Vol. 4 No. 1 Edisi November – Januari 2027 E. ISSN. 3032-2472
Multidisciplinary Indonesian Center Journal (MICJO)
Journal page is available to
https://e-jurnal.jurnalcenter.com/index.php/micjo
Email: admin@jurnalcenter.com

# JURIDICAL REVIEW OF THE INCONSISTENT SCORING BY THE JUDGES OF THE 2026 FOUR PILLARS QUIZ COMPETITION OF THE PEOPLE'S CONSULTATIVE ASSEMBLY OF THE REPUBLIC OF INDONESIA (MPR RI) FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF THE PRINCIPLES OF JUSTICE AND OBJECTIVITY

# TINJAUAN YURIDIS TERHADAP PENILAIAN YANG TIDAK KONSISTEN OLEH DEWAN JURI DALAM LOMBA CERDAS CERMAT EMPAT PILAR MAJELIS PERMUSYAWARATAN RAKYAT REPUBLIK INDONESIA (MPR RI) TAHUN 2026 DITINJAU DARI PRINSIP KEADILAN DAN OBJEKTIVITAS

**Ahmad Aqil Rabbani[1*], Sutrisno[2], Muhammad Fahri[3], Alwie Kerim Muhyie[4]**

[1*]Universitas Pamulang, Email: aqilll001z@gmail.com
[2]Universitas Pamulang, Email: nino79279@gmail.com
[3]Universitas Pamulang, Email: muhf15222@gmail.com
[4]Universitas Pamulang, Email: alwiekerimmuhyie@gmail.com

*email koresponden: aqilll001z@gmail.com

DOI: https://doi.org/10.62567/micjo.v4i1.3591

**Abstract**

This study examines the juridical implications of inconsistent scoring by judges in the 2026 Four Pillars of the People's Consultative Assembly of the Republic of Indonesia (MPR RI) Quiz Competition in West Kalimantan from the perspective of justice and objectivity principles. The issue arose when two teams provided substantively identical answers but received different scores, resulting in public controversy and institutional corrective measures. The purpose of this study is to analyze the legal status of the judges' assessment as an administrative act, identify the legal norms violated, and formulate recommendations to strengthen fair and accountable assessment mechanisms in official state competitions. This research employs normative legal research using statutory, conceptual, and case approaches. Primary legal materials include the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, Law Number 30 of 2014 on Government Administration, Law Number 25 of 2009 on Public Services, and Law Number 39 of 1999 on Human Rights. Secondary materials consist of legal doctrines and scholarly literature on administrative law and general principles of good governance. The findings indicate that the judges' inconsistent scoring constitutes a substantively defective administrative act because it violates the principles of legal certainty, impartiality, accuracy, justice, and accountability. The study also finds that participants' rights to fair and non-discriminatory treatment were infringed. The corrective actions taken by MPR RI, including apologizing, suspending judges, and repeating the final round, represent a valid form of administrative correction. This study implies that all competitions organized by state institutions should be governed by transparent, measurable, and legally accountable assessment procedures.

Multidisciplinary Indonesian Center Journal (MICJO)
Journal page is available to
https://e-jurnal.jurnalcenter.com/index.php/micjo
Email: admin@jurnalcenter.com

**Keywords :** Accountability, Administrative Law, Justice, Objectivity, Public Service.

**Abstrak**

Penelitian ini mengkaji implikasi yuridis ketidakkonsistenan penilaian dewan juri dalam Lomba Cerdas Cermat Empat Pilar MPR RI Tahun 2026 tingkat Provinsi Kalimantan Barat dalam perspektif asas keadilan dan objektivitas. Permasalahan muncul ketika dua regu memberikan jawaban yang substansinya sama, tetapi memperoleh skor yang berbeda sehingga menimbulkan polemik publik dan tindakan korektif dari penyelenggara. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menganalisis kedudukan hukum penilaian juri sebagai tindakan administratif, mengidentifikasi norma hukum yang dilanggar, serta merumuskan rekomendasi guna memperkuat sistem penilaian yang adil dan akuntabel dalam kompetisi resmi lembaga negara. Metode yang digunakan adalah penelitian hukum normatif dengan pendekatan perundang-undangan, konseptual, dan kasus. Bahan hukum primer meliputi Undang-Undang Dasar Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 1945, Undang-Undang Nomor 30 Tahun 2014 tentang Administrasi Pemerintahan, Undang-Undang Nomor 25 Tahun 2009 tentang Pelayanan Publik, dan Undang-Undang Nomor 39 Tahun 1999 tentang Hak Asasi Manusia. Bahan hukum sekunder terdiri atas doktrin dan literatur hukum administrasi negara serta Asas-Asas Umum Pemerintahan yang Baik. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa ketidakkonsistenan penilaian juri merupakan tindakan administratif yang cacat secara substantif karena melanggar asas kepastian hukum, ketidakberpihakan, kecermatan, keadilan, dan akuntabilitas. Penelitian ini juga menemukan bahwa hak peserta untuk memperoleh perlakuan yang adil dan bebas dari diskriminasi telah terlanggar. Permintaan maaf, penonaktifan juri, dan pengulangan final merupakan bentuk koreksi administratif yang sah. Implikasi penelitian ini menegaskan bahwa setiap kompetisi yang diselenggarakan lembaga negara harus dilaksanakan berdasarkan mekanisme penilaian yang transparan, terukur, dan dapat dipertanggungjawabkan secara hukum.

