



**CONSTITUTIONAL COURT  
OF THE REPUBLIC OF INDONESIA**

**SUMMARY OF DECISION  
FOR CASE NUMBER 42/PUU-XXI/2023**

**Concerning**

**The Validity Period of Driving License is 5 (Five) Years and  
May Be Extended**

<b>Petitioner</b>	: Arifin Purwanto
<b>Type of Case</b>	: Judicial Review of Law Number 22 of 2009 concerning Road Traffic and Transportation (Law 22/2009) against the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia (1945 Constitution)
<b>Subject Matter</b>	: Judicial Review of Article 85 paragraph (2) of Law 22/2009 against Article 1 paragraph (3), Article 27 paragraph (1), Article 28D paragraph (1) and Article 28I paragraph (2) of the 1945 Constitution
<b>Verdict</b>	: To dismiss the Petitioner's petition in its entirety
<b>Date of Decision</b>	: Thursday, 14 September 2023
<b>Overview of Decision</b>	:

Whereas the Petitioner is an Indonesian citizen as proven by a Resident Identity Card (*Kartu Tanda Penduduk* or KTP) which is valid for life, who believes that he is harmed by the provisions regarding the validity period of Driving License (*Surat Izin Mengemudi* or SIM). According to the Petitioner, the norm of Article 85 paragraph (2) of Law 22/2009 is contrary to Article 1 paragraph (3) of the 1945 Constitution because the validity period of SIM is 5 (five) years and subsequently must be renewed, the legal basis and benchmarks for the matter are unclear. Therefore, the Petitioner suffered losses due to the enactment of the norms of Article 85 paragraph (2) of Law 22/2009, because the Petitioner had to spend money/expenses, energy, time and also felt stressed in order to extend the validity period of the SIM after it expired (after 5 years of issuance). This should not happen if the SIM is valid for life like KTP.

Whereas the Petitioner petitions for a review of the constitutionality of statutory norms, *in casu* Law 22/2009 against the 1945 Constitution, therefore the Court has the authority to hear the *a quo* petition.

Regarding the legal standing of the Petitioner, pursuant to the descriptions of the Petitioner in explaining his legal standing, the Court is of the opinion that the Petitioner has been able to specifically explain the constitutional rights which he believes are being impaired due to the enactment of the norm being petitioned for review, namely the principle of the rule of law; the right to equal treatment before the law and in the government; the right to fair legal recognition, guarantees, protection and certainty as well as equal treatment before the law; the right to be free from discriminatory treatment on any basis and the right to receive protection against discriminatory treatment as guaranteed in the 1945 Constitution. Therefore, it appears that there is a logical connection and causal relationship between the presumed loss of the Petitioner's constitutional rights and the enactment of the norms of the article being petitioned for review, specifically due to the difficulty in completing the process of obtaining an renewal for the SIM since its validity period is not for life, unlike the KTP. Therefore, regardless of whether the unconstitutionality of the norms of Article 85 paragraph (2) of Law 22/2009 is proven or not, the Court is of the opinion that the Petitioner has the legal standing to submit the *a quo* petition;

Whereas before considering this issue any further, first, the Court needs to state the following: Road traffic and transportation is part of the national transportation system whose potential and role

must be developed in order to realize the security, safety, order and effectiveness of road traffic and transportation. In this context, Law 22/2009 requires every person who drives any motorized vehicle on the road to have a driving license according to the type of motorized vehicle he/she drives. The testing and issuance of driving license is part of the registration and identification of motorized vehicles and drivers, law enforcement, operational management and traffic engineering, and traffic education organized by the National Police of the Republic of Indonesia.

Regarding the aforementioned registration and identification of motorized vehicles and drivers, the SIM has several functions, including to determine driving competency, it also functions as a motorized vehicle driver registration which contains complete driver identity information, and as a data source on driver registration that may be used to support police preliminary investigation, investigation and forensic identification activities. Regarding these functions, the SIM has a validity period of 5 (five) years which subsequently may be renewed, because in issuing a SIM there is an element of driving competency, where people must meet administrative requirements, must fulfil the age, physical and mental health requirements and must passed the testing process. In this regard, in addition to the police being given the authority to issue SIM, they are also given the authority to provide marks or data on the driver's SIM if the driver commits any traffic crime. This authority includes the temporarily detaining or temporarily revoking a SIM before being decided by the court.

