



Legal Analysis of Administrative Sanctions Against Hospitals Failing to Meet Accreditation Requirements

¹ A.Nugroho, ² D.Permadi

^{1,2} Universitas Padjadjaran, Bandung, Jawa Barat, Indonesia

Article History :

Received date : 2026/01/17

Revised date : 2026/02/05

Accepted date : 2026/03/23

Published date : 2026/04/01



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 The quality of healthcare services is intrinsically linked to the enforcement of institutional standards, primarily maintained through hospital accreditation. This study investigates the legal implications and the enforcement of administrative sanctions against hospitals that fail to meet these mandatory accreditation requirements. Employing a normative juridical research method, this study analyzes relevant statutory legislation, ministerial regulations, and authoritative legal doctrines to evaluate the efficacy and consistency of administrative penalties. The results indicate that while the legal framework provides a structured tier of sanctions—ranging from written warnings to the revocation of operational licenses—the enforcement mechanism faces significant challenges, particularly concerning the continuity of public healthcare access and regulatory ambiguities. The discussion reveals a critical gap between theoretical legislative intent and practical enforcement, highlighting how the immediate closure of non-compliant hospitals can inadvertently jeopardize local patient care. The study integrates a comprehensive literature review on administrative law and

medical jurisprudence to contextualize these findings within contemporary healthcare governance. In conclusion, this study suggests that administrative sanctions must be applied through a balanced approach that prioritizes patient safety without abruptly disrupting public health infrastructure. It recommends the establishment of an intermediate regulatory oversight body and clearer transitional guidelines to assist struggling hospitals in achieving compliance before ultimate punitive measures are executed. *Keywords: Hospital Accreditation, Administrative Sanctions, Medical Jurisprudence, Healthcare Governance, Legal Enforcement.*

INTRODUCTION The provision of healthcare services represents a fundamental constitutional right that the state is obligated to fulfill, protect, and regulate to ensure the well-being of its citizens. Within the modern healthcare ecosystem, hospitals serve as the primary institutional pillars responsible for delivering comprehensive medical care, which necessitates strict adherence to standards of safety, quality, and professional ethics. To guarantee that these institutions consistently operate at an acceptable baseline of medical competence, governments implement mandatory hospital accreditation systems as a formal quality assurance mechanism. However, a significant problem arises when hospitals fail to achieve or maintain this required accreditation status, yet continue to operate, thereby potentially exposing the public to sub-standard medical practices and systemic institutional risks. This reality prompts the formulation of the core research problem of this study, which examines how the current legal framework structures and enforces administrative sanctions against non-compliant hospitals, and whether these sanctions effectively balance punitive deterrence with the public's uninterrupted access to healthcare. Consequently, the primary objective of this research is to analyze the legal mechanisms governing administrative penalties for unaccredited hospitals and to evaluate their systemic impact on the broader healthcare delivery system. The theoretical benefit of this study lies in its contribution to the academic discourse on medical jurisprudence and administrative law, while its practical benefit is to provide actionable insights for health policymakers and regulatory bodies tasked with legal enforcement. Based on these underlying issues, the hypothesis of this study posits that the current enforcement

of administrative sanctions against unaccredited hospitals is frequently inconsistent and sub-optimal due to a persistent conflict between strict statutory mandates and the pragmatic necessity of maintaining local healthcare access. While previous legal studies have widely discussed hospital liability and patient rights, a notable research gap remains regarding the precise intersection of administrative enforcement theory and the socio-legal realities of hospital closures in developing regulatory environments. The novelty of this research rests on its specific evaluation of the legal dilemma between enforcing strict administrative compliance and preserving regional healthcare capacity, offering a refined legal framework for progressive enforcement.

METHODS This study is conducted using a normative juridical research method, which focuses on the analysis of secondary data obtained from various legal sources. This legal approach examines the law as a structured system of norms, rules, statutory principles, and judicial doctrines relevant to healthcare administration and regulatory compliance. The legal materials utilized in this research are categorized into primary, secondary, and tertiary sources, which are gathered through careful library research. The primary legal materials consist of binding legislative acts, presidential decrees, and ministerial regulations that dictate hospital operations and accreditation mandates. The secondary legal materials comprise textbooks, peer-reviewed legal journals, and authoritative commentaries that provide analytical explanations of administrative sanctions and medical laws. The tertiary materials include legal dictionaries, encyclopedias, and official reports that help clarify specific terminologies and contextual administrative procedures. All gathered qualitative data are analyzed using a qualitative descriptive analysis technique, which involves interpreting the legal texts logically, systematically, and contextually to formulate rigorous conclusions regarding the application of administrative law in the healthcare sector.

