

ABSTRAK

Putusan hakim harus dibangun berdasarkan ketepatan penerapan hukum acara perdata agar mampu mewujudkan kepastian hukum, keadilan, dan kemanfaatan. Dalam Putusan Pengadilan Agama Bangkalan Nomor 679/Pdt.G/2025/PA.Bkl, Majelis Hakim menyatakan Pemohon tidak bersungguh-sungguh karena tidak hadir dalam persidangan meskipun telah dipanggil secara resmi dan patut, tetapi amar putusan yang dijatuhkan berupa membatalkan perkara dan memerintahkan Panitera untuk mencoret perkara dari register perkara. Kondisi tersebut menimbulkan persoalan mengenai ketepatan putusan hakim serta pengaturan pembatalan perkara dalam hukum acara perdata. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menganalisis ketepatan putusan hakim ditinjau dari hukum acara perdata yang berlaku di Indonesia serta menganalisis pengaturan pembatalan perkara terhadap Putusan Pengadilan Agama Bangkalan Nomor 679/Pdt.G/2025/PA.Bkl.

Penelitian ini merupakan penelitian hukum normatif dengan pendekatan perundang-undangan, pendekatan konseptual, dan pendekatan kasus. Bahan hukum diperoleh melalui studi kepustakaan terhadap HIR, RBg, UU Peradilan Agama, Buku II Pedoman Pelaksanaan Tugas dan Administrasi Peradilan, Buku II Pedoman Teknis Administrasi dan Teknis Peradilan Perdata Umum dan Perdata Khusus, putusan pengadilan, serta doktrin hukum. Wawancara dengan Ketua Majelis Hakim digunakan sebagai data pendukung untuk memperkuat analisis normatif.

Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa putusan hakim tersebut tidak tepat menurut hukum acara perdata karena pertimbangan hukum mengarah pada gugurnya perkara sebagaimana yang di atur dalam HIR dan RBg, jika di lanjutkan maka persidangan dan putusan di lakukan secara kontradiktoir, sedangkan amar yang dijatuhkan berupa pembatalan perkara merupakan mekanisme administratif akibat tidak dipenuhinya kewajiban penambahan panjar biaya perkara. Penelitian ini juga menunjukkan bahwa pengaturan pembatalan perkara tidak diatur secara eksplisit dalam HIR maupun RBg, melainkan bersumber pada UU Peradilan Agama dan diatur lebih lanjut dalam Buku II Mahkamah Agung sebagai pedoman administrasi perkara.

Kata Kunci: Pertimbangan Hukum, Amar Putusan, Pembatalan Perkara, Hukum Acara Perdata, Rasio Decidendi.

ABSTRACT

Judicial decisions must be founded upon the proper application of Indonesian civil procedural law in order to uphold legal certainty, justice, and legal utility. In Decision of the Bangkalan Religious Court Number 679/Pdt.G/2025/PA.Bkl, the Panel of Judges concluded that the Petitioner had not demonstrated a genuine intention to pursue the case because the Petitioner failed to appear before the court despite having been duly and properly summoned. However, the operative part of the judgment declared the case cancelled and instructed the Court Registrar to remove it from the court register. This inconsistency raises legal issues concerning the correctness of the judicial decision and the regulation governing case cancellation under Indonesian civil procedural law. This study aims to analyze the correctness of the judicial decision in light of the applicable Indonesian civil procedural law and to examine the legal framework governing case cancellation in Decision of the Bangkalan Religious Court Number 679/Pdt.G/2025/PA.Bkl.

This study employs normative legal research using the statutory, conceptual, and case approaches. Legal materials were collected through library research on the Herziene Indonesisch Reglement (HIR), the Rechtsreglement voor de Buitengewesten (RBg), the Religious Courts Law, Book II of the Guidelines for the Implementation of Judicial Duties and Court Administration, Book II of the Technical Guidelines for the Administration and Procedure of General and Special Civil Courts, judicial decisions, and legal doctrines. An interview with the Presiding Judge of the Panel was conducted as supporting data to strengthen the normative analysis.

The findings indicate that the judicial decision was inconsistent with Indonesian civil procedural law because the legal reasoning supported a declaration that the case should be dismissed (gugur) pursuant to the HIR and RBg. Had the proceedings continued, both the trial and the judgment should have been conducted through adversarial proceedings (contradictoir). Nevertheless, the operative part of the judgment instead ordered the cancellation of the case, which constitutes an administrative mechanism arising from the petitioner's failure to fulfill the obligation to pay the additional court fee deposit. The study further finds that the regulation governing case cancellation is not expressly provided in either the HIR or the RBg but instead derives from the Religious Courts Law and is further elaborated in Book II of the Supreme Court Guidelines as an administrative guideline for court case management.

Keywords: *Legal Reasoning, Operative Part of the Judgment, Case Cancellation, Civil Procedural Law, Ratio Decidendi.*