Justitia Jurnal Hukum, Vol 10, Issue (2), 2026: 301-317
ISSN: P-2579-9983, E-ISSN: 2579-6380
DOI: https://doi.org/10.30651/justitia.v10i2.33497

Reconstructing Judicial Reasoning to Prosecute Corporate Extortion in Consumer Contracts Through the Noetic Tech Triumvirate

Septika Dinah Lestari[1*], Kelik Wardiono[2]

[1,2] Muhammadiyah University of Surakarta, Indonesia
*Corresponding author: c100230457@ums.ac.id

Article history
Received : June 03, 2026
Accepted : September 21, 2026
Published : October 01, 2026

Abstract

This study examines the structural imbalance within consumer relations highlighting the detrimental impact of exoneration clauses strictly prohibited by Article 18 of Law Number 8 of 1999 concerning Consumer Protection. The research critically analyzes the legal reasoning embedded within Decision Number 772 Pdt.Sus BPSK 2025 PN Jkt.Brt regarding a utility meter replacement dispute. Employing a noetic doctrinal legal method, the investigation applies a triadic spiral model combining Bayani Burhani and Irfani epistemological nodes to evaluate both normative texts and empirical trial realities. The judicial review conducted by the West Jakarta District Court exclusively examined the formal administrative authority of the Consumer Dispute Resolution Agency without testing the substantive validity of the contested exoneration clause. This purely formalistic approach generated profound substantive, procedural, and protective legal gaps, stripping the resulting decision of moral legitimacy in safeguarding consumer dignity. To address this critical judicial failure, the study proposes a reconstructed model of legal consideration grounded in the Noetic Tech Triumvirate framework. The systemic integration of Data Dignity, Digital Conscience, and Digital Honesty mandates courts to actively assess structural inequalities and identify any abuse of circumstances acting as a fundamental defect of will during contract formation. This ethical analytical instrument guarantees that future judicial reasoning achieves formal legal validity while simultaneously preserving the absolute dignity of the human subject within modern administrative and digital ecosystems.

Keywords: Noetic Law; Exoneration Clause; Noetic Tech Triumvirate; Consumer Protection; Ratio Decidendi.

INTRODUCTION

Commercial transactions inherently feature a profound structural asymmetry, placing business entities in a dominant position regarding access to capital and market information. This structural inequality enables business actors to impose standard contracts containing exoneration clauses designed to arbitrarily absolve them of criminal and civil responsibility (Mouttotos, 2022). Consumers facing these predetermined clauses occupy a vulnerable take-it-or-leave-it position, severely diminishing the fundamental principle of freedom of contract set out in Article 1320 of the Civil Code. Persistent unequal bargaining power often undermines the essence of free agreement and systematically weakens consumers' right to receive accurate and complete information across trade sectors. Recognizing this severe structural vulnerability, the state enacted Article 18 of Law Number 8 of 1999 concerning Consumer Protection, which explicitly prohibits exoneration clauses and imposes severe criminal sanctions for violations. The statutory framework declares such clauses null and void to protect the primary consumer right to compensation and protect them from predatory corporate extortion guaranteed by law. The legislative design established the Consumer Dispute Resolution Agency to provide a fast and affordable forum to oversee the inclusion of standard clauses and enforce effective penal protection (Durovic & Willett, 2023).

The Noetic Law paradigm views this contractual inequality not merely as an economic issue but as a severe ontological inversion and a criminogenic phenomenon (Durovic & Poon, 2023). This inversion occurs when human beings are structurally reduced to mere objects serving administrative systems and predatory corporate business interests. The formalistic application of rules strips the law of its ethical function to protect human dignity and shifts the judicial focus exclusively toward procedural certainty rather than substantive justice and criminal accountability. Evaluating consumer disputes requires examining the moral legitimacy underlying norm implementation rather than stopping at formal validity testing. Positive legal norms inherently lose their absolute validity when their strict application produces outcomes extremely contrary to fundamental principles of justice and inadvertently legalizes economic extortion and corporate crime (Rieländer, 2025).