**Kata Kunci :** Akuntabilitas, Hukum Administrasi Negara, Keadilan, Objektivitas, Pelayanan Publik.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The administration of government in a state based on the rule of law requires that every action of a state institution be carried out on the basis of the principles of legality, justice, objectivity, and accountability. These principles follow from the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, which affirms that Indonesia is a state based on the rule of law and guarantees every citizen's right to fair recognition, protection, and legal certainty. From the perspective of State Administrative Law, every action of a state administrator must be guided by the General Principles of Good Governance (Asas-Asas Umum Pemerintahan yang Baik, AUPB). Yos Johan Utama (n.d.: 1) explains that administrative law is a legal instrument that provides the basis of legality for the state in carrying out government functions. Yusri Munaf (2016: v) emphasizes that administrative law requires government to be managed and administered properly. Accordingly, every decision produced by a state institution must be made objectively, consistently, and accountably.

The principles of justice and objectivity find clear normative grounding in Law Number 30 of 2014 on Government Administration, which requires every government action to be guided by the principles of legal certainty, impartiality, accuracy, and openness. In addition, Law Number 25 of 2009 on Public Services affirms the principles of professionalism, equal treatment, accountability, and non-discrimination. Solechan (2019: 542) states that the AUPB are legal norms that public service providers must use as a basis and, at the same time, a means of legal protection for the public. Lalu Dhedi Kusmana (2013: 577) asserts that administrative actions that disregard the AUPB can be tested

Multidisciplinary Indonesian Center Journal (MICJO)
Journal page is available to
https://e-jurnal.jurnalcenter.com/index.php/micjo
Email: admin@jurnalcenter.com

and declared invalid. These views show that justice and objectivity are fundamental requirements for every action of a state institution.

The application of these principles became a current issue in the controversy surrounding the 2026 Four Pillars Quiz Competition of the People's Consultative Assembly of the Republic of Indonesia (MPR RI) at the West Kalimantan Province level. In the final round, two teams gave the same answer but received different assessments. One team was penalized with a point deduction, while the other received full marks. This inconsistency triggered protests from participants and public scrutiny, until the MPR RI issued an apology, suspended the board of judges, and decided to repeat the final. These facts indicate a problem in the application of objective, fair, and accountable scoring standards.

Previous studies show that the AUPB have been widely used to assess the validity of state administrative actions. Solechan (2019: 541–542) examined the AUPB in public services, Lalu Dhedi Kusmana (2013: 576–577) studied their application in the issuance of permits, and Sri Wahyuni Zees (2025: 403–404) highlighted the role of administrative law in safeguarding the public interest through public services. Mhd. Fakhrurrahman Arif (2023: 55–56) also emphasizes that the AUPB serve as a bridge between legal norms and ethical norms in preventing arbitrariness. Nevertheless, these studies remain focused on public services, licensing, and formal administrative decisions, and have not examined the assessment mechanisms of official competitions organized by state institutions.

Given these circumstances, there is a research gap concerning the application of the principles of justice and objectivity in the assessment process of official activities of state institutions. This research is urgent because inconsistent scoring not only harms participants but can also reduce public trust in the integrity of state institutions. The novelty of this research lies in the use of an administrative law perspective to analyze the assessment mechanism of a national competition as an administrative act that directly affects participants' rights. This research aims to analyze juridically the inconsistent scoring by the judges of the 2026 MPR RI Four Pillars Quiz Competition from the perspective of the principles of justice and objectivity, and to formulate recommendations so that similar activities can be carried out in a more transparent, consistent, and accountable manner.

**THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

This research uses the theories of the rule of law, administrative law, the General Principles of Good Governance (AUPB), justice, and objectivity. Article 1 paragraph (3) of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia affirms that Indonesia is a state based on the rule of law, so that all actions of state institutions must be carried out on the basis of law and must guarantee fair treatment. Yos Johan Utama (n.d.: 1) explains that administrative law is a legal instrument that provides the basis of legality for the state in carrying out government functions. Yusri Munaf (2016: v) states that administrative law requires government to be managed and administered properly. Amelia Ayu Paramitha et al. (2023: 2) assert that administrative law functions as a norm, an instrument, and a guarantee of legal protection for the public. The General Principles of Good Governance (AUPB) are principles that must be observed in every administrative action. Philipus M. Hadjon (2008: 2) states that administrative law serves to provide legal protection to the public against government actions. Ridwan HR (2017: 234) explains that objectivity requires every decision to be based on rational and measurable parameters that are free from subjective considerations. John Rawls (1971: 3) defines justice as fairness, namely equal treatment of parties who are in equal conditions. This research uses the theories of the rule of law, administrative law, the AUPB, justice, and objectivity to analyze the legality of the judges' assessment in the 2026 MPR RI Four Pillars Quiz Competition and to formulate the legal responsibility of the organizer.

## 2. RESEARCH METHOD

This research uses a normative legal research method with statutory, conceptual, and case approaches. According to Peter Mahmud Marzuki (2021: 35), normative legal research aims to examine legal norms, principles, and doctrines in order to answer a legal issue. The object of the

Multidisciplinary Indonesian Center Journal (MICJO)
Journal page is available to
https://e-jurnal.jurnalcenter.com/index.php/micjo
Email: admin@jurnalcenter.com

research is the inconsistent scoring by the judges of the 2026 MPR RI Four Pillars Quiz Competition from the perspective of the principles of justice and objectivity.