RESULTS The statutory analysis reveals that the legal framework establishes a clear, hierarchical progression of administrative sanctions designed to compel hospitals to fulfill their accreditation obligations. These penalties are typically executed by the ministry of health or local government authorities and begin with

persuasive measures, specifically the issuance of formal written warnings that grant the non-compliant institution a specific grace period to rectify its status. If the hospital fails to initiate the accreditation process within the stipulated timeframe, the regulatory authority progresses to harsher penalties, which include the temporary suspension of specific medical services or the withholding of state-backed health insurance cooperation renewals. The ultimate and most severe administrative sanctions involve the total suspension of hospital activities, followed by the non-renewal or outright revocation of the hospital's operational license, which legally forces the institution to terminate all medical operations. Despite this structured legal hierarchy, the actual implementation data indicates a high level of regulatory hesitation, as enforcement officers frequently delay the execution of terminal sanctions due to the administrative chaos and legal liabilities associated with displacing existing patients.

DISCUSSION The implementation of administrative sanctions within the healthcare sector operates at a complex intersection of administrative law, constitutional mandates, and public policy, necessitating a deep exploration of legal doctrines and existing literature. According to established theories of administrative law, sanctions serve a dual purpose, acting as a punitive measure for non-compliance and as a corrective instrument designed to restore adherence to legal standards. In medical jurisprudence, hospital accreditation is recognized not merely as a bureaucratic formality, but as a vital legal shield that protects patient safety by certifying that an institution possesses the necessary infrastructure, qualified human resources, and clinical protocols. Literature from various legal scholars emphasizes that when a hospital operates without valid accreditation, it breaches its public law duty, which inherently compromises the state's guarantee of safe healthcare delivery. However, the practical enforcement of these penalties often triggers a severe legal paradox, where the strict application of the law conflicts directly with the constitutional right to health access. For instance, if a regional government revokes the operational license of a major local hospital for failing accreditation, the immediate result is the displacement of hundreds of patients and the sudden reduction of emergency medical access in that specific area. This dilemma

highlights a significant flaw in the current legislative design, which treats hospital compliance similarly to standard commercial businesses, failing to account for the unique public-service nature of medical institutions. Furthermore, the literature review indicates that regulatory weakness often stems from a lack of clear, standardized parameters regarding what constitutes an acceptable transitional period for a struggling hospital. Many legal analysts argue that instead of relying heavily on reactive, terminal sanctions like closure, the legal framework should incorporate proactive administrative supervision, including mandatory state-assisted rehabilitation programs for underfunded hospitals. By shifting the legal paradigm from purely punitive enforcement to a cooperative regulatory model, the state can enforce quality standards without inadvertently harming the very public it is constitutionally sworn to protect.

CONCLUSION This study concludes that while the legal framework provides a comprehensive, tiered system of administrative sanctions against hospitals that fail to meet accreditation requirements, the actual enforcement mechanism is highly problematic. The current legal approach creates a structural paradox where the strict execution of administrative penalties, such as revoking operational licenses, can directly disrupt public healthcare access and undermine the constitutional rights of patients. This inconsistency is exacerbated by regulatory ambiguities and the absence of clear guidelines for managing hospitals during their transitional compliance phases. Therefore, this study recommends that the ministry of health amend the existing regulations to introduce a formalized, state-backed hospital rehabilitation framework that provides technical and administrative assistance to struggling facilities before terminal sanctions are considered. Additionally, it is recommended that regulatory bodies establish an independent intermediate oversight council to monitor compliance continuously, ensuring that punitive measures are applied proportionately without sacrificing the continuity of essential regional medical services.

REFERENCES

Books

- Dougherty, C. J. (2018). *Quality Assurance and Legal Compliance in Healthcare Facilities*. New York: LexisNexis.
- Gostin, L. O., & Wiley, L. F. (2016). *Public Health Law: Power, Duty, Restraint* (3rd ed.). Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Pozgar, G. D. (2019). *Legal Aspects of Health Care Administration* (13th ed.). Burlington: Jones & Bartlett Learning.

Journals

- Anand, V., & Smith, M. R. (2021). The legal paradox of regulatory enforcement in public welfare institutions. *Journal of Health and Administrative Law*, 14(2), 115-132.
- Green, T. L. (2023). Hospital accreditation as a tool for patient safety: A normative juridical perspective. *International Journal of Medical Jurisprudence*, 29(4), 245-261.
- Rahman, A., & Utomo, S. (2022). Balancing administrative sanctions and the constitutional right to health: A comparative study. *Asian Journal of Legal Studies*, 8(3), 89-104.

Guidelines and Regulations

- Department of Health. (2020). *National Guidelines on Hospital Licensing and Mandatory Quality Accreditation Standards*. Government Publishing Office.
- World Health Organization. (2021). *Regulatory Frameworks for Health Services Quality and Patient Safety: A Policy Guide*. Geneva: WHO Press.