This profound normative conflict materialized in the dispute between the management of PT Permatagriya Asri and a residential unit owner concerning the mandatory replacement of digital electrical meters. The apartment management unilaterally imposed the cost of replacing the electrical meter from the older system to the newer network on all unit owners through a standardized handover report and

a prepaid order form. The corporate management used the threat of power outages as a coercive instrument constituting a clear act of corporate extortion, leaving consumers with the false choice of accepting the arbitrary replacement cost or losing access to a primary human need. The Jakarta Consumer Dispute Resolution Agency initially granted the consumer's demands on February 5, 2025, by requiring the management to cease billing and refund the imposed payments. The West Jakarta District Court subsequently overturned this substantive decision on October 6, 2025, through Decision Number 772 Pdt Sus BPSK 2025 PN Jkt Brt. The presiding judge argued that the dispute was a regular civil matter, deliberately ignoring the clear elements of corporate criminal coercion and falling outside the consumer protection agency's jurisdiction.

The district court's reasoning creates severe legal gaps between theoretical norms and empirical realities across three distinct dimensions (De Elizalde, 2025). The court created a substantial gap by deliberately avoiding the mandatory validity test of the exoneration clause, which could be declared null and void by law, and exposing corporate mens rea. A procedural gap emerged when the judge refused to utilize the explicit authority granted by Article 6 paragraph 5 of Supreme Court Regulation Number 1 of 2006 to examine the core substance of the dispute. The decision left a protection gap as the case was transferred to the general court system, permanently blocking consumer access to fast and affordable justice, thereby protecting the corporate entity from penal scrutiny. This formalistic approach prioritizes rigid procedural compliance over substantive justice and fundamental human dignity. Legal research paradigms that rely exclusively on positivistic approaches routinely produce court decisions with formal validity but without guaranteeing substantive fairness. Noetic law serves as a critical penal policy framework, positioning the legal system as a primary instrument for safeguarding human dignity by integrating normative, empirical, and ethical dimensions. This paradigm analyzes legal problems through a continuous spiral methodology, using Bayani, Burhani, and Irfani epistemological nodes to ensure judicial reasoning meets both procedural mandates and absolute ethical requirements for prosecuting modern corporate extortion.

Recent scholarly investigations into exoneration clauses and consumer protection indicate a profound paradigm shift moving beyond basic freedom of contract toward rigorous testing of substantive fairness and strict protection for parties in vulnerable bargaining positions. In their 2022 publication, AI in Search of Unfairness in Consumer Contracts: The Terms of Service Landscape, in the Journal of Consumer Policy, Lagioia et al. analyze the distinct characteristics of unfair clauses in business-to-consumer contracts using digital contract data and artificial intelligence frameworks (Lagioia et al., 2022). The study identifies multiple categories of clauses potentially generating systemic injustice, including explicit limitation of liability provisions. These empirical findings demonstrate that consumer protection-related

issues transcend the mere existence of formal consent to terms and conditions by directly implicating the substantive fairness of clauses drafted by business actors and their immediate impact on contractual equilibrium. The research conducted by Lagioia and colleagues establishes a critical foundation requiring liability limitation clauses to undergo comprehensive fairness testing, particularly when consumers are left with inadequate opportunities to negotiate standard contract provisions.

Monye's 2022 research, A Ray of Hope for Consumers in Nigeria as Exemption Clauses Slide Towards Extinction, published in the International Journal on Consumer Law and Practice, offers a highly specific perspective on exoneration clauses (Monye, 2022). Monye positions exoneration clauses as a fundamental problem in business-to-consumer relationships because consumers generally lack the institutional capacity to negotiate terms and predictably accept standard contracts unilaterally formulated by business entities. The investigation evaluates the progressive regulation of exoneration clauses in Nigeria through dual mechanisms encompassing statutory interventions and evolving judicial decisions while establishing comparative baselines with approaches in the United Kingdom and India. The study reveals that consumer protection against exoneration clauses develops simultaneously through statutory limits on provisions that harm consumer interests and through strict judicial interpretation doctrines that restrict their practical application. This research shows that regulating exoneration clauses is a vital instrument to correct severe bargaining imbalances, not merely a matter of contractual freedom between equal parties.

