

# The Role of Court Excellence in Facilitating Expedited Trials to Enhance Legal Efficiency in Indonesia

Edward T.H. Simarmata<sup>1\*</sup>, Tubagus Achmad Darodjat<sup>2</sup>

Doctoral Program in Law, Pancasila University, Indonesia<sup>1</sup>, Rajamangala University of Technology Krungthep, Thailand<sup>2</sup>

\*Corresponding author: [edwardsimarmata.es5@gmail.com](mailto:edwardsimarmata.es5@gmail.com)

## Abstract

This scholarly article investigates the implementation of court excellence frameworks as a mechanism for expediting trials, thereby improving legal efficiency within Indonesia's judicial landscape. The Indonesian justice system confronts considerable challenges in delivering timely justice, largely attributed to case backlogs and procedural inefficiencies. Court excellence principles are examined here as a strategic approach to streamline judicial processes, boost institutional efficiency, and accelerate case resolutions. Through an analysis of Indonesia's legal structures and current practices, this paper underscores the critical role of court excellence principles in fostering a justice system that is both equitable and efficient. Key insights and strategic recommendations are provided to support the effective implementation of expedited trials, ultimately promoting legal expediency in Indonesia.

**Keywords:** expedited trial, court excellence, judicial efficiency.

## Introduction

At the 4th International Conference on Multidisciplinary Challenges on Sustainability and Advanced Social Intelligence 2024, the primary focus is on addressing sustainability challenges and advancing social intelligence across diverse domains. In this context, my paper, titled "The Role of Court Excellence in Facilitating Expedited Trials to Enhance Legal Efficiency in Indonesia," aligns with the conference themes by integrating sustainability principles and social intelligence into judicial innovation. Court excellence not only drives legal efficiency but also fosters social sustainability by enhancing public trust, accessibility, and the quality of court services. Through streamlined procedures and the prioritization of expedited trials, this principle contributes to a responsive and sustainable judicial system—an approach that resonates deeply with the era's emphasis on social intelligence and resource efficiency.

In modern governance, the administration of justice represents a foundational pillar essential to sustaining democratic integrity and social equity. The concept of court excellence—defined by fair, prompt, and unbiased adjudication—remains pivotal to bolstering public confidence in judicial institutions. However, numerous judicial systems grapple with efficiency-related impediments, which undermine their capacity to dispense justice effectively. Case



backlogs, prolonged litigation timelines, and delayed case management diminish the judiciary's ability to meet societal expectations for accessible and prompt legal resolutions.

The prominence of court excellence has intensified amidst these persistent systemic inefficiencies, reflecting society's increasing demand for a legal system that not only safeguards individual rights but also administers justice expediently. Within this framework, the constitutional guarantee of a "speedy trial" stands as a fundamental safeguard, ensuring not only the individual's right to timely justice but also supporting the judiciary's overarching efficiency. By promoting timely case resolution, the principle of a speedy trial addresses both the personal need for swift justice and the broader public interest in an efficient and trustworthy legal process.

This article delves into the intricate interplay between court excellence, judicial performance, and the strategic implementation of expedited trials as a remedy to systemic challenges. By examining current judicial performance metrics and evaluating the impact of procedural delays on various stakeholders, this study emphasizes the urgent need for reform and innovation within the justice system. In doing so, it outlines a structured framework highlighting the pivotal role of expedited trials as a core component of court excellence within Indonesia's complex legal environment.

## Method

This study employs a normative legal research methodology, drawing from both primary and secondary legal sources to assess the relationship between court excellence, the expeditious trial process, and overall judicial efficiency. The methodological approach is structured as follows:

### Literature Review

A comprehensive examination of relevant legal literature was conducted to identify fundamental themes related to court excellence and expedited trials. This review encompasses academic journal articles, legal treatises, and official publications from jurisdictions recognized for their effective judicial frameworks.

Court Excellence serves as an aspirational benchmark, promoting universal access to justice,<sup>1</sup> and strengthening judicial systems essential for fostering foreign investment and ensuring an equitable, competitive market environment. Efficient and transparent judicial practices not only reinforce public trust but also create a rule-based, predictable legal environment that instills confidence among investors and citizens alike.

An Expeditious Trial, grounded in universally accepted legal principles, seeks to resolve complex and protracted procedural issues.<sup>2</sup> Dory Reiling identifies three primary challenges frequently encountered by courts: procedural delays, barriers to access, and technological integrity.