By tracing the history of the regulations for issuing SIM, such regulations have started since the existence of *Wegverkeersordonnantie*, *Staatsblad* 1933 No. 86, which then amended several times by the enactment of Law Number 7 of 1951 concerning Amendments and Supplements to the Road Traffic Law (Law 7/1951), Law Number 3 of 1965 concerning Road Traffic and Transportation (Law 3 /1965), and Law Number 14 of 1992 concerning Road Traffic and Transportation (Law 14/1992) where each of these laws stipulates that every motorized vehicle driver is required to have a driving license.

Whereas after careful reading and observation, the Court found that the regulation regarding the validity period of a SIM is not stated explicitly in the aforementioned laws. The period of validity of SIM is further regulated in government regulations, one of which is stated in Article 214 of Government Regulation Number 44 of 1993 concerning Vehicles and Drivers (PP 44/1993), which states, "Driving license as intended in Article 211 and Article 212 shall be valid for 5 (five) years and may be renewed." This means that Law 22/2009 is the first law to explicitly determine the validity period of SIM, *in casu* Article 85 paragraph (2) of Law 22/2009. Further regulations regarding the validity period of SIM are determined in the Regulation of the Chief of the National Police of the Republic of Indonesia, namely in the Regulation of the Chief of the National Police of the Republic of Indonesia (*Peraturan Kepala Kepolisian Negara Republik Indonesia* or *Perkapolri*) Number 9 of 2012 concerning Driving Licenses (*Perkapolri* 9/2012), which was later amended by *Perkapolri* Number 5 of 2021 concerning the Issuance and Marking of Driving Licenses (*Perkapolri* 5/2021) which was then re-amended by *Perkapolri* Number 2 of 2023 concerning Amendments to the Regulation of the Chief of the National Police of the Republic of Indonesia Number 5 of 2021 concerning the Issuance and Marking of Driving Licenses (*Perkapolri* 2/2023 ). Without the Court intending to review the legality of the *Perkapolri* (Regulation of the Chief of the National Police of the Republic of Indonesia), the regulation of a driving license validity period of 5 (five) years has been taken into account in order to ensure a person's fitness to drive which includes aspects of physical health and mental health for the sake of traffic safety. Therefore, if a SIM is valid for life without continuous examination of a person's fitness to drive a motorized vehicle, such conduct will increase the risks of safety on the road. Such risks do not only threaten the motor vehicle drivers but also other people on the road.

Meanwhile, the validity period of driving license is also different in each country, for example in France as one of the countries cited by the Petitioner also does not apply a lifetime validity period for driving license because driving license, called *Permis de Conduire* in France, is divided into several types, namely: *Permis A* intended for motorcycle drivers, which consists of several categories, namely: (a) *Permis AM* (for drivers who are at least 16 years old and are used to riding small motorcycle with pedals); (b) *Permis A1* (for motorcycle drivers who have an engine capacity of 120cc-125cc); (c) *Permis B1* (for four-wheeled light vehicle drivers); and D) *Permit A2* (for motorcycle drivers who are at least 18 years old). Whereas, *Permis B* is intended for car drivers with a maximum weight of 3500 kg and a maximum of 8 passengers. *Permis BE* is intended for car drivers with a maximum weight of 3500 kg and a trailer with a maximum weight of 3500 kg. These driving licenses are only intended for drivers who are at least 18 years old. Meanwhile *Permis C* and *Permis D* are intended for drivers of medium and large sized cars, meanwhile *Permis D* is intended for small bus and bus drivers. The validity period of driving licenses in France are 15 (fifteen) years and there are certain processes and requirements to fulfil in order to be able to renew such licenses. Meanwhile, a driver who is 70 years old is not required to renew his/her *permit de conduire*.

