International Journal of Business, Law, and Education
Publisher: IJBLE Scientific Publications Community Inc.
Volume 7, Number 2, 2026
https://ijble.com/index.php/journal/index

Legal Aid Implementation in Indonesia: Regulatory Design, Institutional Barriers, and Access to Justice

I Kadek Rico Vergian Dinatha[1], Komang Widiana Purnawan[2]
[1,2]Faculty of Law, Universitas Udayana, Indonesia
Corresponding author: ricovergian@gmail.com

ABSTRACT
Indonesia constitutionally affirms the rule of law, equality before the law, and equal legal protection. In practice, however, economic inequality, limited legal literacy, uneven institutional distribution, and administrative rigidity continue to restrict access to justice for poor and vulnerable communities. This article analyzes the legal framework governing state-funded legal aid in Indonesia and identifies the principal legal and institutional problems that arise in its implementation. Using a socio-legal design, the study combines statutory analysis of Law No. 16 of 2011 on Legal Aid, Law No. 18 of 2003 on Advocates, Government Regulation No. 42 of 2013, and related instruments with factual analysis of public reports, survey findings, and secondary legal scholarship. The findings show that Indonesia has substantially transformed legal aid from a voluntary pro bono practice into a state responsibility funded through the national budget. Nevertheless, four implementation problems remain salient: the persistence of informal operational charges despite the free-service mandate; ambiguous parameters for identifying eligible poor beneficiaries; low public awareness of free legal aid, with 62.9% of respondents in a 2024 national survey unaware of the service; and a rigid three-year verification and accreditation cycle for legal aid organizations. The article argues that the Indonesian legal aid regime requires more precise eligibility standards, explicit prohibition and monitoring of hidden charges, rolling accreditation, stronger public legal education, and integrated digital outreach. These reforms are necessary to align statutory design with the constitutional promise of equal access to justice.

Keywords: legal aid; access to justice; equality before the law; poor communities; Indonesia; socio-legal research

DOI. https://doi.org/10.56442/ijble.v7i2.1504

INTRODUCTION

Indonesia is a constitutional state founded on the rule of law. Article 1(3) of the 1945 Constitution declares that Indonesia is a state based on law, while Article 28D(1) guarantees recognition, protection, fair legal certainty, and equal treatment before the law. These constitutional commitments are not merely formal declarations. They create a normative obligation for the state to ensure that legal protection is practically accessible, including to people who cannot afford professional legal services (Republic of Indonesia, 1945; Ramdan, 2016).

The central difficulty is the persistent gap between formal equality and practical access. Poor and economically disadvantaged citizens are frequently exposed to legal problems without the financial capacity, legal knowledge, or institutional guidance required to defend their rights. The concept of access to justice therefore cannot be reduced to the availability of courts; it also includes the capacity of ordinary people to recognize legal problems, obtain trustworthy legal information, secure advice, and receive representation when necessary (Cappelletti & Garth, 1978; OECD & Open Society Foundations, 2019).

Legal aid is one of the most important institutional mechanisms for narrowing this gap. Under Article 1(1) of Law No. 16 of 2011, legal aid is a legal service provided free of charge by legal aid providers to legal aid recipients. Article 22(1) of Law No. 18 of 2003 on Advocates also requires advocates to provide free legal aid to justice seekers who cannot afford it. In addition, Law No. 39 of 1999 on Human Rights reinforces the normative basis for access to justice and legal protection. These provisions demonstrate that the Indonesian legal system recognizes legal aid as part of the constitutional architecture of equal treatment before the law (Republic of Indonesia, 1999, 2003, 2011).

Despite this normative architecture, implementation remains problematic. The present analysis identifies three core issues that remain highly relevant. First, the legal definition of free legal aid may be interpreted narrowly as the absence of professional honorarium, leaving room for demands related to transportation, meals, fuel, document handling, or other operational costs. Second, the statutory category of poor or underprivileged legal aid recipients remains difficult to operationalize uniformly. Third, public awareness is weak. A 2024 survey reported by Databoks, based on Litbang Kompas data, found that 62.9% of respondents did not know that free legal aid services existed, 27.2% knew the services existed but did not know how to access them, and only 9.9% knew how to obtain them (Muhamad, 2024).