<sup>1</sup> UNDP, *Judicial Integrity Champions*, Jakarta: UNDP, 2019, p. 11

<sup>2</sup> Heri Hartanto, etc, *The Implementation of Simple, Expeditious, and Inexpensive Principle for Quality Private Court Decision Through E-Court*, ICEEP 2021 Proceedings, 2021, p. 22



Focusing on court excellence and expedited trials, Brian Ostrom emphasizes the need for judicial leadership to strive for excellence in court administration to sustain justice and public confidence.<sup>3</sup> These principles are enshrined in the International Framework for Court Excellence, embodying values such as Equality, Fairness, Impartiality, Competency, Integrity, Transparency, Accessibility, Timeliness, and Certainty.<sup>4</sup>

The principle of a Speedy Trial encapsulates the balance between the procedural and substantive aspects of justice, maintaining that trials proceed expeditiously without sacrificing fundamental fairness or imposing undue costs on any parties involved.<sup>5</sup> A judiciary committed to delivering swift justice must be supported by adequate facilities and resources to enable timely and fair resolutions.<sup>6</sup>

Judicial Efficiency is defined as the optimal duration of case processing and resolution, specifically emphasizing effective case management and resource allocation to advance justice for litigants and uphold judicial integrity.<sup>7</sup>

### Case Studies

Detailed case studies from jurisdictions that have successfully adopted reforms to expedite trial processes were analyzed. These cases provide concrete examples of effective strategies to enhance judicial efficiency.

One notable case examined is *Betterman v. Montana*,<sup>8</sup> which underscores the importance of the speedy trial principle in ensuring a prompt and fair adjudication process for criminal matters. However, the case also delineates that a swift trial mandate does not extend to sentencing, which could otherwise compromise judicial independence.

Another pertinent case is *Bloate v. United States*,<sup>9</sup> illustrating that while the speedy trial principle prioritizes trial efficiency, it does not justify any compromises on human rights, including the improper inclusion of pre-trial detention in the main trial timeline.

### Data Analysis

Findings from the literature and case study analyses were synthesized to propose solutions to enhance judicial efficiency.

<sup>3</sup> Brian Ostrom, *Achieving High Performance: A Framework for Courts*, Virginia: National Center for State Courts, 2010, p. iv

<sup>4</sup> Ibid. p.6

<sup>5</sup> Brian Ostrom and Roger A. Hanson, *Efficiency, Timeliness, and Quality: A New Perspective from Nine State Criminal Trial Courts*, Nevada: U.S. Department of Justice, 2000, p. 3

<sup>6</sup> The World Bank, *Reducing Court Delays: Five lessons from the United States*, Geneva: Prem Notes 1999, 1999, p. 7

<sup>7</sup> Teresa Dalton and Jordan M. Singer, *Bigger isn't always better: An analysis of Court Efficiency Using Hierarchical Linear Modeling*, Pace Law Review Vol. 34 No. 3, 2014, p. 1170

<sup>8</sup> *Betterman v. Montana*, 136 S. Ct. 1609 (2016)

<sup>9</sup> *Bloate v. United States*, 559 US 196 (2010)



## Results and Discussion

The findings of this study underscore the critical importance of integrating Court Excellence principles, Speedy Trial frameworks, and Judicial Efficiency measures to uphold fundamental legal imperatives, particularly legal expediency. Effective court administration—marked by timely case resolution, backlog reduction, cost efficiency, equitable access, preservation of public confidence, document integrity, protection of rights, and promotion of fairness—emerges as a key factor in fulfilling justice.

The study reveals that Court Excellence is instrumental in guaranteeing access to justice, timely proceedings, high-quality judicial services, transparency, accountability, and optimal resource management, all while adhering to the rule of law. Consequently, achieving judicial efficiency through expedited trials is viable when such trials are conducted within a framework grounded in court excellence values.<sup>10</sup>

These results suggest that the expedited trial process, aligned with the principles of Court Excellence, can significantly enhance court efficiency by providing effective justice for litigants and improving overall system performance.

Following the study's findings, two core issues are addressed: measuring judicial efficiency and utilizing expedited trials within the framework of Court Excellence to resolve efficiency challenges.

