ANALISIS YURIDIS FREIES ERMESSEN SEBAGAI DASAR KEABSAHAN KEPUTUSAN PEJABAT PEMBINA KEPEGAWAIAN TENTANG DEMOSI (STUDI PUTUSAN NOMOR: 088/G/2014/PTUN.SMG) JURIDIC ANALYSIST ABOUT FREIES ERMESSEN AS DECISION LEGALITY FUNDAMENTAL BY EMPLOYMENT SUPERVISORY OFFICER ABOUT DEMOTION (SEMARANG STATE ADMINISTRATIVE COURT CASE STUDY NUMBER: 088/G/2014/PTUN.SMG)

Accreditation This research is sourced from the Semarang State Administrative Court Case Study Number: 088 / G / 2014 / PTUN.SMG, which will elaborate on how the Employment Supervisory Officer authority uses discretionary power in determining demotion decisions, also how the judges determines legal consideration in determining the cancellation of demotion decree that against the discretionary power principle. Defendant in this case is Magelang Regency Regent with lawsuit object is Magelang Regent Decree Number 821.2/123/KEP/13/2014 at 26 September 2014. The method research used in this study is normative juridict with statute approach, case approach, and conceptual approach. The author uses primary legal materials and secondary legal materials with normative legal inventory and scientific literature studies related to research. The legal materials is processed by qualitative data analysis methods with grammatical interpretation, systematic interpretation, and authentic interpretation. Based on this research, discretionary power, because demotion decree is not in accordance with Legislation Number 30, 2014 that regulate about using discretionary power as decision legality fundamental that use discretionary power, because demotion is rigidly regulated in Government Regulated his authority as employment supervisory officer, the decree is against the rule of discretionary power, and defendant uses improper legal standing in issuing the decree.ÅA Keywords: Discretionary Power, Demotion Decree, State Administrative DecisionLegality Publish Date 2020-07-25 Publish Year 2020 Doi DOI: 10.20884/1.slr.2020.2.2.49 Citation Source Issue Yol 2, No 2 (2020) Source Issue Yol	Title	ANALISIS YURIDIS FREIES ERMESSEN SEBAGAI DASAR KEABSAHAN KEPUTUSAN PEJABAT PEMBINA KEPEGAWAIAN TENTANG DEMOSI (STUDI PUTUSAN NOMOR: 088/G/2014/PTUN.SMG) JURIDIC ANALYSIST ABOUT FREIES ERMESSEN AS DECISION LEGALITY FUNDAMENTAL BY EMPLOYMENT SUPERVISORY OFFICER ABOUT DEMOTION (SEMARANG STATE ADMINISTRATIVE COURT CASE STUDY NUMBER: 088/G/2014/PTUN.SMG)
AbstractThis research is sourced from the Semarang State Administrative Court Case Study Number: 088 / G / 2014 / PTUN.SMG, which will elaborate on how the Employment Supervisory Officer authority uses discretionary power in determining demotion decisions, also how the judges determines legal consideration in determining the cancellation of demotion decree that against the discretionary power principle. Defendant in this case is Magelang Regency Regent with lawsuit object is Magelang Regent Decree Number 821.2/123/KEP/13/2014 at 26 September 2014. The method research used in this study is normative juridict with statute approach, case approach, and conceptual approach. The author uses primary legal materials and secondary legal materials with normative legal inventory and scientific literature studies related to research. The legal materials is processed by qualitative data analysis methods with grammatical interpretation, systematic interpretation, and authentic interpretation. Based on this research, discretionary power principle in demotion decree is not in accordance with Legislation Number 30, 2014 that regulate about using discretionary power as decision legality fundamental that use defendant uses improper legal standing in issuing the decree.Å,Å Keywords: Discretionary power, Demotion Decree, State Administrative DecisionLegalityPublisher Name2020-07-25Publish Year 	Author Order	2 of 3