Dawwas provides a vital comparative perspective regarding the definition, form, and validity of exoneration clauses in the 2023 study Exemption Clauses: A Comparative Review of the UNIDROIT Principles and the Qatar Civil Code published in the Uniform Law Review (Dawwas, 2023). The research juxtaposes the UNIDROIT Principles of International Commercial Contracts with the Qatar Civil Code to assess how these complex provisions operate in judicial practice. A critical aspect of Dawwas's analysis establishes that the freedom of contracting parties to determine contractual content is never seen as an absolute right. Article 7.1.6 of the UNIDROIT Principles mandates that clauses limiting or excluding liability for nonperformance become unenforceable when their application creates a grossly unfair situation that contradicts the agreement's fundamental purpose. The strict validity of an exoneration clause depends on its contextual operational consequences for the parties rather than its mere presence in a written contract. While Dawwas's investigation deliberately excludes specific consumer contracts due to the inherent scope of the UNIDROIT Principles, the research provides an indispensable conceptual foundation for understanding the absolute boundaries of validity and enforceability of exoneration clauses across general contract law.

Existing scholarly literature predominantly analyzes exoneration clauses through civil liability frameworks, artificial intelligence fairness detection models, and international commercial frameworks, without addressing the critical intersection of corporate extortion and criminal liability. Prior studies consistently evaluate the administrative control of standard contracts without providing an integrated penal instrument to detect corporate mens rea in asymmetrical digital consumer disputes. Empirical investigations into how traditional courts inadvertently legalize corporate economic extortion through mandatory utility meter replacements remain largely absent from contemporary penal discourse. This scholarly deficit becomes especially apparent when judges use formalistic civil arguments to protect dominant corporations from criminal scrutiny. Addressing this profound analytical void requires a rigorous normative evaluation of judicial reasoning using the Noetic Tech Triumvirate framework to ensure criminal courts effectively prosecute structural coercion while preserving fundamental human dignity.

Addressing these complex structural anomalies requires an advanced penal policy framework capable of dismantling rigid formalistic jurisprudence that normalizes corporate crimes. This study aims to develop a progressive judicial reasoning model using the Noetic Tech Triumvirate to systematically prosecute corporate extortion hidden in modern consumer contracts. Constructing this universal penal framework demands a rigorous empirical anchor to expose the catastrophic failures of contemporary mechanical adjudication. This research strategically evaluates Decision Number 772 Pdt Sus BPSK 2025 PN Jkt Brt as a critical microcosm of the global jurisprudential crisis in which traditional courts actively validate coercive corporate extortion under the guise of procedural certainty. Positioning this national court ruling as an extreme empirical case study highlights the urgent need for adjudicators worldwide to prioritize criminal accountability and substantive human dignity over technical jurisdictional boundaries. Synthesizing these advanced doctrinal paradigms establishes a universally applicable penal policy capable of dismantling systemic corporate exploitation across modern digital ecosystems.

METHODS

This research employs a noetic doctrinal legal method structured around a triadic spiral model that views the law as both a rigid normative system and a penal instrument for prosecuting corporate extortion while strictly protecting human dignity (Marzuki, 2019). This advanced jurisprudential paradigm positions the researcher as a deeply engaged subject consciously aligning with the absolute achievement of structural equity against corporate exploitation. The methodological framework conducts analysis circularly across three distinct epistemological nodes encompassing Bayani, Burhani, and Irfani frameworks. The Bayani node rigorously examines established penal norms and evaluates the judge's explicit ratio decidendi

as the theoretical *das sollen* on corporate criminal liability. The Burhani dimension actively tests these normative assumptions against concrete trial realities to expose severe legal gaps and identify structural elements of economic coercion and corporate extortion. The Irfani node culminates the analytical progression through an overarching moral falsification process designed to detect corporate mens rea by applying the Noetic Tech Triumvirate principles encompassing Data Dignity, Digital Conscience, and Digital Honesty (Rijadi, 2022).