**Table 1. Research Method Design**

| Component | Description |
|---|---|
| Type of research | Normative legal research |
| Approach | Statutory, conceptual, and case approaches |
| Research object | Inconsistent scoring by the judges of the 2026 MPR RI Four Pillars Quiz Competition |
| Primary legal materials | 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia; Law No. 30 of 2014; Law No. 25 of 2009; Law No. 39 of 1999 |
| Secondary legal materials | Books by Yusri Munaf (2016), Philipus M. Hadjon (2008), Ridwan HR (2017), Peter Mahmud Marzuki (2021), and Amelia Ayu Paramitha et al. (2023) |
| Tertiary legal materials | Legal dictionaries and legal encyclopedias |
| Data collection technique | Literature study and documentation |
| Analysis technique | Qualitative analysis using a descriptive-analytical method |
| Output | Conclusions on the legality of the judges' actions and the legal responsibility of the organizer |

The analysis was carried out by identifying the legal facts, examining the relevant norms and doctrines, and then assessing the conformity of the judges' actions with the General Principles of Good Governance, particularly the principles of justice and objectivity. The results of the analysis were used to formulate the legal responsibility of the organizer and recommendations for improving the assessment mechanism.

## 3. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

### Inconsistent Scoring by the Judges in the 2026 MPR RI Four Pillars Quiz Competition

This research analyzes the legality of the actions of the board of judges in the final round of the 2026 Four Pillars Quiz Competition of the People's Consultative Assembly of the Republic of Indonesia (MPR RI) at the West Kalimantan Province level. The research data were obtained through documentation studies of the video recording of the final, national media coverage, official statements of the People's Consultative Assembly of the Republic of Indonesia, and primary and secondary legal materials. Data collection was carried out in May 2026. The analysis focuses on the different assessments given to two substantively identical answers, which produced opposite scoring consequences.

**Table 2. Reconstruction of the Legal Facts**

| Component | Description |
|---|---|
| Object of dispute | The board of judges' assessment of participants' answers |
| Main fact | Two identical answers received different scores |
| Team C | Declared incorrect and given a score of −5 |
| Team B | Declared correct and given a score of 10 |
| Impact | Change in the competition result and harm to participants |
| Response of MPR RI | Apology, suspension of the judges, evaluation of the committee, and repetition of the final |

Multidisciplinary Indonesian Center Journal (MICJO)
Journal page is available to
https://e-jurnal.jurnalcenter.com/index.php/micjo
Email: admin@jurnalcenter.com

Table 2 shows a disparity in assessment of the same factual condition. From the perspective of administrative law, this condition indicates that the organizer's actions did not satisfy the principles of consistency and rationality. Different scores for identical answers cannot be justified if the assessment parameters were truly applied objectively. The acknowledgment of error through the apology and the repetition of the final also shows that the organizer was aware of a procedural defect that affected the legitimacy of the competition result.

**Analysis of the Principle of Justice**

Justice is a fundamental principle that requires equal treatment of parties who are in equal conditions. John Rawls (1971: 3) defines justice as fairness, namely balanced, proportional treatment that is free from discrimination. In a competition, justice requires that answers of the same substance must receive the same score. A difference in scores for identical answers shows that participants did not receive equal treatment.

**Table 3. Test of Fulfilment of the Principle of Justice**

| Indicator | Empirical Condition | Status |
|---|---|---|
| Equality of treatment | Same answer, different result | Not fulfilled |
| Non-discrimination | Differential treatment occurred | Not fulfilled |
| Fairness | Assessment results were unbalanced | Not fulfilled |
| Certainty of result | Scores were inconsistent | Not fulfilled |

Based on Table 3, none of the indicators of justice was fulfilled. This shows that the judges' action was substantively contrary to the principle of equal treatment guaranteed by the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia and Law Number 39 of 1999 on Human Rights. From the perspective of administrative law, procedural injustice of this kind has the potential to delegitimize the resulting decision.

**Analysis of the Principle of Objectivity**

Objectivity requires that every decision be based on facts, measurable criteria, and rational considerations. Ridwan HR (2017: 234) states that objectivity requires officials to act on the basis of clear parameters that are free from subjective considerations. In this case, the judges' reasoning regarding articulation is not sufficient to explain why answers of the same substance produced different scores. Thus, there is a mismatch between the facts and the assessment result.

**Table 4. Test of Fulfilment of the Principle of Objectivity**

| Indicator | Empirical Condition | Status |
|---|---|---|
| Standard assessment criteria | Not applied uniformly | Not fulfilled |
| Consistency of decisions | A score disparity occurred | Not fulfilled |
| Rationality of reasons | Explanation was inadequate | Not fulfilled |
| Verifiability | Difficult to prove objectively | Not fulfilled |

These results confirm that the judges' assessment did not meet the standard of objectivity. Under Law Number 30 of 2014 on Government Administration, an action that is not based on accuracy and impartiality constitutes a deviation from the AUPB.

**Analysis of the Principle of Accountability**

Accountability is the obligation of state administrators to explain and answer for the actions they take. Amelia Ayu Paramitha et al. (2023: 2) assert that administrative law is not merely an instrument of authority but also a guarantee of legal protection. In this case, accountability can be viewed in two stages, namely before and after the error was revealed.

