



Potential Conflict of Authority Among State High Institutions: A Study of Indonesian Constitutional Law

Sarji*, Azis Budianto

Universitas Borobudur, Indonesia

Email: faisalsarji@gmail.com*, azis_budianto@borobudur.ac.id

Keywords:

conflict of authority; state institutions; constitutional law; Constitutional Court.

Abstract

Conflict authority between body and institution tall country is consequence the logical basis for implementing the principles of separation of powers and checks and balances in the Indonesian constitutional system following the amendment to the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia. The increasingly complex distribution of authority, accompanied by the emergence of independent institutions, has the potential to lead to overlapping authority and differences in the interpretation of constitutional norms. This study aims to analyze the construction of authority of state institutions, identify potential conflicts of authority, and examine the mechanisms for resolving them from the perspective of Indonesian constitutional law. The research method used is normative legal research with a statutory, conceptual, and case approach, through an analysis of laws and regulations, legal literature, and Constitutional Court decisions related to disputes over the authority of state institutions. The results of the study indicate that the potential for conflict of authority caused by ambiguity norm, overlapping regulations and the dynamics of legal politics in state governance practices. The Constitutional Court plays a strategic role in resolving authority disputes, but its effectiveness still faces challenges. This study offers a constitutional ambiguity approach as a basis for analysis and recommends strengthening normative clarity and harmonizing regulations to minimize authority conflicts.

INTRODUCTION

The development of Indonesia's constitutional system following the amendments to the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia (UUD NRI 1945) has brought fundamental changes to the structure and distribution of state power (Punu, 2023). The constitutional reforms that took place between 1999 and 2002 not only strengthened the principles of democracy and the rule of law but also restructured the relationship between state institutions through the implementation of the principle of separation of powers and the mechanism of checks and balances (Amelia, 2026). framework This, authority institution country No Again centralized, but rather distributed horizontally between the executive, legislative and judicial institutions, and expanded by the presence of independent institutions that have strategic functions in the state system (Maskur, 2025).

However, the increasingly complex distribution of authority actually opening up space for conflicts of authority between high state bodies and institutions. Conflict authority is phenomenon Which inherent in system modern constitutionalism, especially when the

boundaries of authority between institutions are not clearly defined or when there are differing interpretations of constitutional norms (Alaryahiyyah, 2025). In the Indonesian context, the potential for such conflict increases with the development of new state institutions and independent institutions, which often overlap in function with the main state institutions (Agustin, 2025).

The phenomenon of conflict of authority between state institutions in Indonesia can be seen in various state dynamics, both normatively and in practice (Malik, 2024). This conflict can arise between the executive and legislative institutions. the process of forming laws, between the judiciary and other institutions in terms of supervision or law enforcement, and between the main state institutions and independent institutions that have authority special ((Pulu, 2026). In a number of In cases, conflicts of authority even lead to disputes over the authority of state institutions which must be resolved through constitutional mechanisms by the Constitutional Court as guardian of the constitution (Latif, 2025).

Although a mechanism for resolving authority disputes through the Constitutional Court exists, this mechanism has not been able to completely eliminate the potential for authority conflicts (S. R. Putra, 2025). This is due to several factors, including the persistence of multi-interpretable constitutional norms, overlapping provisions in laws and regulations, and the strong influence of political dynamics on the practice of state administration. This condition shows that conflict of authority is not only a legal issue, but is also closely related to the political, legal and constitutional cultural aspects of a country (D. E. Putra, 2025).

In academic studies, the issue of conflicts of authority between state institutions has been widely discussed by constitutional law experts, both in the context of Indonesia and from a comparative perspective (Doing, 2024). Most previous research tends to focus on normative analysis of the division of power and the mechanism for resolving disputes over authority through the Constitutional Court. Furthermore, several studies have also highlighted the Constitutional Court's role in maintaining the balance of power among state institutions and the implications of its decisions for Indonesia's constitutional system.

However, there are several gaps that have not been thoroughly explored in previous research. First, there is a lack of studies that specifically identify and map potential conflicts of authority. systematically based on the construction of norms in the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia and regulations related legislation. Second, the analysis linking conflicts of authority with the dynamics of legal politics and developing state practices is less than optimal. in Indonesia. Third, lack of effort reconstruction conceptual Which offers a comprehensive model for preventing conflicts of authority within the framework of the Indonesian constitutional system.