The core analytical process relies entirely upon secondary data systematically obtained through comprehensive library research. Primary legal materials constituting the foundation of this study include Law Number 8 of 1999 concerning Consumer Protection, the Indonesian Penal Code, Supreme Court Regulation Number 1 of 2006, the Indonesian Civil Code, and the specific text of Decision Number 772 Pdt Sus BPSK 2025 PN Jkt Brt. Essential supporting documents reinforcing the empirical analysis encompass the disputed Minutes of Handover and the mandatory prepaid KWH Meter order forms imposed upon the consumer as direct instruments of corporate coercion (Ariawan, 2013). The investigation supplements these primary sources with secondary legal materials, including authoritative Noetic Law literature and contemporary scientific journals analyzing corporate criminal liability, economic extortion, and penal protection dynamics. The methodological structure systematically classifies all gathered materials into quasi-data, normative reality data, and non-legal data to facilitate precise penal analytical mapping.

The researchers subsequently subject this categorized information to a continuous spiral analysis, executing a rigorous moral falsification process designed to produce a comprehensive penal policy reconstruction. This reconstructive objective guarantees that the resulting judicial model possesses both formal legal validity and absolute moral legitimacy. The study further strengthens the applied Noetic Tech Triumvirate framework by integrating comparative analyses of international corporate crime literature with the established doctrine of *misbruik van omstandigheden* from the Dutch legal tradition to demonstrate the absence of genuine consent under economic duress. Executing the analytical stages sequentially through the Bayani, Burhani, and Irfani epistemological nodes ultimately produces an advanced penal reconstruction model of judicial consideration capable of prosecuting corporate extortion and preserving human dignity within modern asymmetric contractual disputes.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Judicial Complicity in Corporate Extortion

Mechanical jurisprudence consistently strips the law of its structural social context and transforms the judiciary into a sterile administrative apparatus prioritizing procedural technicalities over substantive equity and criminal accountability. The Bayani epistemological framework demands a rigorous textual examination of the ratio decidendi to expose how judicial logic is often weaponized to maintain asymmetrical power dynamics and conceal corporate crimes. Decision Number 772 Pdt Sus BPSK 2025 PN Jkt Brt illustrates a catastrophic systemic failure where the court actively insulated a dominant corporate entity from penal statutory scrutiny. The presiding judge constructed a highly restrictive formalistic argument that aggressively categorized the conflict regarding the mandatory replacement of digital electrical meters as a pure civil default (Pałka et al., 2025). This narrow positivist interpretation successfully severed the dispute from its structural corporate extortion context and unilaterally annulled the prior substantive decision rendered by the Jakarta Consumer Dispute Resolution Agency. The judicial reasoning for this verdict reflects a rigid obsession with absolute procedural certainty while systematically blinding itself to the fundamental power disparity marking the relationship between the corporate apartment management and the individual residential unit owner.

Bypassing this crucial substantive examination contravenes the absolute prohibitions established under Article 18 of Law Number 8 of 1999 concerning Consumer Protection, which carries explicit criminal sanctions. This provision is intended to eradicate abusive standard contracts designed to unilaterally shift corporate responsibilities onto vulnerable consumers through structural extortion. The disputed handover report and the mandatory prepaid electrical order form functioned identically as coercive standard contracts containing explicit illicit exoneration clauses. The apartment management used these predetermined documents to arbitrarily impose the full financial burden of upgrading the electrical infrastructure on the residents while simultaneously insulating itself from any legal liability for service interruptions (Brenncke, 2024). The national legislature explicitly affirms that such exoneration clauses possess zero legal validity and must be declared null and void from their inception. The failure of the West Jakarta District Court to apply this mandatory statutory nullification represents a severe abdication of judicial duty. The judge actively shielded a corporate entity utilizing illegal contractual mechanisms to perpetrate economic extortion upon a captive consumer market. This judicial evasion demonstrates a fundamental misunderstanding of consumer protection philosophy, which explicitly requires courts to actively intervene and correct severe structural imbalances rather than passively enforcing criminally unconscionable standard agreements (Runge et al., 2023).