The research questions are therefore: (1) how is legal aid regulated under Indonesian legislation; and (2) what legal and institutional problems arise in the implementation of legal aid under that regulatory framework? The article contributes to the literature by integrating doctrinal analysis of legal aid legislation with socio-legal attention to eligibility, institutional accreditation, public awareness, and hidden access costs.

Literature Review and Conceptual Framework

1. Access to Justice as a Constitutional and Institutional Problem

Access to justice has been widely conceptualized as the ability of individuals and communities to claim rights, obtain remedies, and resolve legal problems through fair, effective, and accountable mechanisms. The classic access-to-justice movement emphasized that formal legal rights are ineffective when the costs, complexity, and professional barriers of the legal system prevent citizens from using them (Cappelletti & Garth, 1978). Later scholarship expanded this view by demonstrating that people often fail to use legal assistance not because they lack problems, but because they do not recognize the legal character of those problems, lack trust in legal institutions, or fear unaffordable costs (Genn, 1999; OECD & Open Society Foundations, 2019).

This framework is important for Indonesia because equality before the law requires more than equal legal status. It also requires institutional conditions that make legal remedies reachable for people with limited financial and social capital. Legal aid is therefore both a service-delivery mechanism and a constitutional instrument. It translates the abstract principle of equality before the law into concrete assistance for those who cannot protect their rights independently (Fauzi & Ningtyas, 2018; Ramdan, 2016).

2. Legal Aid, Pro Bono, and State Responsibility

The Indonesian legal aid tradition historically developed through voluntary and humanitarian practices. In the early post-independence period, advocates provided assistance primarily as a moral and professional responsibility. The establishment of the Legal Aid Institute (Lembaga Bantuan Hukum, LBH) in 1970, associated with Adnan Buyung Nasution, was a major milestone in institutionalizing legal assistance for marginalized groups. The reform era then brought more explicit statutory recognition through Law No. 18 of 2003 on Advocates and, later, Law No. 16 of 2011 on Legal Aid (Palgunadi, 2018; Sundari, 2013).

The conceptual shift introduced by Law No. 16 of 2011 is significant. Legal aid is no longer framed merely as an advocate's voluntary pro bono obligation; it is framed as a state responsibility funded through public resources. This model is consistent with the welfare-oriented view that the state must allocate budgetary support to guarantee legal protection for poor people (Ahyar, 2020; Ramdan, 2016). Yet the existence of state funding does not automatically ensure implementation quality. Comparative access-to-justice literature shows that legal aid schemes often fail when eligibility rules are unclear, service quality is weak, or the public does not know how to enter the system (Chaara et al., 2022; Curran & Noone, 2008).

3. Analytical Framework

This article uses four analytical lenses. The first is the constitutional lens, which examines whether legal aid fulfills equality before the law and the right to fair legal protection. The second is the statutory lens, which assesses the relationship between Law No. 16 of 2011, Law No. 18 of 2003, Government Regulation No. 42 of 2013, and implementing instruments. The third is the institutional lens, which focuses on verification, accreditation, funding, supervision, and legal aid organizational capacity. The fourth is the user-centered lens, which evaluates whether poor communities know, trust, and can practically access free legal aid.

METHOD

This study applies a socio-legal research design. Socio-legal research combines legal analysis with attention to how legal rules operate in social and institutional contexts. It is appropriate for legal aid because the problem is not limited to the content of statutes; it also concerns implementation, administrative capacity, public knowledge, and the gap between das sollen (law in the normative sense) and das sein (law in social reality).

The study uses three approaches. First, the statutory approach examines the 1945 Constitution, Law No. 16 of 2011 on Legal Aid, Law No. 18 of 2003 on Advocates, Law No. 39 of 1999 on Human Rights, Government Regulation No. 42 of 2013 on the Requirements and Procedures for Providing Legal Aid and Disbursing Legal Aid Funds, and related ministerial or institutional instruments. Second, the conceptual approach evaluates legal aid through access-to-justice theory, equality before the law, and state responsibility. Third, the factual approach analyzes empirical indicators drawn from public reports, survey findings, official announcements, and legal scholarship, including the 2024 Litbang Kompas survey reported by Databoks and BPHN public information on verification and accreditation.