Based on this gap, this study own urgency Which tall Good in a way theoretical and practical. Theoretically, this research is expected to contribute to the development of constitutional law, especially in understand dynamics of conflict of authority between institutions country in system democracy constitutional. In practice, the results of this study are expected to serve as a reference for policy makers and state institutions in formulating clearer boundaries of authority and strengthening effective and equitable mechanisms for resolving authority disputes.

The novelty of this research lies in its development of a "constitutional ambiguity approach" as an analytical framework for identifying potential authority conflicts. Unlike

previous studies that analyze conflicts after they occur, this research examines constitutional and statutory norms proactively to identify provisions that, by their linguistic or structural ambiguity, create conditions ripe for inter-institutional disputes. The research also offers a reconstructive model for preventing authority conflicts through normative clarification, regulatory harmonization, and constitutional culture strengthening.

Based on this background, the formulation of the problem in this research is as follows: (1) how is the construction of the authority of the agency and institution tall state in the Indonesian constitutional system after the amendment to the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia?; (2) what is the potential for conflict of authority between state institutions in Indonesian constitutional practice?; and (3) what is the mechanism for resolving conflict of authority between state institutions from the perspective of Indonesian constitutional law?

In line with the formulation of the problem, the aim of this research is to analyzing the construction of authority of state institutions in the Indonesian constitutional system, identifying and examining potential conflicts of authority between state institutions, and evaluating the mechanisms for resolving conflicts of authority within the framework of Indonesian constitutional law.

The state of the art in this research lies in its effort to integrate normative analysis with a contextual approach to Indonesian constitutional practice. This research not only examines the legal norms governing the authority of state institutions but also examines the dynamics of conflicts that occur in practice and the role of the Constitutional Court in resolving disputes over such authority. Thus, this research This make an effort give description Which more comprehensive study of conflicts of authority between state institutions in Indonesia.

Furthermore, the novelty of this research lies in developing an analysis of potential conflicts of authority based on the concept of constitutional ambiguity, namely the condition in which constitutional norms allow for various different interpretations, potentially giving rise to conflict between state institutions. Furthermore, this research also offers a reconstructive approach in formulating a model for preventing conflicts of authority by strengthening normative clarity, harmonizing laws and regulations, and strengthening constitutional culture in the practice of state administration.

Thus, this research is expected to not only provide academic contributions in development theory law order country, but Also give implications practical in an effort to realize a constitutional system Which more harmonious, effective, And in accordance with the principles of a democratic legal state in Indonesia.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This research uses a normative legal research method, emphasizing the analysis of legal norms governing the authority of high state bodies and institutions in the Indonesian constitutional system. The approach used includes a legal approach. legislation, conceptual, and case, with utilizing primary legal materials such as the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia and Constitutional Court decisions regarding disputes over the authority of state institutions, which are then strengthened by secondary legal materials in the form of literature and scientific journals. All data are analyzed qualitatively to identify potential conflicts of authority and assess the conformity of state administration practices with the principles of constitutionalism.

The statute approach is used to systematically examine the legal norms governing the division and implementation of authority between high state bodies and institutions within the Indonesian constitutional system. The analysis focuses on the provisions of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia and related laws and regulations to identify potential disharmony in norms, unclear regulations, or overlapping authorities that could trigger conflict between state institutions.

Next, the conceptual approach utilized for build framework theoretical comprehensive with reference to constitutional law doctrines, such as the theory of separation of powers, the principle of checks and balances, as well as the concept of modern constitutionalism. This approach allows researchers to critically analyze the construction of state institutions' authority and formulate scientific arguments regarding the ideal limits of authority in a constitutional democratic system.

The case approach is used to study in a way deep practice resolving conflicts of authority through Constitutional Court decisions, particularly in cases of disputes over the authority of state institutions. Through this approach, research is not only normative-doctrinal but also contextual, examining the ratio decidendi, the judges' legal considerations, and the implications of decisions for the dynamics of relations between state institutions in Indonesia.

The legal materials in this study consist of primary legal materials, which serve as the primary reference in examining the construction and boundaries of authority between state institutions. These primary materials include constitutional norms in the Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia. Year 1945 as well as decisions Court Constitution Which relevant to disputes over the authority of state institutions. These two sources are used to identify the legal basis for the division of power and to understand the practice of constitutional interpretation in resolving conflicts of authority.