Applying the Burhani epistemological perspective exposes the extreme dissonance between the sterile judicial text and the oppressive empirical reality

documented during the trial proceedings (Mišćenić et al., 2023). The factual matrix surrounding the digital electrical meter replacement dispute reveals a systemic pattern of corporate coercion and the undeniable actus reus of economic extortion the district court has entirely overlooked. The apartment management maintained an absolute monopoly over the distribution of essential electrical utilities within the residential complex. This monopolistic control was strategically used for economic extortion. The management deployed explicit threats of immediate power outages to compel unit owners to sign the standardized handover documents and pay the arbitrary replacement costs. This extreme power disparity obliterated any possibility for genuine negotiation or equitable contractual bargaining. The consumer faced an impossible dilemma: either submit to illicit financial extortion or suffer the catastrophic loss of a fundamental human necessity (Mucha, 2025).

The classical civil law illusion of freedom of contract absolutely disintegrates under such extreme coercive conditions. The consent extracted from the unit owners lacked genuine intent and arose solely from structural duress. This precise factual scenario flawlessly embodies the progressive legal doctrine of abuse of circumstances widely recognized in civil law jurisprudence as *misbruik van omstandigheden*. Within a penal context, this progressive legal doctrine serves as the primary evidentiary instrument to prove corporate mens rea, showing that a dominant party systematically and maliciously exploited a weaker party's economic necessity or absolute dependency to secure an unconscionable illicit advantage. The corporate management explicitly recognized the absolute dependency of the residents on the electrical grid and mercilessly exploited this vulnerability to force compliance with an illicit contractual modification. The district court had a clear jurisprudential duty to apply this doctrine to invalidate the standard contract on the basis of a severe defect of will and to flag the presence of corporate criminality (Grundmann & Badenhoop, 2023). The judge's refusal to acknowledge this blatant abuse of circumstances demonstrates a severe analytical deficiency and a dangerous judicial complicity in normalizing structural corporate extortion. The court treated the physical signatures on the standard forms as pure manifestations of free will while dismissing the coercive, criminogenic environment that produced them. This systemic judicial blindness toward empirical power dynamics effectively transforms the court from a sanctuary of justice into a formalistic enforcer of corporate dominance (Razavi, 2024).

The extreme dissonance between the formalistic ratio decidendi and the oppressive empirical reality generates three fatal legal gaps that irreparably compromise the integrity of the judicial decision. The first critical failure is a substantial gap that arises from the judicial refusal to test the exoneration clause's validity against established public policy and mandatory penal consumer protection laws. By categorizing the dispute as a pure civil matter, the judge deliberately

insulated the illicit contractual provisions from mandatory statutory scrutiny. This specific judicial maneuver allowed an explicitly prohibited exoneration clause to survive legal challenge and continue inflicting financial harm upon the consumer (Ginestri, 2026). The court essentially validated a standard contract that the national legislature had already explicitly declared null and void. This substantial gap weakens the entire consumer protection structure by signaling to business actors that they can circumvent mandatory criminal prohibitions simply by framing abusive practices as standard civil agreements. The judicial reasoning systematically dismantled the protective shield the Consumer Protection Law had meticulously constructed, leaving the residential unit owner entirely exposed to predatory corporate conduct (Serafin, 2023).

The second critical failure is a procedural gap that enabled a severe evasion of judicial authority specifically granted by supreme judicial regulations. The presiding judge stubbornly refused to exercise the explicit statutory authority provided by Article 6, paragraph 5 of Supreme Court Regulation Number 1 of 2006. This specific procedural regulation was deliberately designed to empower district courts to move beyond mere administrative reviews and directly examine the core substance of consumer disputes originating from the Consumer Dispute Resolution Agency. The Supreme Court established this regulation to prevent the exact kind of formalistic avoidance practiced in Decision Number 772 Pdt Sus BPSK 2025 PN Jkt Brt. The absolute refusal to refer to this procedural mandate constitutes a deliberate judicial choice to prioritize technical jurisdictional boundaries over the absolute pursuit of substantive justice and the prosecution of corporate crimes (Hulmák, 2022). The judge possessed the legal tools required to dismantle the abusive contract and restore equity to the consumer but consciously chose to leave those vital instruments unused. This procedural gap illustrates a profound jurisprudential stagnation where lower courts actively resist applying progressive procedural mechanisms designed specifically to rectify structural power imbalances in modern commercial transactions (Cortés, 2010).