Next, the Court will answer the Petitioner's argument which questions the constitutionality of the validity period of driving license in Article 85 paragraph (2) of Law 22/2009 because, according to the Petitioner, this norm violates the principle of the rule of law as guaranteed by Article 1 paragraph (3) of the 1945 Constitution, the principle of equal treatment before the law and in the government as guaranteed by Article 27 paragraph (1) of the 1945 Constitution, fair legal certainty as guaranteed by Article 28D paragraph (1) of the 1945 Constitution since there are different treatments for some people in receiving SIM, therefore this violates the principle of protection from discriminatory treatment as guaranteed by Article 28I paragraph (2) of the 1945 Constitution. Whereas related to the Petitioner's argument which questions the existence of a violation of equal treatment before the law and in the government due to the validity period of a SIM being 5 (five) years and may be extended. The Court is of the opinion that the regulations regarding the validity period of SIM has been regulated in statutory regulations, *in casu* Law 22/2009, and since the provisions are stated in the law, they shall automatically apply to all Indonesian citizens, without any exceptions. Therefore, as long as these provisions are applied equally to all citizens, there will be no violation of constitutional rights as argued by the Petitioner. A similar interpretation also applies in understanding and applying what is meant in the norms of Article 28D paragraph (1) and Article 28I paragraph (2) of the 1945 Constitution. The Court is of the opinion that the enactment of a certain validity period of SIM does not violate the fair legal recognition, guarantees, protection and certainty and equal treatment before the law and does not give rise to discriminatory treatment. Moreover, regarding the discriminatory treatment as argued by the Petitioner, it is important for the Court to reaffirm its decisions related to discrimination which have been limited by the Court, including in the Constitutional Court Decision Number 024/PUU-III/2005 which was declared in a plenary session open to the public on 29 March 2006, which was also cited in several decisions, among others, in the Constitutional Court Decision Number 97/PUU-XIV/2016 which was declared in a plenary session open to the public on 7 November 2017, it was stated that "Discrimination occurs when there are any direct or indirect limitation, harassment or exclusion on the grounds of religion, custom, race, ethnicity, group, class, social status, economic status, gender, language, political beliefs, which result in the reduction, deviation or elimination of recognition, implementation or use of human rights and fundamental freedoms in life both individually and collectively in the political, economic, legal, social, cultural and other aspects of life [*vide* Article 1 point 3 of Law Number 39 of 1999 concerning Human Rights]...". Regarding the aforementioned citation of the Decision, the Petitioner's argument which states that there is different treatment for some people in receiving SIM, the Court is of the opinion that this is a problem at the implementation level, not a violation of norms that will cause loss of constitutional rights. Therefore, as long as these norms do not conflict with the 1945 Constitution, there is no constitutional reason for the Court to annul or re-interpret the norms of Article 85 paragraph (2) of Law 22/2009 as stated in the Petitioner's *petitum*.

Whereas regarding the Petitioner's argument that SIM should be valid for a lifetime, like KTP, it is important for the Court to first refer to the provisions of Article 1 number 14 of Law Number 23 of 2006 concerning Population Administration (Law 23/2006), KTP is an official identity which functions as a proof of residency issued by the Authorities which is valid throughout the territory of the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia. However, in order to improve the population administration services in line with the demands for professional population administration services, to meet the standards, dynamic, orderly and non-discriminatory information technology standards in achieving minimum service standards towards comprehensive excellent service to overcome population problems, several adjustments or amendments have been made to the provisions in Law 23/2006 by enacting Law Number 24 of 2013 concerning Amendments to Law Number 23 of 2006 concerning Population Administration (Law 24/2013). One of the amendments is regarding the meaning of KTP, since the public uses an electronic KTP (e-KTP), namely an Identity Card equipped with chip which shall function as an official identity, as a proof of residency, issued by the Authorities. The use of e-KTP which is currently being implemented is part of the efforts to accelerate and support the accuracy of building population databases in districts/municipal, provincial and national levels. The implementation of E-KTP prevents the possibility of each resident having more than one e-KTP and/or have fake e-KTP, because e-KTP already contains a security code and electronic recording of resident data, which includes, among other things, iris recognition and fingerprints of the resident. The change in the type of KTP makes the validity period for such KTP to change, E-KTP is valid for a lifetime, except for foreigners whose validity period shall be adjusted to the validity period of the Permanent Resident Permit.

Whereas furthermore, e-KTP is a form of population document that must be owned by the public, the requirements to have e-KTP are Indonesian citizens who are 17 (seventeen) years old or have been married or have ever been married and a foreigner who has a permanent residence permit. For children under 17 (seventeen) years of age, instead of e-KTP, a Minor Identity Card (*Kartu Identitas Anak*) is used as proof of identity, the issuance of which is regulated in the Regulation of the Minister of Home Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia Number 2 of 2016 concerning Minor Identity Cards.