Table 1. Material Law Primary

No	Types of Legal Materials	Data source	Function in Research
1	Norm Constitutional	1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia	Identifying the legal basis division of authority between state institutions and the limits of power in the state system
2	Court ruling Constitutional	Constitutional Court	Analyzing the practice of constitutional interpretation in disputes over authority and understanding patterns of conflict resolution between state institutions

The Primary Legal Materials table shows that this research relies on primary legal sources that have direct binding force in the Indonesian constitutional system, namely the constitutional norms in the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia and the decisions of the Constitutional Court. These two types of legal materials not only serve as a legal basis for examining the division of authority between state institutions but also serve as analytical

instruments for understanding how the constitution is interpreted and applied in the practice of resolving disputes. dispute authority, so that allows study This produce prescriptive, systematic, and constitutional studies.

Table 2. Material Law Secondary

No	Types of Legal Materials	Data source	Function in Research
1	Book Constitutional law	The work of experts (e.g. Jimly Asshiddiqie, Mahfud MD, Saldi Isra)	Provides a theoretical basis for the separation of powers, checks and balances, and the concept of the authority of state institutions.
2	Article Scientific Journal	National Journal (Sinta) and relevant international (Scopus)	Identifying the state of the art, finding research gaps, and strengthening arguments scientific
3	Opinion Expert (Doctrine)	Legal literature, research results, and academic studies	To be the basis for conceptual and interpretative analysis of conflicts of authority between state institutions.
4	Other Supporting References	Proceedings, research reports , and related scientific publications	Provides additional comparative and contextual perspectives to support research analysis.

The Secondary Legal Materials Table represents supporting sources that serve to strengthen the theoretical basis and depth of analysis in this research, through the use of literature law order country, article journal scientific, as well as various doctrine and expert opinion. The existence of secondary legal materials allows researchers to conduct studies critical to draft, development, and dynamics the authority of state institutions, while identifying research gaps and building more comprehensive arguments, so that the results of the study are not only normative, but also analytical and contextual in accordance with developments in constitutional law.

Meanwhile, secondary legal materials are used as amplifier analysis And A scientific argumentation framework. This material includes constitutional law literature, scientific journal articles, and expert opinions relevant to the research theme. Through secondary materials, this research gains theoretical and comparative perspectives that support a critical examination of the dynamics of state institutions' authority, ensuring that the resulting analysis is not only normative but also reflective and contextual.

The analysis technique in this study uses a normative qualitative approach, namely by systematically reviewing and interpreting legal materials to understand the construction of authority between state bodies and high institutions from the perspective of Indonesian constitutional law. The analysis is conducted through a process of inventory, classification, and analysis. And synchronization to norms law Which there is in the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia and related regulations, in order to identify potential conflicts, unclear norms, and overlapping authority between state institutions. This approach emphasizes legal interpretation using grammatical, systematic, and teleological interpretation methods to obtain a complete understanding of the intent of the law. and the purpose of regulating authority in

the state system.

Furthermore, a normative qualitative analysis was also conducted on Constitutional Court decisions as a representation of the practice of resolving disputes within the authority of state institutions. In this case, the researcher examined the *ratio decidendi*, the judges' legal considerations, and the implications of the decisions for inter-institutional relations. country. Process The analysis is not only descriptive, but also evaluative and prescriptive, examining the alignment between norms and practices and formulating arguments regarding ideal efforts to minimize conflicts of authority. Thus, this analytical technique is expected to produce a comprehensive, critical, and relevant study for the development of Indonesian constitutional law.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This part most important and must “alive”. It is recommended to divide it into 3 strong sub-chapters:

1. Construction Authority Institution Country in System State administration Indonesia

Construction authority institution country in system state administration Indonesia cannot be separated from the influence of the classical theory of separation of powers introduced by Montesquieu (Dewa, 2024). In this framework, power country sorted to in the legislative, executive, and judicial functions as an effort to prevent the concentration of power that could potentially give rise to authoritarianism (Alam, 2025). However, in Indonesian constitutional practice, this separation is not applied rigidly, but rather is functional and interrelated. This is evident in the overlapping authority between state institutions, which is constitutionally permitted, so that the relationship Institutions are not only separate but also complementary in carrying out state functions (Junaedi, 2025). Thus, the construction of authority in Indonesia reflects a distribution of power approach rather than absolute separation.