The legal materials consist of primary legal materials, namely statutes and official regulations; secondary legal materials, namely journal articles, books, reports, and doctrinal commentary; and factual materials, namely survey data and institutional public information relevant to legal aid implementation. The data were analyzed descriptively and argumentatively. The analysis first identifies the regulatory structure, then evaluates implementation problems, and finally formulates policy recommendations.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Regulatory Architecture of Legal Aid in Indonesia

Legal aid in Indonesia is regulated through a layered framework. At the constitutional level, Articles 1(3) and 28D(1) of the 1945 Constitution establish the rule of law and equal legal protection. At the statutory level, Law No. 16 of 2011 defines legal aid, legal aid recipients, legal aid providers, rights and obligations, application procedures, funding, prohibitions, and criminal provisions. Official regulatory metadata confirms that Law No. 16 of 2011 remains in force and was designed to operationalize state responsibility for legal aid as a means of access to justice (Republic of Indonesia, 2011).

Law No. 18 of 2003 on Advocates complements this framework by regulating the advocate profession, including the obligation to provide free legal aid. Government Regulation No. 42 of 2013 further regulates the requirements and procedures for providing legal aid and the distribution of legal aid funds. It operationalizes the budgetary and administrative dimensions of Law No. 16 of 2011. Together, these instruments create a formal structure in which legal aid is both a professional duty and a publicly funded service (Government of Indonesia, 2013; Republic of Indonesia, 2003).

Article 3 of Law No. 16 of 2011 states that legal aid aims to guarantee and fulfill the rights of legal aid recipients to access justice; realize the constitutional rights of all citizens according to the principle of equality before the law; ensure the nationwide implementation of legal aid; and realize effective, efficient, and accountable justice. The scope of legal aid includes civil, criminal, and state administrative matters. It may be delivered through litigation and non-litigation mechanisms, including legal counseling, legal consultation, case investigation, legal research, mediation, negotiation, community empowerment, out-of-court assistance, and legal document drafting.

Table 1. Principal legal instruments governing legal aid in Indonesia

Legal instrument	Core function	Relevance to legal aid	Implementation issue
1945 Constitution	Constitutional foundation of rule of law and equality before the law	Creates the normative basis for equal protection and access to justice	Formal equality requires institutional mechanisms to become practical equality
Law No. 18 of 2003 on Advocates	Regulates advocate profession and free legal aid obligation	Requires advocates to provide free legal aid to justice seekers who cannot afford it	Professional obligation needs stronger supervision and accountability
Law No. 16 of 2011 on Legal Aid	Defines legal aid, recipients, providers, funding, rights, obligations, and prohibitions	Transforms legal aid into a state responsibility directed to poor persons or groups	Eligibility criteria, hidden charges, and accreditation rigidity remain problematic
Government Regulation No. 42 of 2013	Regulates requirements, procedures, and legal aid fund distribution	Operationalizes APBN-funded litigation and non-litigation services	Budgeting and reporting mechanisms must prevent cost-shifting to recipients

2. Historical Shift from Humanitarian Pro Bono to State-Funded Legal Aid

The development of Indonesian legal aid reflects a shift from voluntary humanitarianism to public responsibility. In the 1945-1960 period, legal assistance was largely associated with advocates' moral responsibility to help disadvantaged justice seekers. The establishment of LBH in 1970 strengthened organized legal aid and connected legal services with broader social justice advocacy. With the enactment of Law No. 18 of 2003, the duty to provide free legal aid became an explicit professional obligation for advocates. However, the obligation remained vulnerable to weak supervision and limited institutional enforceability (Palgunadi, 2018).

Government Regulation No. 83 of 2008 regulated the requirements and procedures for advocates to provide free legal aid, but the model still emphasized individual advocates. Law No. 16 of 2011 and Government Regulation No. 42 of 2013 produced a deeper transformation by placing the state as the primary actor responsible for organizing and funding legal aid. This shift is important because the right to legal aid becomes part of a welfare-oriented constitutional model rather than a charitable act dependent on individual goodwill (Ahyar, 2020; Ramdan, 2016).

