



CONSTITUTIONAL COURT
OF THE REPUBLIC OF INDONESIA

SUMMARY OF DECISION
FOR CASE NUMBER 134/PUU-XXII/2024

Concerning

Obligation to Pay Contribution of Public Housing Savings

- Petitioners** : Federasi Kesatuan Serikat Pekerja Nasional represented by Baso Rukman Abdul Jihad as General Chairperson, Lilis Mahmudah as General Secretary, Lilis Mahmudah as General Treasurer, et al.
- Type of Case** : Judicial Review of Law Number 4 of 2016 concerning Public Housing Savings (Law 4/2016) against the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia (1945 Constitution)
- Subject Matter** : Material review of Article 7 paragraph (1) and Article 9 paragraph (1) of Law 4/2016
- Verdict** : To declare that the Petitioners' petition is inadmissible.
- Date of Decision** : Monday, September 29, 2025
- Overview of Decision** :

Whereas the Petitioners are private legal entities and associations, who believe that their constitutional rights have been violated due to the enactment of Article 7 paragraph (1) and Article 9 paragraph (1) of Law 4/2016.

Regarding the Court's authority, because the Petitioners petition for a review of the constitutionality of Article 7 paragraph (1) and Article 9 paragraph (1) of Law 4/2016 against the 1945 Constitution, the Court has the authority to hear the petition *a quo*.

With respect to the legal standing of the petitioners, whereas as described by the Petitioners in the petition *a quo*, upon examination by the Court, Petitioner III, Petitioner V, Petitioner VIII, and Petitioner IX were unable to prove their qualifications as legal entities in submitting the petition *a quo*, therefore, they have no legal standing. Meanwhile, Petitioner I, Petitioner II, Petitioner IV, Petitioner VI, Petitioner VII, Petitioner X and Petitioner XI (hereinafter referred to as the Petitioners) have met their qualifications as private legal entities and the Court is of the opinion that they have been able to describe their constitutional rights which they believed to be harmed by the enactment of the norms of Article 7 paragraph (1) and Article 9 paragraph (1) of Law 4/2016, which are being petitioned for review. The assumption that the Petitioners' constitutional rights are harmed is specific and potential in nature, and there is a causal relationship (*causal verband*) between the assumed loss of the Petitioners' constitutional rights and the validity of the provisions of the statutory norms that are being petitioned for review, because the norms a

quo have the potential to prevent the Petitioners from obtaining their constitutional rights in the form of the right to legal recognition, guarantees, protection, and certainty, the right to a prosperous life, both physically and mentally, a place to live, and social security. Therefore, if the petition *a quo* is granted, the assumed constitutional loss as described by the Petitioners will not occur.

Whereas with respect to the subject matter of the petition of the Petitioners, the Court has given its considerations in the Constitutional Court Decision Number 96/PUU-XXII/2024, in which the Court stated that the petition was granted in its entirety. Therefore, because Law 4/2016 has been declared unconstitutional in its entirety, including the norms of Article 7 paragraph (1) and Article 9 paragraph (1) of Law 4/2016, the petition to review such norms submitted by the Petitioners must automatically be declared to have lost its object. Whereas with respect to any other matters and the remainder of the petition, they shall not be considered further because they are deemed to be irrelevant.

Subsequently, the Court passes down a verdict which states that the Petitioners' petition is inadmissible.