Furthermore, the application of the theory of checks and balances is an important mechanism in maintaining the balance of power between state institutions. This principle places Each institution is in a position to not only exercise its authority but also have an oversight function over other institutions (Habibah, 2025). In this context, the relationship between the legislative and executive institutions, for example, demonstrates a control function through legislative, oversight, and budgetary mechanisms (Suri, 2025). Similarly, the judicial branch of power plays a role as a guardian of the constitution through its authority to review norms. and the Constitutional Court's resolution of disputes over the authority of state institutions (Lananda, 2024) However, in practice, the checks and balances mechanism does not always operate ideally, particularly when there is an imbalance of political power or differing interpretations of authority between institutions, which ultimately has the potential to give rise to conflicts of authority (Fahira, 2025).

The development of the construction of the authority of state institutions underwent a significant transformation after the amendment to the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia (Oktarina, 2025). This amendment not only emphasized the division of powers, but also... It also creates new institutions and strengthens the position of existing ones. One important implication is the strengthening of the system

of checks and balances through the establishment of an independent judicial institution and the recognition of independent state institutions with specific functions. On the other hand, the increasingly complex distribution of authority also opens up space for corruption. overlapping overlap authority, especially when constitutional norms do not provide clear boundaries. This condition shows that although the amendments to the 1945 Constitution have brought progress in democratization and strengthening of constitutionalism, but at the same time also creates new challenges in the form of potential conflicts of authority between state institutions that require further regulation both normatively and in state practice.

2. Potential Conflict Authority Between Institution Country

The potential for conflict of authority between state institutions in the Indonesian constitutional system is not only theoretical, but also actual in the practice of governance (Arifien, 2025). Generally appear as consequence from distribution complex powers within a framework of checks and balances, where each institution has legitimacy constitutional For operate function certain. In in practice, the boundaries of authority are not always clear, thus opening up space for friction and even conflict between state institutions. These forms of conflict can be classified into several main patterns that reflect the dynamics of power relations within the Indonesian constitutional system.

First, conflicts between the executive and legislative branches often occur in the process of formation. Constitution and in function supervision. For example, in relationship practices between President and Board Representative People (DPR), there is potential for conflict of interest in the discussion of draft laws, especially When there are differences in political orientation. A concrete example can be seen in the dynamics of discussions on revising certain laws, which have sparked tension between the government and the House of Representatives (DPR) regarding the substance of norms and drafting procedures. Furthermore, the DPR's oversight function over government policies can also lead to conflict when perceived as exceeding its authority or when the executive branch responds defensively.

Second, conflicts between the judiciary and other state institutions are generally related to the implementation of judicial functions and the authority to test laws. In this context, the Constitutional Court has strategic authority to test laws against the constitution, which often impacts legislative and executive policies. For example, the Constitutional Court's annulment of statutory norms. often cause resistance or debate from lawmakers, especially when the decision is deemed to disrupt the political agenda or ongoing public policy. On the other hand, the relationship between the Supreme Court and other institutions, including the Judicial Commission, has also raised tensions regarding the limits of authority in overseeing judges.

Third, the conflict between independent institutions and the main state institutions shows new complexities in system state administration modern Indonesia. Institution independent institutions such as the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK), the Judicial Commission (KY), and other institutions Other institutions are established to carry out specific functions relatively free from interference from the authorities. However, in practice, there are often overlaps in authority with the executive and

judicial branches. One clear example is the conflict between the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) and the Indonesian National Police (Polri) in handling corruption cases, reflecting overlapping authority in law enforcement. Furthermore, the relationship between the Judicial Commission and the Supreme Court also shows potential conflict in oversight of judges, particularly regarding the limits of judicial authority, judicial ethical and technical authority.

Thus, the various forms of conflict over authority indicate that the main problem lies not only in the distribution of power, but also in the harmonization of institutional norms and practices. This condition emphasizes the importance of affirming limit authority in a way normative and strengthening of settlement mechanisms conflict through constitutional instruments, so that relations between state institutions remain within the legal corridor and the principles of constitutional democracy.

