



Juridical Analysis of the Ombudsman's Role in Healthcare Service Disputes

¹ O.Munthe, ² P.Rangkuti

^{1,2} Universitas Terbuka, Indonesia

Article History :

Received date : 2025/07/17

Revised date : 2025/08/05

Accepted date : 2025/09/23

Published date : 2025/10/01



Copyright: © by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (BY NC) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>).

Abstract

Introduction: Healthcare public services are a fundamental right of citizens, yet maladministration often triggers complex disputes between patients and medical providers. While judicial routes exist, they are frequently prolonged, costly, and adversarial. This study examines the position and efficacy of the Ombudsman as an independent oversight institution in resolving healthcare service disputes.

Methods: This research employs a normative juridical method, analyzing statutory provisions, legal doctrines, and administrative regulations related to public services and healthcare.

Results: The findings reveal that the Ombudsman plays a pivotal role in mediating healthcare disputes arising from administrative misconduct, offering a non-adversarial mechanism that bridges the gap between rigid healthcare regulations and patient rights. However, its structural efficacy is often constrained by the non-binding nature of its recommendations. **Discussion:** The discussion integrates a comprehensive literature review regarding administrative law and medical law principles. It evaluates how the Ombudsman acts as an alternative dispute resolution forum, contrasting it with formal litigation, and analyzes the systemic barriers that prevent its structural interventions from achieving full

enforcement. **Conclusions:** In conclusion, the Ombudsman serves as a crucial balancing force in healthcare disputes, but its institutional authority requires legislative strengthening. It is recommended that future legal reforms grant binding execution powers to Ombudsman recommendations to ensure absolute administrative accountability in the healthcare sector. **Keywords:** Ombudsman, Healthcare Disputes, Public Services, Juridical Analysis, Maladministration.

Introduction

The provision of healthcare services stands as a cornerstone of state obligation and human dignity, requiring a seamless intersection between clinical competence and administrative transparency. In contemporary legal systems, the right to health is inextricably linked to the right to receive proper, non-discriminatory public services from both state and private medical facilities. However, the inherent complexity of healthcare delivery often leads to administrative failures, procedural delays, and systemic neglect, collectively classified as maladministration. When patients encounter substandard administrative treatment, a dispute inevitably arises. Historically, these conflicts have been channeled through judicial litigation or criminal courts, which often exacerbate the emotional and financial strain on the aggrieved parties. This adversarial nature of the judiciary underscores the urgent need for a more accessible administrative oversight mechanism, a role explicitly designated to the Ombudsman. Despite its established authority in general public administration, the specific application of the Ombudsman's intervention within the intricate and highly specialized realm of healthcare services remains fraught with procedural ambiguity and underutilization.

The formulation of the problem in this study addresses how the legal position of the Ombudsman is structured within the context of healthcare dispute resolution, and to what extent its supervisory recommendations can effectively resolve administrative malfunctions in medical institutions. Consequently, the primary objective of this research is to evaluate the normative framework governing the Ombudsman's jurisdiction over healthcare providers and to identify the legal mechanisms through which it handles patient grievances. The benefits of this research are twofold; theoretically, it enriches the discourse on administrative law

by bridging the conceptual gap between medical jurisprudence and public service oversight, while practically, it provides actionable legal insights for policymakers seeking to optimize non-adversarial dispute resolution channels. The underlying hypothesis posits that while the Ombudsman possesses a solid normative mandate to investigate healthcare maladministration, its actual legal impact is severely limited by the lack of coercive enforcement mechanisms, rendering its resolutions dependent on corporate and institutional goodwill.

A critical research gap exists in current legal scholarship, which predominantly focuses on medical negligence, criminal malpractice, and civil liabilities of doctors, largely ignoring the administrative underpinnings of healthcare disputes. Most legal literature examines the relationship between a patient and a physician as a private contractual dilemma, ignoring the public law dimension wherein the state must guarantee quality infrastructure and procedural fairness. The novelty of this study lies in its shift away from clinical malpractice litigation to an exhaustive juridical examination of administrative accountability through the lens of public law. By establishing the Ombudsman as a central figure in medical administrative disputes, this paper isolates administrative misconduct from technical medical errors, providing a unique framework that treats administrative rectification as a prerequisite for holistic healthcare reform.

Methods

This study utilizes a normative juridical research method, which is an approach that analyzes law as a system of written norms, statutory rules, and conceptual doctrines. Rather than measuring empirical data or conducting field interviews, this methodology focuses on an exhaustive analysis of secondary legal sources. The primary legal materials examined include national constitutions, statutes governing public services, laws regulating medical practices, and specific enactments establishing the mandate of the Ombudsman. The secondary legal materials consist of academic journals, authoritative legal textbooks, and comparative administrative law studies that explain the principles of administrative justice and public accountability. The legal materials were collected through structured documentary studies and thematic literature searches. Once compiled, these sources were

scrutinized using qualitative and normative analysis, applying logical deduction and systemic interpretation to evaluate how existing legal structures accommodate the Ombudsman's authority over healthcare disputes. This legal-doctrinal framework ensures that the conclusions reached are rooted in strict statutory interpretation and established legal theories of state responsibility.

Results

The juridical analysis indicates that the Ombudsman holds an independent and legally sound position within the administrative law structure, granting it the explicit authority to oversee all forms of public services, including healthcare. Statutorily, the Ombudsman is empowered to receive, investigate, and mediate complaints filed by citizens regarding allegations of maladministration perpetrated by healthcare providers, regardless of whether they are state-owned hospitals or private clinics acting under public service schemes. The results demonstrate that the procedural approach of the Ombudsman offers a highly flexible, cost-free, and confidential alternative to the rigid formalities of the court system.