**Table 5. Test of Fulfilment of the Principle of Accountability**

| Indicator | Empirical Condition | Status |
|---|---|---|
| Explanation of assessment reasons | Inadequate | Not fulfilled |
| Institutional responsibility | Official apology | Fulfilled |

Multidisciplinary Indonesian Center Journal (MICJO)
Journal page is available to
https://e-jurnal.jurnalcenter.com/index.php/micjo
Email: admin@jurnalcenter.com

| Indicator | Empirical Condition | Status |
|---|---|---|
| Corrective action | Judges suspended and final repeated | Fulfilled |
| Restoration of participants' rights | Opportunity to compete again | Fulfilled |

Table 5 shows that accountability was not fulfilled at the assessment stage but was restored through institutional corrective action. Legally, such action constitutes repressive protection as described by Philipus M. Hadjon (2008: 2), namely an effort at restoration after a violation of participants' rights has occurred.

**Comprehensive Juridical Analysis**

Based on all of the findings, the judges' inconsistent scoring meets the characteristics of a substantively defective administrative act. The act:

1. Violated the principle of justice because it did not provide equal treatment.
2. Violated the principle of objectivity because it was not based on consistent standards.
3. Violated the principle of openness because the reasons for the assessment could not be verified.
4. Violated the principle of accountability at the initial stage of the process.
5. Caused direct harm to participants.
6. Reduced the legitimacy of the competition result.
7. Lowered public trust in state institutions.

Within the framework of administrative law, an administrative act that does not conform to the AUPB can be assessed as procedurally and substantively defective. The legal consequence is the organizer's obligation to annul or correct the problematic decision. The repetition of the final is a form of administrative correction aimed at restoring conditions to what they should have been.

**DISCUSSION**

**The Legal Status of the Judges' Assessment as an Administrative Act of a State Institution**

The judges' assessment in the 2026 MPR RI Four Pillars Quiz Competition cannot be regarded merely as a technical act of the competition, but also as part of an administrative act carried out in an official activity of a state institution. This is because the assessment has direct consequences for participants, namely the determination of scores, rankings, eligibility to win, and the right to continue in the competition. From the perspective of administrative law, every action of a state administrator that affects a person's rights or interests must be carried out on the basis of the principles of legality, accuracy, justice, objectivity, and accountability.

Administrative law provides the basis for preventing state institutions from acting arbitrarily. Yos Johan Utama (n.d.: 1) explains that administrative law is a legal instrument that provides the basis of legality for the state in carrying out government functions. In line with this, Yusri Munaf (2016: v) emphasizes that administrative law requires government to be managed and administered properly, so that every government action must have relevance to the applicable law. This means that the Four Pillars Quiz Competition of the MPR RI, as an official program of a state institution, must still be subject to the principles of administrative law even though the form of the activity is a competition.

In this case, the board of judges gave different assessments to answers of the same substance. One team was declared incorrect and had points deducted, while another team with the same answer was declared correct and received full marks. This difference in assessment indicates a problem in the application of administrative standards, particularly with respect to consistency, accuracy, and objectivity. If assessment standards are not applied equally, the resulting decision is potentially defective both procedurally and substantively.

Amelia Ayu Paramitha et al. (2023: 2) state that administrative law functions as a norm, an instrument, and a guarantee of legal protection for the public. The function of a norm means that the judges' actions must be guided by clear rules and assessment standards. The function of an instrument means that the assessment becomes a tool for lawfully determining the competition result. The function of a guarantee means that participants are entitled to protection from unfair or non-objective assessment. Accordingly, the scoring error in the Four Pillars Quiz Competition of the MPR RI cannot

Multidisciplinary Indonesian Center Journal (MICJO)
Journal page is available to
https://e-jurnal.jurnalcenter.com/index.php/micjo
Email: admin@jurnalcenter.com

be understood merely as a technical mistake, but must be analyzed as an administrative act that potentially violates participants' rights. The judges' assessment in the 2026 MPR RI Four Pillars Quiz Competition is an administrative act of a state institution because it was carried out in an official activity, used the authority of the organizer, and produced consequences for participants' rights. Therefore, it must be testable under administrative law, especially through the principles of justice, objectivity, accuracy, openness, and accountability.

**Violation of the Principle of Justice in the Judges' Assessment**

The principle of justice is a fundamental principle that requires every party in the same condition to receive the same treatment. In administrative law, justice is understood not only as a moral value but also as a juridical standard that determines whether an administrative act is valid. The 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia guarantees that everyone has the right to fair recognition, guarantee, protection, and legal certainty. This constitutional guarantee affirms that all actions of state institutions, including the assessment process of official competitions, must be carried out fairly and without discrimination. John Rawls (1971: 3) defines justice as fairness, that is, equal treatment of parties in equal situations. Within this framework, answers that are identical in substance must produce identical consequences. If two participants give the same answer but receive different scores, an imbalance of treatment has occurred that is contrary to the principle of fairness. Justice in a competition concerns not only the final result but also a consistent and predictable assessment process.

The facts of the final of the 2026 MPR RI Four Pillars Quiz Competition show that Team C was declared incorrect and given a score of −5, while Team B, which gave an answer of the same substance, received 10. Mathematically, there is a difference of 15 points that directly affects the participants' positions and opportunities. From a legal perspective, this difference is not merely a number but a concrete form of the harm arising from the application of unequal standards. The disadvantaged participants lost the opportunity to obtain the competition result they should have had. This injustice is also contrary to Law Number 39 of 1999 on Human Rights, which affirms that everyone has the right to fair legal treatment and to protection without discrimination. Even though the context is a competition, human rights principles continue to apply because participants interact with an official mechanism run by a state institution. Differential treatment of the same condition is therefore a form of inequality that contradicts the principle of equal rights. From the perspective of the General Principles of Good Governance, the principle of justice demands a proportional distribution of rights and burdens. A negative score for one team and a positive score for another for the same answer shows a disproportionate distribution of consequences. This condition indicates that the judges' decision did not meet the principles of equal treatment and non-discrimination, which lie at the core of administrative justice.

