectiveness of technology-based judicial law is highly dependent on the quality of human resources and the structured data that underpins the system.¹³ This research also empirically demonstrates that the existence of norms without operational obligations is insufficient to encourage behavioral change among officials, and therefore, regulations that are advisory in nature alone cannot guarantee consistent use of technologies like the SDDP. Practically, the research findings suggest the need to develop internal standard operating procedures (SOPs) that explicitly require judges to review the SDDP for each new case. This step must be accompanied by increased human resource training and standardization of case data entry to ensure uniformity in the quality of data entering the system and optimal processing. Furthermore, policy reforms toward a *dismissal mechanism* should be considered as a systemic effort to address case backlogs and prevent the re-examination of disputes that have already been decided. At the policy level, the Supreme Court needs to strengthen the normative position of the SDDP by elevating it from a mere guideline to a binding procedural rule. This effort must be accompanied by more precise digitization of case data so that the SDDP's search algorithms produce relevant and accurate results.¹⁴ In this context, the push to establish regulations regarding the *Dismissal Process* for Civil Cases is becoming increasingly important, because the screening mechanism can be carried out from the start through file examination, preparation of an initial resume containing the results of the SDDP, and providing a legal basis that allows the court to reject cases *ne bis in idem* at an early stage.

Strengthening the concept of legal certainty can also be realized through the obligation for judges to include SDDP analysis results in legal considerations, so that SDDP becomes not only an aid, but also part of the obligation to exercise prudence in deciding cases. Furthermore, integrating SDDP into civil procedural law reform strategies is relevant given the urgency of procedural law modernization. By placing SDDP as a technological basis, procedural law reform can be directed toward strengthening legal certainty, increasing the effectiveness of the judicial process, and expanding access to justice for justice seekers.¹⁵ Overall, SDDP has strong potential to support the principle of simple, expeditious, and low-cost justice by reducing the risk of recurrent disputes and accelerating case identification. Furthermore, SDDP can serve as an important instrument in reducing disparities in decisions by providing information on similar cases that judges can use as references in deciding new cases.

¹² Supreme Court. (2010). Blueprint for Judicial Reform 2010-2035. Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia. Jakarta. p. 25.

¹³ Bayu Sudjatmiko. (2023). Optimizing the Electronic Justice System to Achieve Simple, Fast, and Low-Cost Justice. Untirta. Volume 4. Number 1. p. 91.

¹⁴ Rahmadani G. & Novita R. (2025). E-Court Innovation in Civil Court Processes: Electronic Litigation Management. Scientific Journal of Metadata. Volume 7. Number 1. p. 39.

¹⁵ R. Mansyur. (2015). Information Disclosure in the Courts in the Context of Implementing Integrity and Legal Certainty. Law and Justice. Volume 4. Number 1. p. 88.

CONCLUSION

This study concludes that the Early Case Detection System (SDDP) is an important innovation of the Supreme Court to prevent disparities in decisions, identify potential *ne bis in idem cases*, and support the implementation of the principles of simple, expeditious, and low-cost justice. However, its effectiveness in practice at the Balige District Court has not been optimal. First, the implementation of the SDDP at the Balige District Court is underway, as evidenced by the availability of the latest version of the SIPP infrastructure and access by all judges. The SDDP has also been used as an aid in the initial examination of cases. However, its use is not consistent in every case, and judges' technical understanding of the algorithm's working mechanisms and the urgency of its use remains limited. This has resulted in the SDDP's goal of preventing disparities in decisions being less than optimal.

Second, obstacles to SDDP implementation arise from technical, administrative, and legal factors. Technical obstacles include the inconsistent quality of SIPP data, limited network infrastructure, and varying levels of understanding among officials regarding SDDP features. The main legal obstacles lie in the absence of regulations mandating SDDP use and the lack of a *dismissal process mechanism* in civil procedure law to handle recurring cases. This situation has contributed to the failure to achieve the Trilogy of Justice, as recurring cases are still processed in full, resulting in longer processing times and increased legal costs. Third, optimizing the SDDP requires regulatory, technical, and cultural improvements. From a regulatory perspective, the Supreme Court needs to provide a binding normative basis for requiring SDDP review for every new case, and consider establishing a dismissal mechanism for cases with significant similarities.