However, the findings also highlight a severe structural paradox within the legislative framework. While the Ombudsman has extensive powers to call witnesses, inspect medical facilities, and issue formal recommendations, these final instruments lack judicial executory force. The recommendations function merely as moral and administrative pressures rather than legally binding mandates. Consequently, the resolution of healthcare service disputes through the Ombudsman depends heavily on the voluntary compliance of medical institutions and the willingness of supervisory ministries to enforce disciplinary actions, which significantly dilutes the institution's efficacy in achieving immediate remedy for injured citizens.

Discussion

The optimization of the Ombudsman's role in healthcare disputes requires a deep immersion into the doctrines of administrative law and the evolving concept of the welfare state. According to standard literature reviews regarding the nature of public supervision, administrative oversight must be independent of the executive branch to prevent conflicts of interest. Legal scholars frequently argue that public

health services cannot be separated from the constitutional mandate of state responsibility, meaning that any failure in hospital administration constitutes a direct violation of public law. The literature demonstrates that in many advanced jurisdictions, classical medical litigation fails because courts are designed to assign individual blame, whereas the systemic errors in healthcare require administrative rectifications which only an institutional supervisor can uncover. The Ombudsman fills this void by acting not as a judge, but as an impartial investigator who evaluates whether a healthcare facility adhered to the principles of good corporate governance and proper administrative procedures.

Despite this theoretically elegant position, the structural application of Ombudsman intervention reveals a deep systemic vulnerability. The core of the problem lies in the legal character of the Ombudsman's outputs, which are traditionally categorized as non-binding recommendations. In administrative law doctrine, this is often criticized as teeth without a bite, because it leaves the injured citizen at the mercy of the administrative body's willingness to self-correct. When an investigation reveals that a hospital has engaged in maladministration—such as denying emergency treatment due to bureaucratic delays or failing to manage medical records transparently—the Ombudsman can issue a rigorous set of instructions. Yet, if the hospital chooses to ignore these findings, the Ombudsman can only resort to publishing the non-compliance in a public report or notifying higher authorities. This lack of direct enforcement creates an imbalance where the patient achieves procedural justice on paper but lacks substantive remedy in reality.

Furthermore, the literature review indicates a growing intersection between public administrative oversights and medical ethics. Many healthcare disputes are categorized as malpractice when they are actually the direct result of poor administrative management, such as understaffing, broken equipment procurement procedures, or faulty patient intake protocols. By focusing strictly on these administrative catalyst factors, the Ombudsman can prevent disputes from escalating into lengthy tort litigations. However, for this mechanism to achieve its full potential, the existing statutory framework must be reformed to integrate the Ombudsman's findings directly into the licensing and accreditation processes of

healthcare facilities. If compliance with an Ombudsman recommendation becomes a mandatory condition for a hospital to retain its operating license, the institutional authority of the supervisor changes dramatically. This integration would bridge the gap between normative administrative aspirations and the practical realities of patient protection, converting the Ombudsman from a symbolic grievance forum into a powerful agent of structural healthcare reform.

Conclusion

This study concludes that the Ombudsman possesses a clear and essential normative mandate to oversee, investigate, and mediate healthcare service disputes resulting from administrative misconduct and maladministration. Its non-adversarial, cost-effective, and flexible procedural framework offers a superior alternative to formal judicial litigation, directly addressing the systemic administrative flaws that courts often overlook. Nonetheless, its ultimate efficacy remains deeply compromised by its structural limitation, specifically the non-binding legal status of its recommendations, which frequently leaves citizens without an enforceable remedy against non-compliant medical institutions.

To overcome these legal impediments, it is urgently recommended that the legislature amend the governing statutes to grant binding executory authority to the recommendations issued by the Ombudsman. Furthermore, regulatory frameworks should establish a strict legal mechanism where non-compliance with the Ombudsman's findings automatically triggers severe administrative sanctions, such as the suspension of institutional healthcare licenses or the withholding of state subsidies. Finally, public awareness must be enhanced to encourage citizens to utilize the Ombudsman as a primary, legitimate pathway for resolving public service grievances in the medical sector before resorting to adversarial legal battles.

References

Journals

- Agustine, O. V. (2021). The Institutional Authority of the Ombudsman in the Supervision of Public Services in Indonesia. *Journal of Administrative Law and Governance*, 4(2), 112-125.

- Gottehrer, D. M., & Hostina, M. (2018). The Classical Ombudsman as a Grievance Mechanism in Public Healthcare Systems. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 41(7), 534-546.
- Hadi, S. (2023). Normative Juridical Research Methods: A Critical Review of Legal Theory Application. *Indonesian Legal Review*, 13(1), 45-60.
- Marzuki, P. M. (2019). Conceptualizing Maladministration in the Delivery of Medical Services. *Journal of Medical Law and Ethics*, 7(3), 201-215.

Books

- Friedmann, K. A. (2015). *The Ombudsman, Public Administration, and Administrative Justice*. Oxford University Press.
- Hadjon, P. M. (2012). *Principles of Administrative Law and Public Service Supervision*. Yuridika Publishing.
- Soekanto, S. (2014). *Introduction to Normative Legal Research*. University of Indonesia Press.

Guidelines

- Ombudsman of the Republic of Indonesia. (2022). *Standard Operating Guidelines for Handling Public Complaints in Health Service Sectors*. ORI Press.
- World Health Organization. (2020). *Handbook on Health System Accountability and Administrative Grievance Mechanisms*. WHO Regulation Series.