This finding is in line with the view of Philipus M. Hadjon (2008: 2) that administrative law serves to protect citizens from government actions that harm their rights. In this case, participants had the right to be assessed equally. When that right is violated, administrative law provides a normative basis for assessing the action as an administrative deviation that requires correction. The inconsistent scoring by the judges in the 2026 MPR RI Four Pillars Quiz Competition is juridically proven to violate the principle of justice. The violation is evident from the non-fulfilment of the principles of fairness, equal treatment, and non-discrimination, and is contrary to Article 28D paragraph (1) of the 1945 Constitution and Article 3 of Law Number 39 of 1999 on Human Rights. The judges' action therefore cannot be regarded as a mere technical error, but as an administrative act that has legal consequences for participants' rights.

**Violation of the Principle of Objectivity in the Judges' Assessment**

The principle of objectivity requires every decision to be based on facts, clear criteria, and verifiable parameters. In administrative law, objectivity is a primary requirement for an administrative act to be free from subjective considerations, bias, or irrational treatment. Ridwan HR (2017: 234) explains that objectivity requires officials or state administrators to act on the basis of measurable, logical, and consistent standards. Accordingly, the assessment carried out by the board of judges must

Multidisciplinary Indonesian Center Journal (MICJO)
Journal page is available to
https://e-jurnal.jurnalcenter.com/index.php/micjo
Email: admin@jurnalcenter.com

follow the same standards for all participants. The normative basis of objectivity is affirmed in Law Number 30 of 2014 on Government Administration, which places impartiality and accuracy as part of the General Principles of Good Governance. Impartiality requires that decisions be free from particular preferences, while accuracy requires that decisions be made on the basis of complete information and careful assessment. In practice, these two principles can only be realized if the organizer uses uniform and testable assessment standards.

In the case of the 2026 MPR RI Four Pillars Quiz Competition, two answers that were substantially the same produced different scores. This difference shows that the assessment parameters were not applied consistently. If the reason for the difference lies in articulation, then that aspect should have been formulated as an explicit criterion, announced to participants, and applied uniformly to all teams. Where this was not done, the reason lacks sufficient objective force to justify the score disparity. Methodologically, objectivity requires a linear relationship between facts and decisions. The same facts must produce the same decisions. If that relationship is broken, the decision loses its rationality. In this case, the empirical fact of identical answers did not produce identical decisions. There is thus a discrepancy between the objective condition and the assessment result, which is a strong indicator that the assessment process did not satisfy the principle of objectivity.

Mhd. Fakhrurrahman Arif (2023: 55) explains that the AUPB function as a bridge between legal norms and ethical norms to prevent arbitrariness. When a decision cannot be explained by consistent standards, the action is not only technically problematic but also shows the potential for administrative arbitrariness. In this respect, objectivity serves as a control tool to ensure that the use of authority is not based on subjective considerations. The results of this research reinforce that inconsistent scoring by the judges is a deviation from the principle of objectivity. The deviation is visible in the absence of consistency between facts and scores, the weak rational basis for awarding points, and the organizer's inability to convincingly explain the difference in results at the time of the incident. This condition shows that the judges' decision did not meet the standards of impartiality and accuracy as stipulated in Law Number 30 of 2014 on Government Administration. Juridically, the judges' assessment in the 2026 MPR RI Four Pillars Quiz Competition is contrary to the principle of objectivity. This violation confirms that the resulting assessment has no adequate rational basis, so that the legitimacy of the decision is weakened and corrective action is required to restore participants' rights and maintain the integrity of the event.

**Violation of Law Number 30 of 2014 on Government Administration**

Law Number 30 of 2014 on Government Administration is the primary normative basis for assessing the legality of the actions of state administrators. This law affirms that every exercise of governmental authority must be based on the principle of legality, the protection of human rights, and the General Principles of Good Governance. Thus, the actions of a board of judges in an official activity of a state institution must be not only technically correct but also compliant with the administrative law standards that guarantee justice and objectivity. Article 5 of Law Number 30 of 2014 stipulates that the administration of government must be founded on legality, the protection of human rights, and the AUPB. This provision shows that every decision that affects a person's rights must meet substantive legal standards. In this research, the judges' assessment is a decision that directly affects participants' rights to scores, rankings, and the opportunity to continue in the competition. Therefore, the legality of the assessment must be tested against the principles regulated in that law.