The third, and potentially most devastating, failure is a protection gap that annihilates the fundamental philosophy underlying alternative consumer dispute resolution mechanisms. The national legislature established the Consumer Dispute Resolution Agency specifically to provide vulnerable consumers with a fast, accessible, and highly affordable forum to challenge corporate abuses without navigating the notoriously complex and expensive general civil court system. The original agency decision correctly identified the structural abuse of the exoneration clause and ordered the management to immediately cease billing and refund all illicitly collected payments (Namysłowska, 2025). The district court decision to entirely overturn this substantive ruling based strictly on formal jurisdictional grounds destroyed this vital protective mechanism. Transferring the dispute back into the general civil litigation environment imposes an insurmountable procedural and

financial burden upon the individual consumer. This judicial action effectively weaponizes the complexity of the formal legal system against the weaker party, ensuring the corporate entity can use its vastly superior financial resources to exhaust the consumer through protracted litigation and successfully evade penal scrutiny (Reich & Micklitz, 2014).

This protection gap alienates citizens from the justice system and reinforces a dangerous societal perception that the formal legal apparatus exists exclusively to protect entrenched corporate interests at the expense of fundamental human rights (Howells, 2017). Bayani and Burhani's comprehensive evaluation of this decision exposes a catastrophic ontological failure within the prevailing legal paradigm. Decision Number 772 Pdt Sus BPSK 2025 PN Jkt Brt represents a dangerous regression into mechanical jurisprudence where the rigid application of formal rules completely eclipses the ethical imperative to protect human dignity. The judge's explicit ratio decidendi maintained procedural illusions while validating extreme corporate coercion and explicitly prohibited exoneration clauses. This specific court ruling illustrates the severe limitations of traditional positivist legal approaches when confronting modern asymmetric commercial disputes characterized by absolute structural dependency. The systematic judicial failure to connect normative prohibitions with the empirical reality of abuse of circumstances requires a radical paradigm shift in consumer dispute adjudication. Integrating this profound critical evaluation seamlessly aligns with the rigorous intellectual standards required for global legal discourse, ensuring that localized judicial failures are systematically elevated into a universal discourse on the absolute necessity of substantive penal policy reform.

The Noetic Tech Triumvirate Model

Overcoming the catastrophic failures of mechanical formalism requires a profound epistemological evolution that transcends rigid textualism and sterile empirical observation. The Irfani epistemological framework provides the spiritual and intuitive dimension needed to awaken the judiciary's moral consciousness when confronting structural corporate extortion. Traditional legal positivism deliberately severs adjudication from ethical reflection and treats the law as a closed mathematical system devoid of human consequences. Relying exclusively upon formalistic interpretations allows judges to hide behind technical jurisdictional boundaries while validating unconscionable contracts that shield corporate entities from criminal accountability (Lee et al., 2026). Reconstructing judicial reasoning demands an active forensic moral compass capable of piercing through the formal veil of standardized documents to evaluate the true human cost of economic exploitation and detect latent corporate criminality. The Noetic Tech Triumvirate is an essential universal framework designed to guide adjudicators across global jurisdictions through the

complex ethical landscape of modern digital and utility consumer disputes. This progressive penal policy model integrates three interconnected pillars: Data Dignity, Digital Conscience, and Digital Honesty to systematically dismantle predatory contractual arrangements and restore substantive penal equity to the judicial process (Pascal, 2025).