Abstract088 / G / 2014 / PTUN.SMG, which will elaborate on how the Employment Supervisory Officer authority uses discretionary power in determining demotion decisions, also how the judges determines legal consideration in determining the cancellation of demotion decree that against the discretionary power principle. Defendant in this case is Magelang Regency Regent with lawsuit object is Magelang Regent Decree Number 821.2/123/KEP/13/2014 at 26 September 2014. The method research used in this study is normative juridict with statute approach, case approach, and conceptual approach. The author uses primary legal materials and secondary legal materials with normative legal inventory and scientific literature studies related to research. The legal materials is processed by qualitative data analysis methods with grammatical interpretation, systematic interpretation, and authentic interpretation. Based on this research, discretionary power principle in demotion decree is not in accordance with Legislation Number 30, 2014 that regulate about using discretionary power as decision legality fundamental that use discretionary power, because demotion is rigidly regulated in Government Regulation Number 53, 2010. The Judges decide to cancel the decree because defendant violated his authority as employment supervisory officer, the decree is against the rule of discretionary power, Demotion Decree, State Administrative DecisionLegalityPublisher Name2020-07-25Publish Date Source2020DoiDOI: 10.20884/1.slr.2020.2.2.49CitationSource Issue Vol 2, No 2 (2020)SourceSoedirman Law ReviewSource PageVol 2, No 2 (2020)SourceSoedirman Law ReviewSource PageVol 2, No 2 (2020)Source PageVol 2, No 2 (2020)<	Accreditation	
NameFaculty of Law, Universitas Jenderal SoedirmanPublish Date2020-07-25Publish Year2020DoiDOI: 10.20884/1.slr.2020.2.2.49CitationSoedirman Law ReviewSourceSoedirman Law ReviewSource IssueVol 2, No 2 (2020)Source PageImage: Comparison of the state of the stat	Abstract	088 / G / 2014 / PTUN.SMG, which will elaborate on how the Employment Supervisory Officer authority uses discretionary power in determining demotion decisions, also how the judges determines legal consideration in determining the cancellation of demotion decree that against the discretionary power principle. Defendant in this case is Magelang Regency Regent with lawsuit object is Magelang Regent Decree Number 821.2/123/KEP/13/2014 at 26 September 2014. The method research used in this study is normative juridict with statute approach, case approach, and conceptual approach. The author uses primary legal materials and secondary legal materials with normative legal inventory and scientific literature studies related to research. The legal materials is processed by qualitative data analysis methods with grammatical interpretation, systematic interpretation, and authentic interpretation. Based on this research, discretionary power principle in demotion decree is not in accordance with Legislation Number 30, 2014 that regulate about using discretionary power as decision legality fundamental that use discretionary power, because demotion is rigidly regulated in Government Regulation Number 53, 2010. The Judges decide to cancel the decree because defendant violated his authority as employment supervisory officer, the decree is against the rule of discretionary power, and defendant uses improper legal standing in issuing the decree.Ã, Keywords: Discretionary
Publish Year2020DoiDOI: 10.20884/1.slr.2020.2.2.49CitationSourceSourceSoedirman Law ReviewSource IssueVol 2, No 2 (2020)Source PageUrlhttp://journal.fh.unsoed.ac.id/index.php/SLR/article/view/49/44	Publisher Name	Faculty of Law, Universitas Jenderal Soedirman
DoiDOI: 10.20884/1.slr.2020.2.2.49CitationSourceSourceSoedirman Law ReviewSource IssueVol 2, No 2 (2020)Source PageImage: Comparison of the state	Publish Date	2020-07-25
Citation Source Source Soedirman Law Review Source Issue Vol 2, No 2 (2020) Source Page Image: Comparison of the state of th	Publish Year	2020
Source Soedirman Law Review Source Issue Vol 2, No 2 (2020) Source Page Image: Comparison of the state of th	Doi	DOI: 10.20884/1.slr.2020.2.2.49
Source Issue Vol 2, No 2 (2020) Source Page Url http://journal.fh.unsoed.ac.id/index.php/SLR/article/view/49/44	Citation	
Source Page Url http://journal.fh.unsoed.ac.id/index.php/SLR/article/view/49/44	Source	Soedirman Law Review
Url http://journal.fh.unsoed.ac.id/index.php/SLR/article/view/49/44	Source Issue	Vol 2, No 2 (2020)
··································	Source Page	
Author Dr TEDI SUDRAJAT, S.H., M.H, M.H	Url	http://journal.fh.unsoed.ac.id/index.php/SLR/article/view/49/44
	Author	Dr TEDI SUDRAJAT, S.H., M.H, M.H