Whereas the e-KTP contains population data, namely NIK (*Nomor Induk Kependudukan* or Resident Identity Number), name, place, date of birth, male or female, religion, marital status, blood type, address, occupation, nationality, passport photo, validity period, place and date of issuance of the e-KTP, and signature of the owner of the e-KTP. In the event of any changes to the e-KTP, which is valid for life, for example, it e-KTP is damaged or lost, then the relevant person shall be required to report it so that such change or replacement can be made in accordance with the provisions as regulated in Article 64 paragraph (9) of Law 24/2013, namely " "In the event that the e-KTP is damaged or lost, the person who owns the e-KTP shall be required to report it to the Authorities through the sub-district head or village head no later than 14 (fourteen) days and complete a statement which describes the cause of the damage or loss."

Whereas furthermore regarding the Petitioner's argument which request to amend the validity period of the SIM, so that it would be the same as that of the KTP (e-KTP), the Court is of the opinion that SIM and KTP have different functions. SIM is a form of document in the form of an electronic card or other form that must be owned only by anyone who wishes to drive motorized vehicles. To obtain it, the prospective driver must have the competency of driving in accordance with the type of SIM he/she applies for, and he/she must meet the specified requirements such as age, health and she/he must pass the practical and written driving exams. All of these requirements are regulated in Article 81 paragraph (2), paragraph (3), paragraph (4) and paragraph (5) of Law 22/2009.

In addition, it has also been determined in Article 86 paragraph (2) and paragraph (3) of Law 22/2009, that the SIM functions as a registration for motor vehicle driver which contains complete identity information of the driver and data of the driver's registration which can be used to support preliminary investigation, investigation, and police forensic identification activities. Meanwhile, e-KTP functions as population identity in accordance with statutory provisions.

Pursuant to the aforementioned descriptions, the Court is of the opinion that even though e-KTP and SIM are both documents containing identity, their functions are different. In this case, e-KTP is a population document whose ownership is mandatory for all Indonesian citizens, meanwhile a SIM is a permit document to drive motorized vehicle, and not all Indonesian citizens are required to have it, instead only a person who wishes to drive motorized vehicle is required to own it and such person must fulfil the requirements for the issuance of a driving license in accordance with the laws and regulations. Due to these differences, it is possible to have a lifetime validity period of e-KTP because using the e-KTP does not require an evaluation of the competence of the e-KTP owner, if there is any change in data, or if E-KTP is lost or damaged, the e-KTP owner is required to report it and renew or replace the e-KTP. This is different from a SIM, the function of a SIM is greatly influenced by a person's condition and competence as it is closely related to traffic safety, therefore an evaluation process is required prior to the issuance of SIM. Because these two documents have different functions and uses, it is impossible to equate things that are different, including the time period for which they are valid.

Meanwhile, in relation to the 5-year validity period of a driving license, it has been determined by the legislators because there is a need to evaluate and supervise the physical and mental health conditions and the competency or skills of the driver by taking into account the socio-cultural conditions of the community. Therefore, so far the 5 (five) year validity period is considered reasonable to evaluate the changes that may occur to the holders of SIM. Within the limits of reasonable reasoning, the possibility of changes in the physical and mental health condition of the SIM holder may affect the competency or skills of the relevant person in driving a motorized vehicle. These changes can occur in form of vision, hearing, motor functions, cognitive abilities, psychomotor skills, and/or personality of the SIM holder, all of which will have an impact on the driver's ability to drive a motorized vehicle on the road in accordance with the type of SIM he/she has. Moreover, within a period of 5 (five) years there is also the possibility of changes to the SIM holder's identity such as name, face, address and even fingerprints. This is in line with the conditions of modern society, which are characterized by high levels of social and geographic mobility therefore it is possible to have such changes in several aspects of identity. The renewal of a SIM within a period of 5 years is very functional for updating SIM holder data which is useful in supporting the interests of law enforcement officials in tracing the whereabouts of SIM holders and their families in the event of traffic accident or if the driver is involved in a traffic crime or crime in general. In addition, it is important to carry out an evaluation during the SIM renewal period because the examination of physical and mental health conditions every 5 (five) years contains a social value which conveyed that the safety of the holder of SIM and other people on the road must be respected and maintained. This is an aspect that differentiates between KTP, which is valid for a lifetime, and SIM. Therefore, the Court is of the opinion that the Petitioner's argument that a SIM should be valid for a lifetime, like a KTP, is legally unjustifiable.