## Measuring Judicial Efficiency

Judicial efficiency is paramount in maintaining procedural timeliness, reducing costs, managing cases effectively, strengthening public confidence, and allocating judicial resources judiciously. Measuring court efficiency provides essential insights into the performance of the judicial system. This can be achieved through various metrics, including calculating the case clearance rate, time to disposition, the extent of case backlogs, frequency of trial and hearing dates, cost-effectiveness, satisfaction levels among court users, productivity of judiciary personnel, and adherence to established standards.

For instance, the case clearance rate—a metric calculated by dividing the total number of resolved cases by the number of new cases filed, then multiplying by 100—serves as an indicator of a court's ability to manage its caseload. Through these evaluative measures, courts can identify strengths, address areas of weakness, and improve their pursuit of justice.

## Implementing Expedited Trials Based on Court Excellence to Address Efficiency Issues

An expedited trial process is a strategic solution to judicial inefficiency, ensuring prompt and appropriate handling of cases to uphold justice. Timely progression through trial stages and

<sup>10</sup> Antonio Peyrache, Angelo Zago, *The Inefficiency of Courts of Justice: Industry Structure, Capacity, and Misallocation*, Journal Of Productivity Analysis Vol. 62 pp.217-238 (2024)



the issuance of legal judgments facilitate a justice system that meets the needs of litigants effectively.

As previously outlined, the International Framework for Court Excellence identifies seven domains critical to court excellence: judicial leadership, workforce capacity, infrastructure, user engagement, accessibility of services, and public trust in the judiciary. Within this structure, the leadership and capacity of the judicial workforce play a pivotal role in enabling expedited trials, promoting the values of accessibility and fairness.

Expedited trials anchored in Court Excellence require structured timelines across various stages of litigation, including:

- a) Case Registration
- b) Initial Trial
- c) Formal Response
- d) Injunctions
- e) Evidence Presentation
- f) Closing Arguments
- g) Judgement Issuance

Such structured timeframes may vary between courts due to differing resource capabilities.<sup>11</sup> Nevertheless, maintaining this systematic approach ensures that time-efficient processes are achieved, aligning with the justice seekers' needs and enhancing overall judicial efficiency.

## Conclusion

This study reinforces the necessity of integrating Court Excellence principles within the Indonesian judicial system to ensure timely and efficient administration of justice. The principle of expedited trials, when executed within a structured framework that prioritizes transparency, accountability, and accessibility, can significantly enhance the efficiency of judicial processes. By fostering a court system that aligns with the values of Court Excellence, Indonesia's judiciary can address longstanding challenges such as case backlogs and procedural delays, thus upholding both the rights of litigants and public trust in the legal system.

The successful implementation of expedited trials relies on a judiciary committed to resource optimization, staff training, and adherence to standards that enhance case management and reduce procedural inefficiencies. Moving forward, adopting the International Framework for Court Excellence as a guideline can provide Indonesian courts with a robust foundation for achieving timely justice while safeguarding fairness and judicial independence. The recommendations and insights derived from this study serve as essential steps towards cultivating a more responsive and effective judiciary, thereby contributing to the broader goal of equitable and reliable access to justice in Indonesia.

---

<sup>11</sup> American Bar Association, *Speedy Trial and Timely Resolution of Criminal Cases*, Washington: American Bar Association, 2006, P. 68



## References

- American Bar Association. (2006). *Speedy Trial and Timely Resolution of Criminal Cases*. Washington, DC: American Bar Association.
- Betterman v. Montana, 136 S. Ct. 1609 (2016).
- Bloate v. United States, 559 U.S. 196 (2010).
- Dalton, T., & Singer, J. M. (2014). Bigger isn't always better: An analysis of court efficiency using hierarchical linear modeling. *Pace Law Review*, 34(3), 1170.
- Hartanto, H., et al. (2021). The implementation of simple, expeditious, and inexpensive principle for quality private court decision through e-court. *ICEEP 2021 Proceedings*, 22.
- Ostrom, B. (2010). *Achieving High Performance: A Framework for Courts*. Virginia: National Center for State Courts.
- Ostrom, B., & Hanson, R. A. (2000). *Efficiency, Timeliness, and Quality: A New Perspective from Nine State Criminal Trial Courts*. Nevada: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Peyrache, A., & Zago, A. (2024). The inefficiency of courts of justice: Industry structure, capacity, and misallocation. *Journal of Productivity Analysis*, 62, 217-238.
- The World Bank. (1999). *Reducing Court Delays: Five Lessons from the United States*. Geneva: Prem Notes 1999.
- UNDP. (2019). *Judicial Integrity Champions*. Jakarta: UNDP.