The progress is undeniable. The introduction of state budget support through the national budget (Anggaran Pendapatan dan Belanja Negara, APBN) allows accredited legal aid organizations to receive funding for litigation and non-litigation activities. BPHN reported that legal aid litigation cases increased to 14,007 cases in 2023 from 9,389 in 2022, while non-litigation activities increased from 3,525 in 2022 to 4,125 in 2023. This indicates that institutional capacity and demand have grown (BPHN, 2024a). Nevertheless, growth in case numbers does not by itself prove equal or effective access. The remaining problem is whether the scheme reaches those who need it most and whether it does so without hidden costs.

3. Budgeting, Scope of Services, and Institutional Delivery

Government Regulation No. 42 of 2013 allocates legal aid funding for litigation and non-litigation services. Litigation assistance covers criminal, civil, and state administrative cases until they obtain final and binding legal force, subject to the rules on reimbursable activities and cost standards determined by the competent minister. Non-litigation services cover legal education, consultation, investigation, research, mediation, negotiation, community empowerment, assistance outside court, and legal document drafting. This broad scope is consistent with contemporary access-to-justice theory, which emphasizes that many legal problems should be addressed before they enter formal court processes (OECD & Open Society Foundations, 2019).

Institutionally, legal aid is delivered mainly through verified and accredited legal aid organizations. Accreditation is intended to ensure quality control, accountability, and administrative eligibility for state funding. BPHN's 2024 public information indicates that verification and accreditation for new legal aid organizations were planned in stages, including registration, document correction, factual field verification, regional working-group recommendation, and central verification. The same information notes that 619 legal aid providers were subject to reaccreditation for the 2022-2024 period (BPHN, 2024a).

This institutional model has strengths. It allows the state to channel public funds to organizations rather than relying exclusively on individual advocates, and it supports broader legal empowerment activities through non-litigation programs. However, it also creates administrative dependency. Organizations that are not accredited cannot fully participate in state-funded legal aid, even if they have professional capacity, local legitimacy, or community reach. Accreditation therefore functions as both a quality-control gate and a potential bottleneck.

4. Implementation Problems in Legal Aid Provision

a. Hidden Charges and the Narrow Meaning of Free Legal Aid

The first implementation problem concerns the meaning of free legal aid. Law No. 16 of 2011 defines legal aid as a free legal service, and legal aid providers are prohibited from receiving or requesting payment from legal aid recipients. Yet, in practice, some beneficiaries may still be asked to pay incidental or operational costs such as transportation, fuel, meals, photocopying, or other out-of-pocket expenses. The problem is not the principle of legality itself, but the absence of sufficiently explicit and enforceable rules clarifying that ancillary operational costs may not be shifted to poor recipients unless expressly authorized by transparent regulation.

This issue undermines the substantive meaning of free legal aid. For poor citizens, even small operational charges can become a barrier to legal assistance. Legal aid that is formally free but practically accompanied by informal payments risks reproducing the very inequality it is meant to correct. Recent legal aid quality research similarly notes concerns about legal aid recipients being asked for transport money and about the need for stronger monitoring of legal aid providers (Utami et al., 2025). A credible legal aid regime must therefore define prohibited payments clearly, standardize allowable costs, require receipts for all reimbursable expenses, and establish complaint mechanisms that poor recipients can use safely.

b. Ambiguity in the Criteria for Poor or Underprivileged Recipients

The second problem concerns beneficiary identification. Law No. 16 of 2011 limits legal aid recipients to persons or groups of poor people who cannot fulfill basic rights properly and independently. This statutory phrase is normatively inclusive but administratively difficult. Without precise and standardized indicators, local verification may become inconsistent. Some people who need assistance may be excluded because they cannot produce required poverty documentation, while others may be included through formal documents that do not accurately capture vulnerability.