Whereas related to evaluation in the process of issuing and renewing the validity period of SIM, in principle it cannot be separated from efforts to measure the level of competency, ability and health of the SIM holder in line with the function of the SIM as proof of competency. Therefore, the provisions of Article 85 paragraph (2) of Law 22/2009 which the Petitioner argues use the phrase "may be renewed", which in full states, "SIM shall be valid for 5 (five) years and may be renewed", when referring to Law Number 12 2011 concerning the Formation of Legislative Regulations, as last amended by Law Number 13 of 2022 (Law 12/2011), the meaning of the word "may" is to express the discretionary nature of an authority given to a person or institution. Therefore, the word "may" in the *a quo* provision is one of the mechanisms carried out by the National Police of the Republic of Indonesia to determine the development of a driver's competency which may decrease both in terms of physical and mental health, therefore it needs to be evaluated in accordance with its discretionary authority whether a SIM may be renewed or not.

Whereas the evaluation mechanism in the process of renewing the SIM validity period is also an effort to build a culture of orderly traffic so that it can prevent traffic accidents which can be seen from two aspects, namely the individual aspect and the age aspect. In relation to the individual aspect, it is recorded that between 71 percent and 79 percent of the perpetrators are motor vehicle drivers who do not have driving license and, in relation to the age aspect, it is recorded that the majority of perpetrators are in the age range of 22-29 years or equal to 17-20 percent of the total perpetrators of accident. Therefore, the competency evaluation in the renewal of SIM is necessary because it is one of the factors in reducing the accident fatality rate by ensuring that the SIM holder still has the competence and health to drive a motorized vehicle through the issuance process including the renewal of SIM . The effective evaluation of SIM holders will be able to prevent accidents and reduce the fatality rate of accident victims.

In connection to this, it can be understood that traffic accidents that cause fatalities and material losses are caused by many factors, the first factor and the most dominant, namely 61 percent of the total accidents, are caused by human factors. For example, tired drivers who insist on driving, drivers who are mentally unstable when facing increasingly dense and congested traffic, drivers who have certain illnesses that impair their concentration, drivers under alcohol and certain drugs influences, and drivers who do not understand traffic rules and etiquette because they do not own driving licenses. The second factor is the availability of infrastructure and the environment, which equals to 30 percent of the total accidents. This is related to the condition of the road and the environment around the road which could be in the form of bumpy or damaged roads, slippery roads, winding roads, slopes or inclines, foggy environments or places where animals cross. The third factor is improper motorized vehicles, which equals to 9 percent of the total accidents. In relation to these factors, it is important for the Court to emphasize that the National Police of the Republic of Indonesia carries out evaluations of SIM holders in accordance with the laws and regulations. In this case, Article 77 of Law 22/2009 requires that each person driving motorized vehicle must own a driving license. Therefore, it is the duty of the National Police of the Republic of Indonesia to be more intensive in educating the public to comply with these regulations, that ownership of a driving license is not only a formality but also it is a proof of fulfilling the competencies and factors that are considered important regarding a person's ability to drive a motorized vehicle. In this regards, it is also important to educate the public not to drive motorized vehicles without driving license, especially for minors who are underage, in order to reduce the risks of traffic accidents.

There are various innovations that have been carried out by the National Police of the Republic of Indonesia in bringing SIM services closer to the citizens, including through online SIM service, mobile SIM services or SIM service outlets, online SIM renewal services by using the SINAR application, theory examination services through the use of electronic applications Audio Visual Integrated System or E-AVIS, online physical and mental health examination services through the e-Rikkas application, practical exam services through the use of the E-Drive application. These innovations must be able to guarantee the validity of the driver's competency or skills and health. However, specifically for officers who provide SIM issuance services, they must also carry out their duties and responsibilities professionally by maintaining integrity and providing optimal service, rather than making the intended evaluation only as a formality and to seek income as has often been complained by some people. In addition, in line with the function of SIM as part of identification and registration, it is important to strengthen the integration of *Dukcapil* (Department of Population and Civil Registration) data which uses NIK as the database of SIM. Including to strengthen the quality of technology-based SIM identification which is able to reveal data on violations or crimes quickly and accurately. Therefore, the financial expense in applying for SIM issuance and renewal which constitutes non-tax state revenue (*penerimaan negara bukan pajak* or PNBP) can be used effectively to improve the quality of SIM issuance in order to reduce traffic accident fatalities. This is actually a part of the legal objectives, including the objective of establishing Law 22/2009 as a means of engineering society towards a better

life, especially in terms of traffic.

