

ABSTRAK

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menganalisis rasionalitas konstitusional Mahkamah Konstitusi dalam mengesampingkan syarat *legal standing* serta metode penafsiran hukum yang digunakan dalam menilai dugaan pelanggaran Terstruktur, Sistematis, dan Masif (TSM) pada Putusan Nomor 183/PHPU.BUP-XXIII/2025. Penelitian ini menggunakan metode penelitian hukum normatif dengan pendekatan perundang-undangan (*statute approach*), pendekatan konseptual (*conceptual approach*), dan pendekatan kasus (*case approach*). Sumber bahan hukum terdiri atas bahan hukum primer, sekunder, dan tersier yang dianalisis secara kualitatif. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa Mahkamah Konstitusi mengesampingkan syarat *legal standing* yang didasarkan pada ketentuan Pasal 158 Undang-Undang Nomor 10 Tahun 2016 dengan mengedepankan keadilan substantif, perlindungan hak konstitusional warga negara, dan pemeliharaan integritas demokrasi. Mahkamah menilai bahwa keberadaan dugaan pelanggaran yang berpotensi memengaruhi hasil pemilihan harus diperiksa terlebih dahulu demi menjamin kemurnian kedaulatan rakyat. Dalam menilai dugaan pelanggaran TSM, Mahkamah menggunakan metode penafsiran sistematis, teleologis, dan konstitusional dengan menempatkan prinsip demokrasi, kejujuran, dan keadilan pemilu sebagai dasar pertimbangan hukum. Pendekatan tersebut menunjukkan bahwa Mahkamah tidak hanya berorientasi pada aspek prosedural, tetapi juga pada pencapaian keadilan substantif dalam penyelesaian sengketa pemilihan kepala daerah.

Kata Kunci: Mahkamah Konstitusi, *Legal Standing*, Pelanggaran TSM, Rasionalitas Konstitusional, Sengketa Pilkada.

ABSTRACT

This research aims to analyze the Constitutional Court's constitutional rationale in setting aside the legal standing requirement, as well as the methods of legal interpretation employed in assessing allegations of Structured, Systematic, and Massive (TSM) violations in Constitutional Court Decision Number 183/PHPU.BUP-XXIII/2025. This study adopts a normative legal research method utilizing statutory, conceptual, and case approaches. The legal materials consist of primary, secondary, and tertiary sources, which are examined through qualitative legal analysis. The findings reveal that the Constitutional Court set aside the legal standing requirement stipulated under Article 158 of Law Number 10 of 2016 by prioritizing substantive justice, the protection of citizens' constitutional rights, and the preservation of democratic integrity. The Court held that allegations of violations capable of affecting the election results must be substantively examined to ensure the genuine realization of popular sovereignty. In assessing allegations of TSM violations, the Court employed systematic, teleological, and constitutional methods of interpretation, placing the principles of democracy, electoral integrity, and fairness at the core of its legal reasoning. This approach demonstrates that the Court's adjudication extends beyond procedural considerations and is fundamentally directed toward the attainment of substantive justice in the resolution of regional election disputes.

Keywords: Constitutional Court, Legal Standing, Structured, Systematic, and Massive (TSM) Violations, Constitutional Rationality, Regional Election Disputes.