The eligibility problem is especially important because legal problems do not always correspond neatly to formal poverty categories. A person may be legally vulnerable because of disability, gender-based violence, geographic isolation, migrant status, low literacy, or power imbalance, even if their administrative poverty status is unclear. International access-to-justice literature increasingly recognizes that legal vulnerability is multidimensional and cannot be reduced to income alone (Curran & Noone, 2008; OECD & Open Society Foundations, 2019). Indonesia's current legal aid framework would be strengthened by more precise eligibility indicators combined with discretionary safeguards for vulnerable groups.

c. Low Public Awareness and Legal Literacy

The third problem is public knowledge. A legal aid service cannot produce access to justice if the intended beneficiaries do not know that it exists or do not know how to use it. The 2024 survey reported by Databoks is therefore a serious warning: 62.9% of respondents did not know of the existence of free legal aid services; 27.2% knew that services existed but did not know how to access them; and only 9.9% knew how to obtain them. The same report states that the survey involved 530 respondents across 38 provinces, conducted by telephone on 22-24 July 2024, with a margin of error of approximately 4.32% and a 95% confidence level (Muhamad, 2024).

These findings show that the problem is not only supply-side capacity but also demand-side awareness. Article 3 of Law No. 16 of 2011 requires the nationwide

International Journal of Business, Law, and Education
Publisher: IJBLE Scientific Publications Community Inc.
IJBLE
Volume 7, Number 2, 2026
https://ijble.com/index.php/journal/index

implementation of legal aid. Uneven awareness means that legal aid is not yet socially embedded as a public service. Public legal education, village-level outreach, digital information portals, cooperation with universities, and community paralegal programs should therefore be treated as core legal aid functions, not as supplementary activities. BPHN's public portal already frames free legal aid, legal consultation, paralegal empowerment, and legal aid posts as mechanisms for expanding justice access; the challenge is to ensure that these mechanisms are known and trusted by the communities they are intended to serve (BPHN, 2026).

d. Rigid Verification and Accreditation Cycles

The fourth problem concerns institutional accreditation. Article 7 of Law No. 16 of 2011 provides that verification and accreditation are conducted periodically, and the regulatory practice has developed around a three-year cycle. Quality control is necessary because the state must ensure that legal aid organizations are competent, accountable, and capable of responsibly managing public funds. However, a rigid periodic cycle can create unintended exclusion. Organizations that are newly established or newly ready to meet standards may have to wait until the next cycle, limiting the number of providers available in underserved regions.

BPHN's 2024 announcement that verification and accreditation would be conducted in stages, including new organizations and reaccreditation for the 2022-2024 period, reflects an effort to manage this process administratively (BPHN, 2024a). Still, the broader concern remains: periodic accreditation should not become an administrative barrier to the constitutional goal of equal access. A rolling accreditation model, combined with strict post-accreditation monitoring, could preserve quality control while allowing qualified organizations to enter the system more quickly.

5. Synthesis of Findings

The findings indicate a clear tension between strong statutory commitment and uneven institutional realization. Indonesia has established a relatively comprehensive legal aid regime, but legal aid recipients continue to face hidden cost risks, eligibility uncertainty, lack of information, and limited institutional distribution. These problems are interrelated. Ambiguous eligibility can discourage applications; low awareness prevents eligible citizens from applying; hidden charges undermine trust; and rigid accreditation reduces service availability in regions with fewer providers.

Table 2. Implementation problems and proposed reform directions

Problem	Legal/institutional source	Access-to-justice consequence	Reform direction
Hidden operational charges	Unclear treatment of transport, meals, document, and incidental costs	Poor recipients may still face financial barriers despite nominally free legal aid	Explicit prohibition, transparent reimbursement, receipt-based accountability, complaint channels
Ambiguous eligibility	Broad statutory category of poor persons or groups unable to fulfill basic rights independently	Inconsistent verification and possible exclusion of vulnerable applicants	Combine poverty documentation with vulnerability indicators and discretionary safeguards
Low public awareness	Insufficient legal literacy and uneven outreach	Citizens do not use services because they do not know the service exists or how to access it	National legal education campaign, village-level outreach, university clinics, paralegal networks, digital and offline information

Rigid accreditation cycle	Periodic verification and accreditation of legal aid organizations	Qualified new providers may be delayed from serving communities under the state-funded scheme	Rolling accreditation, conditional provisional accreditation, post-accreditation audits

6. Policy Implications and Reform Agenda

First, the government should clarify the meaning of free legal aid through implementing regulations or technical guidelines that expressly prohibit legal aid providers from shifting operational expenses to recipients. Any reimbursable operational costs must be borne through transparent budget mechanisms, not through informal payments requested from poor clients.