Article 10 of Law Number 30 of 2014 contains the principles relevant to this case, namely legal certainty, impartiality, accuracy, openness, and good service. The principle of legal certainty requires the application of consistent assessment standards. The principle of impartiality requires that all participants be treated equally. The principle of accuracy requires that decisions be made carefully and on the basis of adequate data. The principle of openness requires that the reasons for decisions can be explained transparently. The principle of good service requires professionalism and respect for participants' rights. On the facts, all of these elements were breached. Different assessments of the

Multidisciplinary Indonesian Center Journal (MICJO)
Journal page is available to
https://e-jurnal.jurnalcenter.com/index.php/micjo
Email: admin@jurnalcenter.com

same answer show that legal certainty was not fulfilled because the assessment result could not be predicted on the basis of uniform standards. Impartiality was not fulfilled because two participants in the same condition received different treatment. Accuracy was not fulfilled because an error occurred in determining the score. Openness was not fulfilled because the reason concerning articulation could not objectively prove the difference in results. Good service was not fulfilled because the assessment process provided no guarantee of fairness. Yusri Munaf (2016: v) emphasizes that good government requires actions that are responsible and in line with the law. This opinion shows that the scoring error cannot be regarded merely as a technical mistake, but as an indicator that the organizer had not exercised its authority in accordance with administrative law standards. Solechan (2019: 542) also asserts that the AUPB are binding legal norms, so that their violation has juridical consequences for the validity of administrative actions.

Theoretically, if an administrative act is contrary to the AUPB, the act contains a substantive defect. A substantive defect occurs when the content of a decision does not conform to the underlying legal principles. In this case, the judges' decision lost its legitimacy because it was built on the application of inconsistent standards. Consequently, the problematic assessment result lacks sufficient legitimating force to be maintained. The actions of the People's Consultative Assembly of the Republic of Indonesia in suspending the judges, evaluating the committee, and repeating the final constitute administrative correction. Juridically, these steps acknowledge that the previous decision did not meet the provisions of Law Number 30 of 2014. The correction serves to restore the legal situation to what it should be and to restore the rights of the affected participants. The inconsistent scoring by the judges in the 2026 MPR RI Four Pillars Quiz Competition is proven to be contrary to Articles 5 and 10 of Law Number 30 of 2014 on Government Administration. This violation shows that the judges' decision contains a substantive defect because it fails to satisfy the principles of legal certainty, impartiality, accuracy, openness, and good service, so that the organizer is obliged to carry out restoration and a comprehensive improvement of the assessment system.

**Violation of Law Number 25 of 2009 on Public Services**

Law Number 25 of 2009 on Public Services affirms that every public service provider is obliged to provide services that are of good quality, professional, transparent, accountable, and non-discriminatory. Although the Four Pillars Quiz Competition of the MPR RI is a competitive activity, its substance forms part of public service in the fields of national education and the socialization of the constitution. Therefore, all stages of the event, including the assessment process, must meet the public service standards set by law. Article 4 of Law Number 25 of 2009 establishes the principles of public service, among others professionalism, equal treatment, openness, accountability, and special treatment for groups in need. Of all these principles, those most relevant to this research are professionalism, equal treatment, openness, accountability, and non-discrimination. Professionalism requires the judges to be competent and to apply the guidelines correctly. Equal treatment obliges participants in the same condition to receive the same decision. Openness requires that the basis of the assessment can be explained. Accountability requires responsibility for the decisions taken.

In the 2026 MPR RI Four Pillars Quiz Competition, two identical answers received different assessment results. This condition shows that public service standards were not carried out optimally. Professionalism is questioned because the judges failed to apply the assessment criteria consistently. Equal treatment was violated because participants were treated differently although they were in the same situation. Openness was not fulfilled because the reasons given could not provide an objective justification. Accountability only emerged after the organizer admitted the error and took corrective action. Philipus M. Hadjon (2008: 2) asserts that the purpose of administrative law is to protect citizens from government actions that harm them. In public services, this protection is realized through the organizer's obligation to provide services that are fair and accountable. When service standards are not met, the public has a basis to conclude that the organizer has committed maladministration. The inconsistent scoring in this case meets the characteristics of maladministration because it involves inaccuracy, injustice, and unprofessional service.

Multidisciplinary Indonesian Center Journal (MICJO)
Journal page is available to
https://e-jurnal.jurnalcenter.com/index.php/micjo
Email: admin@jurnalcenter.com

Yusri Munaf (2016: v) states that good government requires the performance of duties that are responsible and oriented toward the public interest. A competition organized by a state institution must be viewed as a form of service to participants and the public. Therefore, the quality of the assessment process must not depend on subjective considerations but must be built on measurable and consistent procedures. The actions of the People's Consultative Assembly of the Republic of Indonesia in apologizing, suspending the judges, and repeating the final constitute a restoration of public service. These steps show that the organizer realized that the previous process did not meet good service standards. Legally, such correction is an institutional obligation to restore public trust and to ensure that participants' rights are fulfilled equally. Accordingly, the inconsistent scoring by the judges in the 2026 MPR RI Four Pillars Quiz Competition is proven to be contrary to the principles of professionalism, equal treatment, openness, and accountability as regulated in Article 4 of Law Number 25 of 2009 on Public Services. This violation shows that the assessment process did not meet good public service standards, so that the organizer is obliged to carry out corrections, restore participants' rights, and institutionally improve the assessment system.