The potential for conflict of authority between state institutions in the Indonesian constitutional system stems not only from the dynamics of power relations, but also from the construction of norms that open up space for multiple interpretations. blurry (vague norms) in the constitution and legislation often do not provide limits which is clear regarding the scope of authority of each state institution. This situation has triggered differences in interpretation between institutions, particularly in the implementation of oversight, testing, and strategic policy-making functions. For example, in Indonesian constitutional practice, tensions have arisen between the House of Representatives' oversight authority over independent institutions, which, on the one hand, are viewed as part of a political control function, but on the other hand, are considered to have the potential to exceed their authority because independent institutions are not fully within the power structure. executive. Ambiguity This show that Norms that are not formulated precisely have the potential to give rise to latent or open conflicts of authority.

Besides that, conflict authority also triggered by overlapping authority (overlapping overlap function) between state institutions that own mandate similar or intersecting. In In the Indonesian context, this is apparent in the relationship between the judiciary and external supervisory institutions, for example in the relationship between the Supreme Court And Commission Judicial related to judicial oversight. Differences in perceptions regarding the limits of authority in judicial ethical and technical oversight have led to institutional friction that led to a judicial review of authority at the Constitutional Court. On the other hand, the dynamics of legal politics also exacerbate the potential for conflict, particularly when the formation of laws is driven more by short-term political interests than by the consistency of the constitutional system. This can be seen in the formation or changes in the authority of certain institutions, which tend to expand or limit power disproportionately, thereby triggering resistance from other institutions. Thus, the combination of norms that No Firmness, overlapping authority, and legal political intervention are the main factors that structurally and functionally trigger conflicts of authority between state institutions in Indonesia.

Table 3. Potential Conflict Authority Between Institution Country

No	Causative factor	Analytical Description	Example of Implementation in Indonesia
1	Norm Vague Norms	The ambiguity in the formulation of norms in the constitution and laws and regulations gives rise to multiple interpretations of the limits of the authority of state institutions.	Differences in the interpretation of the DPR's supervisory authority over independent institutions, which has given rise to debate about the limits of political control over non-executive institutions.
2	Overlapping Authority	Overlapping functions or overlapping authorities between state institutions that have similar or adjacent mandates	The conflict of authority between the Supreme Court and the Judicial Commission regarding the supervision of judges which resulted in the testing of authority at the Constitutional Court.
3	Political Law (Legal Politics)	The formation and changes to regulations influenced by political interests thus shifting the balance of authority between state institutions.	Revision of laws that expand or limit the authority of certain institutions, thereby giving rise to resistance and conflict between state institutions.

The table shows that the conflict of authority between state institutions is essentially a structural problem rooted in the ambiguity of constitutional design and the dynamics of state practice. Its significance lies in the fact that the relationship between institution country No always walk in line harmonious coordination, but often in a space of tug-of-war interpretation of authority. In the context of vague norms, for example, problems arise when there are no boundaries Which explicit about as far as where institution legislative can carry out its oversight function over independent institutions. This has sparked controversy over the DPR's practice of summoning or evaluating the performance of independent institutions, which some view as a form of constitutional oversight, while others consider it an intervention that exceeds its authority. This issue demonstrates that unclear norms have the potential to create interpretive conflicts that can lead to institutional disharmony. A possible solution is to strengthen the formulation of norms through a revision of more specific laws and regulations. firm and systematic, as well as strengthening guidelines for constitutional interpretation based on the principle of checks and balances to prevent unilateral expansion of authority.

Furthermore, regarding overlapping authority and legal politics, the table indicates that conflicts are not only normative in nature but also influenced by institutional interests and power configurations. A concrete example is seen in the relationship between the Supreme Court and the Judicial Commission regarding

judicial oversight, where differing interpretations of the limits of ethical and technical judicial authority create friction that must be resolved through the Constitutional Court. side other, dynamics political The law also often triggers conflict, such as in the formation of laws that change the structure or authority of certain institutions without considering the balance of the state system. in a way comprehensive. Condition This can cause resistance between institutions and has the potential to weaken the principle of constitutionalism. Therefore, the necessary solution is not only normative, but also institutional, namely through harmonization. regulations cross sector, strengthening role Court Constitution as constitutional interpreters, as well as the development of a constitutional culture that upholds the limits of authority and ethical relations between state institutions.