Second, eligibility rules should be refined. Poverty certificates remain useful, but they should be complemented by vulnerability indicators, including disability, gender-based violence, child status, elderly status, migrant status, geographic isolation, detention, and low legal literacy. This would align legal aid with the real distribution of legal vulnerability.

Third, Indonesia should adopt a rolling or semi-annual accreditation pathway for legal aid organizations that are ready to meet standards before the end of the three-year cycle. Accreditation should be coupled with stronger supervision, service-quality audits, case documentation, client feedback, and sanctions for hidden charging or administrative non-compliance.

Fourth, public legal education should be institutionalized as a national access-to-justice strategy. Outreach must be available through village offices, universities, religious and community organizations, schools, prisons, courts, digital platforms, and local government channels. Legal aid information should not be limited to legal communities; it must reach ordinary people before legal problems escalate.

Fifth, digital access should be integrated with offline assistance. Online portals and mobile applications can improve visibility and initial guidance, but many poor communities may lack digital access or legal literacy. Legal aid posts, paralegals, and local legal educators are therefore essential to translate digital information into practical assistance.

CONCLUSION

Legal aid regulation in Indonesia has developed substantially. The country has moved from a predominantly humanitarian and pro bono model toward a state-funded legal aid regime established through Law No. 16 of 2011 and Government Regulation No. 42 of 2013. This development reflects the constitutional duty to guarantee equality before the law and access to justice for poor communities. The scope of legal aid now covers litigation and non-litigation matters, including criminal, civil, and administrative cases, as well as consultation, mediation, legal counseling, and community empowerment.

However, implementation remains constrained by structural and practical problems. The most important problems are hidden operational charges, unclear parameters for determining poor legal aid recipients, limited public awareness, and rigid verification and accreditation cycles for legal aid organizations. The 2024 survey showing that 62.9% of respondents were unaware of free legal aid is especially concerning because it reveals that a statutory right may remain socially invisible. For legal aid to fulfill its constitutional purpose, Indonesia must move beyond formal regulation toward a system that is clear, trusted, widely known, easy to access, and accountable.

The core conclusion is that Indonesia's legal aid framework is normatively progressive but institutionally incomplete. Its future effectiveness depends on precision in regulation, flexibility in accreditation, stronger supervision, broader public legal education, and a user-centered approach that treats poor communities not merely as passive recipients but as rights-holders entitled to accessible legal protection.

Limitations and Future Research

This article is based on statutory analysis and secondary factual materials, including public survey reports and institutional information. It does not include direct interviews with legal aid recipients, advocates, paralegals, or legal aid organization administrators. Future research should conduct fieldwork across provinces to compare urban and rural access, examine the actual incidence of hidden charges, evaluate the quality of litigation and non-litigation services, and assess whether digital legal aid platforms improve access for poor and vulnerable communities.

Declarations

Acknowledgements: The author thanks academic reviewers and colleagues who may provide comments during the journal submission process.
Funding: This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.
Competing interests: The authors declare no competing interests.
Data availability: The dataset may be requested from the corresponding author subject to institutional permission and confidentiality requirements.

References

Ahyar, A. (2020). Optimalisasi pelayanan bantuan hukum bagi masyarakat miskin [Optimization of legal aid services for poor communities]. Jurnal Penelitian Hukum De Jure, 20(3), 409-434. https://doi.org/10.30641/dejure.2020.V20.409-434

Angga, A., & Arifin, R. (2019). Penerapan bantuan hukum bagi masyarakat kurang mampu di Indonesia [Implementation of legal aid for underprivileged communities in Indonesia]. DIVERSI: Jurnal Hukum, 4(2), 218-236. https://doi.org/10.32503/diversi.v4i2.374

Atsar, A. (2021). Profesi advokat dan tantangan masa depan [The advocate profession and future challenges]. Perkumpulan Rumah Cemerlang Indonesia.