**Violation of Law Number 39 of 1999 on Human Rights**

Law Number 39 of 1999 on Human Rights places the right to fair treatment as part of the fundamental rights of every person. Article 3 paragraph (2) affirms that everyone has the right to fair recognition, guarantee, protection, and legal treatment, while Article 3 paragraph (3) states that everyone has the right to the protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms without discrimination. Furthermore, Article 17 guarantees that everyone has the right to obtain justice through an objective and impartial process. These provisions show that the principles of justice and non-discrimination apply not only in judicial proceedings but also in all actions of state institutions that affect a person's rights. In the 2026 MPR RI Four Pillars Quiz Competition, participants had the right to be treated equally and assessed according to the same standards. When two identical answers received different results, the right to fair treatment was not fulfilled. The difference in scores caused concrete harm in the form of reduced points, a changed competitive position, and the loss of the opportunity to obtain the result to which participants were entitled. Thus, the judges' action not only violated the principles of government administration but also touched on the dimension of human rights protection. Philipus M. Hadjon (2008: 2) states that the function of administrative law is to protect citizens' rights against government actions. This view confirms that participants' rights in an official activity organized by a state institution must be effectively guaranteed. When the assessment process is carried out inconsistently, the state, through its organizer, fails to fulfill its obligation to provide adequate legal protection.

John Rawls (1971: 3) affirms that justice is fairness. From a human rights perspective, fairness contains elements of equal treatment, non-discrimination, and respect for the dignity of every person. A difference in scores for the same answer shows that participants were not treated as subjects of equal standing. This condition creates procedural injustice that ultimately affects the substance of participants' rights. Yusri Munaf (2016: v) emphasizes that good government must be responsible and in line with the law. If an administrative act harms a person's rights, the organizer is obliged to provide restoration. In this case, the apology, the suspension of the judges, and the repetition of the final constitute an acknowledgment that participants' rights were affected and needed to be restored through corrective action. Juridically, the human rights violation in this case need not be understood as a gross violation, but as an administrative failure to guarantee the right to fair treatment free from discrimination. This failure has legal consequences because state institutions are obliged to ensure that every procedure they run respects the basic principles of human rights. The inconsistent scoring by the judges in the 2026 MPR RI Four Pillars Quiz Competition is contrary to Article 3 paragraph (2), Article 3 paragraph (3), and Article 17 of Law Number 39 of 1999 on Human Rights. The violation shows that participants did not receive fair, equal, and non-discriminatory treatment, so that the organizer has a legal obligation to restore participants' rights and to improve the assessment mechanism in line with human rights principles.

Multidisciplinary Indonesian Center Journal (MICJO)
Journal page is available to
https://e-jurnal.jurnalcenter.com/index.php/micjo
Email: admin@jurnalcenter.com

**Legal Protection for Participants and the Administrative Responsibility of MPR RI**

Legal protection is a direct consequence of the principle of the rule of law, which requires the state not only to prevent violations but also to restore rights that have been harmed. Philipus M. Hadjon (2008: 2) distinguishes legal protection into two forms, namely preventive and repressive. Preventive protection aims to prevent disputes through clear procedures and standards, while repressive protection is provided after a violation has occurred in order to restore the rights of the injured party. In the 2026 MPR RI Four Pillars Quiz Competition, both forms of protection serve as parameters for assessing the quality of the organizer's legal responsibility. Preventive legal protection should have been realized through written assessment guidelines, standard operating procedures, training for the board of judges, the use of verification mechanisms, and an effective objection forum. Yusri Munaf (2016: v) states that good governance requires an orderly, rational, and responsible working system. If all of these preventive instruments were applied properly, the likelihood of different assessments of the same answer could be minimized. The fact that the error still occurred shows that the internal control system was not yet running optimally.

Repressive legal protection arises after the error is revealed and participants' rights have been affected. In this case, the People's Consultative Assembly of the Republic of Indonesia took several corrective steps, namely issuing an official apology, suspending the board of judges, evaluating the committee, and repeating the final round. From the perspective of administrative law, these actions constitute administrative correction aimed at annulling the effects of a defective decision and restoring conditions to what they should have been. The repetition of the final has a restitutive function because it gives all participants an equal opportunity to obtain an objective result. The administrative responsibility of MPR RI arises because the board of judges acted in the exercise of the institution's authority. In the theory of public organizations, the actions of officials or officers carrying out an institution's functions are attached to the responsibility of the institution that gave the mandate. Amelia Ayu Paramitha et al. (2023: 2) affirm that administrative law not only regulates authority but also provides a guarantee of legal protection for the public. Thus, the judges' error does not end as a matter of personal responsibility in legal terms, but becomes the institutional responsibility of the organizer.

Normatively, the administrative responsibility of MPR RI comprises three stages. First, acknowledging the error as a form of accountability. Second, restoring participants' rights through the repetition of the final. Third, preventing the recurrence of violations through evaluation of the system and improvement of procedures. These three stages show that administrative responsibility is not merely reactive but also corrective and preventive. It is not enough for an institution to acknowledge an error; it must also build mechanisms that guarantee that the competition is held again under more objective standards. From the perspective of the General Principles of Good Governance, MPR RI's corrective action reflects the fulfilment of the principles of accountability and good service after the violation occurred. However, this fulfilment is ex post, that is, it took place after participants' rights had been disrupted. Ideally, these principles should already be internalized in the design of the event, so that preventive legal protection prevails over repressive protection.

The practical implication of these findings is the need to establish a more structured assessment system. Such a system should at least include a documented assessment rubric, standards for handling objections, the use of audio recordings as a verification tool, and internal audits of the judges' decisions. Implementing these measures would strengthen the legitimacy of competition results and reduce the risk of disputes in the future. Participants in the 2026 MPR RI Four Pillars Quiz Competition are entitled to legal protection against unfair assessment, while MPR RI as the organizer bears the administrative responsibility to acknowledge errors, restore participants' rights, and improve the assessment system. This responsibility is the juridical consequence of the violation of the principles of justice, objectivity, accountability, and the protection of human rights that occurred in the assessment process.