3. Mechanism Settlement Dispute Authority

The mechanism for resolving disputes over authority between state institutions in the Indonesian constitutional system is constitutionally vested in the Constitutional Court, acting as guardian of the constitution. This authority holds a strategic position because it functions to maintain a balance of power relations between state institutions while ensuring that the exercise of authority remains within the constitutional framework. In practice, the Constitutional Court acts not only as an adjudication forum, but Also as institutions Which give affirmation regarding the limits of authority which are often open to multiple interpretations. Thus, the role of the Constitutional Court is crucial in prevent escalation conflict authority which has the potential to disrupt the stability of the government system.

In the context of practice, several Constitutional Court decisions show How this institution concretely carries out its function of resolving disputes over authority. One example is Decision Number 005/SKLN-IV/2006, which involved a dispute between the Judicial Commission and the Supreme Court regarding the authority to supervise judges. In this decision, the Constitutional Court emphasized the limits of the Judicial Commission's authority so that it does not exceed the independence of the judiciary. Another example is Decision Number 030/SKLN-IV/2006, which demonstrates the dynamics of the relationship between the two institutions. between state institutions in terms of interpreting constitutional authority. In addition, in several cases related to institutional relations independent and institution As the main authority of the state, the Constitutional Court also demonstrates an active role in formulating the limits of authority through progressive and contextual legal considerations.

However, the Constitutional Court's effectiveness in resolving disputes over jurisdiction still faces a number of challenges. One of the main obstacles is limited space. scope authority Court Constitution Which only can adjudicate disputes between state institutions whose authority is explicitly granted by the Constitution. This means that not all conflicts of authority can be resolved through constitutional mechanisms. especially conflict Which involving non-constitutional institutions or independent institutions whose authority is regulated through Constitution. Besides That, in in practice Still found the tendency for political interests to be drawn into conflict that can influence the dynamics of authority disputes before reaching the adjudication stage.

Academically, this condition has given rise to criticism that the mechanism for resolving authority disputes in Indonesia is still reactive and not yet fully implemented. preventive. The Constitutional Court tends to play a role after conflict happen, No as an institution capable of preventing conflict from occurring in the first place through the affirmation of more comprehensive norms. Therefore, required strengthening design institutional and harmonization regulations For minimize potential overlapping overlap authority. In the context of implementation in Indonesia, concrete steps that can be taken include improving laws and regulations governing relations between state institutions, improving institutional coordination, and strengthening constitutional culture in state governance practices. Thus, resolving disputes over authority is not only a matter of depends on decision Court Constitution, but also on a more adaptive and preventive legal system.

CONCLUSION

The potential for conflict of authority between high state bodies and institutions in the Indonesian state system is a logical consequence of the application of the principle of separation of powers and the checks and balances mechanism which has not been fully followed. clarity limit authority. Conflict the generally triggered by There is a lack of clarity in norms, overlapping regulations, and differing interpretations of constitutional provisions in the practice of state administration. In this regard, the Constitutional Court plays a central role as the institution authorized to resolve disputes over authority through a final and binding interpretation of the constitution. However, the existing mechanisms are still reactive and are not yet fully capable of addressing all forms of authority conflicts that arise in state administration practices.

Scientifically, this research provides a contribution in the form of strengthening the analysis of the construction of the authority of state institutions from the perspective of modern constitutionalism, while also offering a new understanding of the importance of a preventive approach in minimize conflict authority. Study This confirm that Conflict resolution does not only depend on the adjudication mechanism by the Constitutional Court, but also on the clarity of norms and harmonization regulations Which become base relations between state institutions. Thus, the main contribution of this research lies in developing the argument that systematic reformulation of authority arrangements needs to be carried out to create more effective and balanced governance of power.

As recommendation, in a way normative required improvement legislation that regulates the authority of state institutions to be clearer, be firm and prevent multiple interpretations. Furthermore, policy-wise, it is necessary to strengthen coordination between state institutions and develop a constitutional culture that emphasizes adherence to the basic principles of the rule of law. In the context of implementation in Indonesia, concrete steps that can be taken include revising sectoral laws that have the potential to lead to overlapping authority, increasing institutional capacity to understand the limits of their respective authorities, and optimizing the role of the Constitutional Court not only as a dispute resolver but also as a constitutional interpreter capable of providing direction in maintaining the balance of state power.