Badan Pembinaan Hukum Nasional. (2024a, January 22). BPHN siap verifikasi dan akreditasi organisasi bantuan hukum baru pada bulan Maret 2024. https://bphn.go.id/berita-utama/bphn-siap-verifikasi-dan-akreditasi-organisasi-bantuan-hukum-baru-pada-bulan-maret-2024

Badan Pembinaan Hukum Nasional. (2024b). Indeks informasi bantuan hukum. https://bphn.go.id/informasi/dir/bankum

Badan Pembinaan Hukum Nasional. (2026). Justice access for all: Free legal aid services. https://bantuanhukum.bphn.go.id/en/services/

Cappelletti, M., & Garth, B. (1978). Access to justice: The worldwide movement to make rights effective. In M. Cappelletti & B. Garth (Eds.), Access to Justice: Vol. 1. A World Survey (pp. 3-124). Sijthoff and Noordhoff.

Chaara, I., Falisse, J. B., & Moriceau, J. (2022). Does legal aid improve access to justice in fragile settings? Evidence from Burundi. Journal of Peace Research, 59(6), 810-827. https://doi.org/10.1177/00223433211055633

Curran, L., & Noone, M. A. (2008). Access to justice: A new approach using human rights standards. International Journal of the Legal Profession, 15(3), 195-229. https://doi.org/10.1080/09695950902785879

Fauzi, S. I., & Ningtyas, I. P. (2018). Optimalisasi pemberian bantuan hukum demi terwujudnya access to law and justice bagi rakyat miskin [Optimizing legal aid provision to realize access to law and justice for the poor]. Jurnal Konstitusi, 15(1), 50-72. https://doi.org/10.31078/jk1513

Genn, H. (1999). Paths to justice: What people do and think about going to law. Hart Publishing.

Government of Indonesia. (2013). Government Regulation No. 42 of 2013 on the requirements and procedures for providing legal aid and disbursing legal aid funds. State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia No. 98 of 2013.

Iksan, M. (2017). Asas legalitas dalam hukum pidana: Studi komparatif asas legalitas hukum pidana Indonesia dan hukum pidana Islam (jinayah) [The principle of legality in criminal law: A comparative study]. Jurnal Serambi Hukum, 11(1), 1-28.

Muhamad, N. (2024, August 7). Mayoritas warga RI tak tahu ada bantuan hukum gratis [Most Indonesians do not know that free legal aid exists]. Databoks. https://databoks.katadata.co.id/demografi/statistik/66b3209dcf228/mayoritas-warga-ri-tak-tahu-ada-bantuan-hukum-gratis

OECD & Open Society Foundations. (2019). Legal needs surveys and access to justice. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/g2g9a36c-en

Palgunadi, P. (2018). Reposisi bantuan hukum secara pro bono oleh organisasi bantuan hukum dalam kajian Undang-Undang Nomor 16 Tahun 2011 tentang Bantuan Hukum [Repositioning pro bono legal aid by legal aid organizations under Law No. 16 of 2011]. Jurnal USM Law Review, 1(2), 202-215. https://doi.org/10.26623/julr.v1i2.2253

Ramdan, A. (2016). Bantuan hukum sebagai kewajiban negara untuk memenuhi hak konstitusional fakir miskin [Legal aid as a state obligation to fulfill the constitutional rights of the poor]. Jurnal Konstitusi, 11(2), 233-255. https://doi.org/10.31078/jk1122

Republic of Indonesia. (1945). The 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia.

Republic of Indonesia. (1999). Law No. 39 of 1999 on Human Rights.

Republic of Indonesia. (2003). Law No. 18 of 2003 on Advocates. State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia No. 49 of 2003.

Republic of Indonesia. (2011). Law No. 16 of 2011 on Legal Aid. State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia No. 104 of 2011.

Rhode, D. L. (2004). Access to justice. Oxford University Press.

Sundari, E. (2012). Legal aid scheme in Indonesia: Between the policy and the implementation. Jurnal Hukum IUS QUIA IUSTUM, 19(4), 545-561.

United Nations Development Programme. (2005). Programming for justice: Access for all: A practitioner's guide to a human rights-based approach to access to justice. UNDP.

Utami, N. A. T., Haryanto, T., & Santoso, B. (2025). Evaluation of legal aid service quality and supervision in Indonesia. Journal of Human Rights, Culture and Legal System, 5(1), 187-216.