Multidisciplinary Indonesian Center Journal (MICJO)
Journal page is available to
https://e-jurnal.jurnalcenter.com/index.php/micjo
Email: admin@jurnalcenter.com

## 4. CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the research and discussion, it can be concluded that the board of judges' assessment in the 2026 MPR RI Four Pillars Quiz Competition is an administrative act because it was carried out in an official activity of a state institution and has direct consequences for participants' rights, namely the determination of scores, rankings, and the opportunity to win the competition. Therefore, the act is subject to the principles of State Administrative Law and must meet the standards of legality, justice, objectivity, openness, and accountability.

The inconsistent scoring of two substantively identical answers is proven to violate the principle of justice because participants did not receive equal treatment, and to violate the principle of objectivity because the decision was not based on consistent and rational parameters. Normatively, the act is contrary to the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, Articles 5 and 10 of Law Number 30 of 2014 on Government Administration, Article 4 of Law Number 25 of 2009 on Public Services, and Articles 3 and 17 of Law Number 39 of 1999 on Human Rights.

The People's Consultative Assembly of the Republic of Indonesia, as the organizer, bears the administrative responsibility to acknowledge the error, restore participants' rights, and improve the assessment system. The official apology, the suspension of the judges, the evaluation of the committee, and the repetition of the final constitute appropriate administrative correction to restore the legal situation to what it should be. However, the findings of this research show that preventive legal protection still needs to be strengthened through the preparation of standard assessment guidelines, an effective objection mechanism, and a transparent verification system.

**Suggestions**

The People's Consultative Assembly of the Republic of Indonesia needs to prepare detailed standard operating procedures for assessment that bind all members of the board of judges, including assessment indicators, verification mechanisms, and procedures for resolving objections. These standards must be announced openly to participants in order to create legal certainty and transparency. The organizer also needs to conduct training, certification, and periodic evaluation of the board of judges to ensure that the assessment process is carried out professionally, objectively, and accountably. In addition, all stages of the assessment should be supported by audio and video documentation as a verification tool if disputes arise. For future researchers, this research can be developed by examining the legal responsibility of state institutions in other forms of non-regulatory activities, such as selections, awards, and competitions, so that the application of the General Principles of Good Governance can be understood more broadly in Indonesian constitutional practice.

## 5. REFERENCES

Arif, M. F. (2023). Asas-Asas Umum Pemerintahan yang Baik sebagai Jembatan antara Norma Hukum dan Norma Etika dalam Mencegah Kesewenang-wenangan Pemerintah [The General Principles of Good Governance as a Bridge between Legal Norms and Ethical Norms in Preventing Government Arbitrariness]. *Jurnal Hukum dan Pemerintahan*, 5(1), 55–67.

Hadjon, P. M. (2008). *Perlindungan Hukum bagi Rakyat di Indonesia* [Legal Protection for the People in Indonesia]. Surabaya: Bina Ilmu.

Kusmana, L. D. (2013). Penerapan Asas-Asas Umum Pemerintahan yang Baik dalam Penerbitan Izin oleh Pemerintah Daerah [The Application of the General Principles of Good Governance in the Issuance of Permits by Regional Governments]. *Jurnal IUS*, 1(3), 576–588.

Marzuki, P. M. (2021). *Penelitian Hukum* [Legal Research]. Jakarta: Kencana.

Munaf, Y. (2016). *Hukum Administrasi Negara* [State Administrative Law]. Pekanbaru: Marpoyan Tujuh Publishing.

Paramitha, A. A., Nurhayati, R., & Suryani, D. (2023). *Hukum Administrasi Negara* [State Administrative Law]. Bandung: Widina Bhakti Persada.

Rawls, J. (1971). *A Theory of Justice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Ridwan HR. (2017). *Hukum Administrasi Negara* [State Administrative Law]. Jakarta: Rajawali Pers.

Multidisciplinary Indonesian Center Journal (MICJO)
Journal page is available to
https://e-jurnal.jurnalcenter.com/index.php/micjo
Email: admin@jurnalcenter.com

Solechan. (2019). Asas-Asas Umum Pemerintahan yang Baik dalam Pelayanan Publik [The General Principles of Good Governance in Public Services]. *Administrative Law and Governance Journal*, 2(3), 541–557. https://doi.org/10.14710/alj.v2i3.541-557

Utama, Y. J. (n.d.). *Pengertian Administrasi Negara dan Hukum Administrasi Negara* [The Definition of State Administration and State Administrative Law]. Semarang: Fakultas Hukum Universitas Diponegoro.

Zees, S. W. (2025). Peran Hukum Administrasi Negara dalam Menjamin Kepentingan Umum melalui Implementasi Kebijakan Pelayanan Publik di Indonesia [The Role of State Administrative Law in Guaranteeing the Public Interest through the Implementation of Public Service Policy in Indonesia]. *Jurnal Ilmu Hukum*, 9(2), 403–412.

Undang-Undang Dasar Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 1945 [The 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia].

Undang-Undang Nomor 25 Tahun 2009 tentang Pelayanan Publik [Law Number 25 of 2009 on Public Services].

Undang-Undang Nomor 30 Tahun 2014 tentang Administrasi Pemerintahan [Law Number 30 of 2014 on Government Administration].

Undang-Undang Nomor 39 Tahun 1999 tentang Hak Asasi Manusia [Law Number 39 of 1999 on Human Rights].