REFERENCES

- Agustin, N. A. (2025). Tumpang Tindih Kewenangan Antar Lembaga: Tantangan dalam Tata Kelola Pemerintahan yang Efektif. *Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan*, 4(2), 32–38.
- Alam, R. N. (2025). Penyalahgunaan Kekuasaan Eksekutif dalam Sistem Ketatanegaraan. *Ranah Research: Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Development*, 7(5), 3509–3517.
- Alaryahiyah, F. B. (2025). Konflik Kewenangan Antar Lembaga Negara dalam Ketatanegaraan Indonesia. *Politika Progresif: Jurnal Hukum, Politik Dan Humaniora*, 2(3), 19–36.
- Amelia, F. N. (2026). Pelembagaan Hukum pada Pemerintahan Presiden Megawati Soekarnoputri Tahun 2001-2004. *Langgas: Jurnal Studi Pembangunan*, 5(1), 55–64.
- Arifien, B. M. (2025). Kedudukan Mahkamah Konstitusi dalam Mekanisme Hubungan antar Lembaga Negara. *CENDEKIA: Jurnal Penelitian Dan Pengkajian Ilmiah*, 2(7), 1340–1352.
- Dewa, M. J. (2024). Implementasi Teori The New Separation of Power dalam Sistem Kelembagaan Negara di Indonesia. *Halu Oleo Legal Research*, 6(2), 432–448.
- Doing, M. K. (2024). Strengthening the Constitutional Law System (Legal Challenges and Strategies in Handling the Social, Economic and Political Crisis in Indonesia). *Journal Equity of Law and Governance*, 5(1), 113–122.
- Fahira, Y. (2025). Sistem Checks and Balances dalam Menjaga Prinsip Demokrasi di Indonesia. *Jurnal Media Akademik (JMA)*, 3(6).
- Habibah, S. W. (2025). Implementasi Konsep Check and Balance Peter L. Strauss dalam Sistem Kelembagaan Indonesia. *Cerdika: Jurnal Ilmiah Indonesia*, 5(1).
- Junaedi, A. M. (2025). *Hukum Tata Negara Indonesia: Teori, Struktur Kekuasaan, dan Masa Depan Konstitusi*. Yogyakarta: Filosofis Indonesia Press.
- Lananda, A. M. (2024). Dampak Putusan Mahkamah Agung dan Mahkamah Konstitusi Mengenai Open Legal Policy di Tinjau Dari Hukum Administrasi Negara. *The Juris*, 8(2), 384–403.
- Latif, A. Z. (2025). Analisis Peran Mahkamah Konstitusi dalam Penyelesaian Sengketa Kewenangan Antar Lembaga Negara di Indonesia. *Al-Zayn: Jurnal Ilmu Sosial & Hukum*, 3(6), 11464–11476.
- Malik, D. A. (2024). Navigating the Labyrinth: A Normative Juridical Analysis of Legal Politics and Policy Formulation in Indonesia. *Enigma in Law*, 2(1), 75–86.
- Maskur, M. S. (2025). Kedudukan Lembaga-Lembaga Negara Independen dalam Struktur Ketatanegaraan Indonesia. *Jurnal Tana Mana*, 6(2), 66–74.
- Oktarina, E. (2025). Dinamika Kewenangan Presiden Republik Indonesia Di Bidang Legislatif Pasca Perubahan Undang-Undang Dasar 1945. *Lex Librum: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum*, 11(2), 243–250.
- Pulu, I. K. (2026). Dinamika Hubungan Antar Lembaga Negara dalam Perspektif Konstitusi Indonesia. *Journal of Law and Justice*, 1(1), 1–6.
- Putra, D. E. (2025). Harmonisasi Hukum Administrasi Negara Dengan Konstitusi Dalam Sistem Pemerintahan Di Indonesia. *Journal of Global Legal Review*, 3(2), 85–94.
- Putra, S. R. (2025). Kekuasaan Mahkamah Konstitusi dalam Merekonsiliasi Konflik Politik: Sebuah Tinjauan terhadap Putusan Kontroversial. *Jurnal Hukum Lex Generalis*, 6(10).

Suri, M. (2025). Dinamika Hubungan Lembaga Eksekutif dan Legislatif dalam Sistem Presidensial di Indonesia. *Jurnal Manajemen, Akuntansi Dan Pendidikan*, 69–81.