Whereas pursuant to the description of the legal considerations above, the norms of Article 85 paragraph (2) of Law 22/2009 have been proven to be not violating the principles of the rule of law, the right to equal treatment before the law and in the government, the right to fair legal recognition, guarantees, protection and certainty and equal treatment before the law, the right to be free from discriminatory treatment on any grounds and the right to receive protection against discriminatory treatment as guaranteed in the 1945 Constitution. Therefore, the Petitioner's argument is entirely legally unjustifiable.

Pursuant to the considerations above, the Court then handed down a decision whose verdict states to dismiss the Petitioner's petition in its entirety.

### **Concurring Opinion**

Regarding the *a quo* decision of the Constitutional Court, Constitutional Justice Daniel Yusmic P. Foekh has a concurring opinion as follows:

Pursuant to the considerations above, there are 2 (two) things to be noted. *First*, the issuance and renewal of SIM is part of non-tax state revenue (*penerimaan negara bukan pajak* or PNBPN), therefore a five-year validity period of SIM remains to be required. *Second*, giving a lifetime validity period for SIM to the elderly may help them in maintaining their quality of life because they would remain to have high mobility. Moreover, pursuant to the data from the Related Party of the National Police of the Republic of Indonesia, the lowest percentage of accident perpetrators are those who are 60 years old and over. Furthermore, regarding at what age should the exception apply, I consider the following.

Whereas to answer this question, it is important to pay attention to the retirement age limit for workers/laborers. By looking closely, Law Number 13 of 2003 concerning Manpower (Law 13/2003) does not regulate the exact retirement age limit. Article 154 letter c of Law 13/2003 states, "Workers/laborers shall reach retirement age in accordance with the provisions in the work agreement, company regulations, collective work agreement, or statutory regulations." However, without intending to review its legality, the retirement age limit has been regulated in Article 15 of Government Regulation Number 45 of 2015 concerning the Implementation of the Pension Guarantee Program (PP 45/2015), such regulations determine the retirement age limit for workers, as follows:

#### **Article 15 of Government Regulation Number 45 of 2015**

- (1) At first, the Retirement Age was set at 56 (fifty-six) years of age.
- (2) Starting from 1 January 2019, the Retirement Age as referred to in paragraph (1) was amended to be 57 (fifty-seven) years of age.
- (3) The Retirement Age as referred to in paragraph (2) was then increased by 1 (one) year for every 3 (three) consecutive years until finally, the Retirement Age is set at 65 (sixty-five) years of age.
- (4) In the event that the Participant has reached the Retirement Age but such person is still employed, the Participant may choose to receive Pension Benefits when they reach the Retirement Age or when they stop working, provided that it is no later than 3 (three) years after the Retirement Age.

By referring to PP 45/2015, it is acknowledged that the retirement age limit for workers/laborers is 65 years. This age limit is in line with the age limit for state civil apparatus (*aparatur sipil negara* or ASN) as referred to in Article 90 of Law Number 5 of 2014 concerning State Civil Apparatus (State Civil Apparatus Law), "Retirement age limit as intended in Article 87 paragraph (1) letter c, namely: a. 58 (fifty-eight) years for Administrative Officers; b. 60 (sixty) years for Senior Leadership Officers; c. in accordance with the provisions of statutory regulations for Functional Officials."

Whereas in relation to functional positions, without intending to review its legality, pursuant to Article 239 of Government Regulation Number 11 of 2017 concerning Management of Civil Servants (PP 11/2017), the State Civil Apparatus retirement age limit is: 58 (fifty-eight) years for administrative officials, junior expert functional officials, first rank expert functional officials, and skilled functional officials; 60 (sixty) years for high management officials and middle functional officials; and 65 (sixty-five) years for civil apparatus in the position of key expert functional officer;

In accordance with the retirement age limit, both workers/laborers and state civil apparatus will generally retire at a maximum age of 65 years. Providing dispensations to certain age groups will not reduce non-tax state revenues (*penerimaan negara bukan pajak* or PNBPN) because the amount is limited, while also not burdening the elderly to renew their driving licenses.

Whereas pursuant to the entire description of the legal considerations above, I am of the same opinion as the majority of constitutional justices that the Petitioner's petition is legally unjustifiable, but in the future the legislators need to consider the existence of an affirmative action for the elderly group to be given a lifetime validity period of driving license (SIM).