From a technical perspective, improving data quality, training human resources, and standardizing case information are key factors in supporting algorithm accuracy. Meanwhile, from a judicial practice perspective, a technology-based work culture must be strengthened so that judges consider the SDDP part of their prudent practice when examining cases. Overall, this study confirms that SDDP has significant potential to achieve legal certainty, prevent conflicting decisions, and support the principles of simple, expeditious, and low-cost justice. However, this potential can only be realized if SDDP is used consistently, supported by clear regulations, and built on an accurate data system and qualified human resources. This research is expected to serve as a foundation for strengthening e-court policies and reforming civil procedural law in the future.

REFERENCES

- Amran Suadi. (2022). Transformasi Digital Sistem Pengawasan Badan Peradilan di Indonesia. Rajagrafindo Persada. Depok.
- Azizah. (2024). Tegaskan Komitmen Di Hari Jadi Ke-79, Mahkamah Agung Luncurkan Lima Aplikasi (online), <https://mahkamahagung.go.id/id>.
- Bayu Sudjatmiko. (2023). Optimalisasi Sistem Peradilan secara Elektronik dalam mewujudkan Peradilan Sederhana, Cepat dan Biaya Ringan. Untirta. Volume 4. Nomor 1.
- Mahkamah Agung. (2010). Cetak Biru Pembaruan Peradilan 2010-2035. Mahkamah Agung Republik Indonesia. Jakarta.
- Meray Hendrik Mezak. (2006). Jenis, Metode dan Pendekatan dalam Penelitian Hukum. Law Review: Fakultas Hukum Universitas Pelita Harapan. Volume V. Nomor 3.
- Muhammad Amin Putra. (2022). Langkah Optimalisasi Pelaksanaan Dismissal Proses dan Pemeriksaan Persiapan di Pengadilan Tata Usaha Negara melalui Peradilan Elektronik. Jurnal Hukum PERATUN. Volume 5. Nomor 1.
- Nahrudin, Sufirman Rahman, dan Anzar Makkuasa. (2023). Penerapan Asas Ne bis in idem Dalam Perkara Perdata: Telaah Putusan Nomor 352/Pdt. G/2019/PA. Mrs. *Journal of Lex Generalis (JLG)*. Volume 4. Nomor 1.
- Nurul Hikmah. (2023). Penerapan Asas Ne Bis In Idem Dalam Putusan Perdata: (Studi Analisis Putusan Mahkamah Agung Nomor 3320 K/Pdt/2018). Novum: Jurnal Hukum. Volume 10. Nomor 4.
- Rahmadani G. & Novita R. (2025). Inovasi E-Court dalam Proses Pengadilan Perdata: Manajemen Litigasi secara Elektronik. Jurnal Ilmiah Metadata. Volume 7. Nomor 1.
- R. Mansyur. (2015). Keterbukaan Informasi di Peradilan dalam Rangka Implementasi Integritas dan Kepastian Hukum. Hukum dan Peradilan. Volume 4. Nomor 1.
- Soerjono Soekanto. (2009). Faktor-faktor yang Mempengaruhi Penegakan Hukum. Raja Grafindo. Jakarta.
- Suteki dan Galang Taufani. (2018). Metodologi Penelitian Hukum (Filsafat, Teori dan Praktik). Rajagrafindo Persada. Jakarta.

Undang-Undang Nomor 48 Tahun 2009 tentang Kekuasaan Kehakiman.

Peraturan Mahkamah Agung Nomor 1 Tahun 2019 tentang Administrasi Perkara dan Persidangan di Pengadilan Secara Elektronik.

Surat Sekretaris Mahkamah Agung Nomor 3748/SEK/TI1.1.1.1/IX/2024 tentang Pemberitahuan Pembaruan Aplikasi SIPP Tingkat Pertama versi 5.6.0 dan Aplikasi e-Court versi 6.0.0.