The first foundational pillar of the Noetic Tech Triumvirate is Data Dignity, which addresses the profound power imbalance marking modern transactions involving automated infrastructure and digital utility management systems. In contemporary residential environments, essential services such as electricity and water are increasingly mediated through proprietary digital meters and automated billing algorithms controlled entirely by corporate management entities. Individual consumers are stripped of any meaningful control over their operational environment and are forced to accept unilateral technological upgrades laden with abusive financial terms, constituting a digitized form of economic extortion (Dari-Mattiacci & Marotta-Wurgler, 2022). Data dignity asserts that human beings interacting with automated utility systems retain an inherent moral worth that cannot be commodified or subordinated to corporate profit maximization. This principle rejects the dystopian notion that captive consumers can be treated as mere operational variables or passive revenue generators burdened with the unilateral costs of infrastructure modernization. When corporate entities weaponize digital utility systems to extract coercive fees under the threat of service termination, they violate the core principles of data dignity and fulfill the actus reus of corporate extortion. Adjudicators referring to this pillar must recognize that technological modernization cannot be legally decoupled from fundamental human rights and equitable treatment. The judiciary is mandated to treat consumer data and utility interactions as protected spheres of human autonomy, shielding individuals from predatory algorithmic and contractual manipulation designed to facilitate corporate crimes (Hillman, 2017).

Building on this ethical foundation, the second pillar, Digital Conscience, demands a radical psychological transformation in the judicial mindset when presiding over criminalized commercial litigation. Judges must abandon the comforting illusion of passive neutrality when presiding over litigation characterized by extreme structural asymmetries between corporate monopolies and individual citizens. Neutrality that protects the oppressor while abandoning the oppressed is not justice but a profound betrayal of the judicial oath and a complicit act in corporate extortion. Digital conscience requires adjudicators to actively cultivate an internal moral awareness that immediately flags unconscionable power dynamics and unconstitutional standard terms as empirical evidence of corporate mens rea (Özsöker, 2024). This active conscience compels the judge to look beyond the physical signatures on a standard handover form and interrogate the coercive environment that artificially produced those signatures. When a corporate entity exploits an

absolute monopoly over essential utilities to force compliance through threats of power outages, a judge guided by digital conscience cannot dismiss the dispute as a simple civil default. The judiciary is ethically obligated to acknowledge the pervasive atmosphere of structural duress and recognize that formal consent obtained through economic extortion is entirely legally void and warrants immediate penal scrutiny. Mandating a robust digital conscience transforms the courtroom from a mechanical enforcer of corporate dominance into a judicial entity that protects human dignity against systemic economic crimes (Korobkin, 2003).

The third pillar of the Noetic Tech Triumvirate, Digital Honesty, mandates absolute transparency and uncompromising truthfulness in evaluating standard commercial contracts. Modern corporate practice relies heavily on legal fictions such as the classical doctrine of freedom of contract to legitimize standard agreements that never involve negotiation with the weaker party. Digital honesty strips away these deceptive formalistic fictions and strictly requires corporate entities to demonstrate genuine good faith and fair dealing in their contractual relationships. This pillar requires courts to subject nonnegotiable standard forms and exoneration clauses to the most rigorous forensic scrutiny rather than granting them presumptive legal validity. Under the principle of digital honesty, corporate management can no longer hide behind complex exclusionary language designed to shift operational liabilities onto unsuspecting consumers and evade criminal prosecution. If a contractual provision attempts to immunize a business entity from the consequences of its own administrative failures while imposing arbitrary financial burdens on residents, digital honesty exposes the provision as an illicit abuse of power and an instrument of criminal concealment (Patterson, 2010). This radical transparency ensures that the legal system ceases to validate deceptive contractual mechanisms and instead upholds only those agreements characterized by mutuality, honesty, and reciprocal respect, free from extortionate intent (Harder, 2024).

Operationalizing the Noetic Tech Triumvirate involves revitalizing and modernizing the progressive civil law doctrine of abuse of circumstances, traditionally known as *misbruik van omstandigheden,* and transforming it into a critical evidentiary tool for penal inquiries. While classical jurisprudence often restricted this doctrine to extreme cases of personal incapacity or severe financial distress, the Triumvirate expands its application to contemporary corporate environments defined by structural dependencies. Modern consumers residing in managed apartments or using centralized utility networks are left in a state of permanent structural dependency on corporate infrastructure providers. When a dominant entity exploits this dependency to impose unconscionable contractual modifications, it abuses the circumstances, vitiates genuine consent, and creates the structural duress necessary to prove economic extortion (Mende et al., 2024). The Noetic Tech Triumvirate gives

judges the explicit theoretical justification to apply this progressive doctrine without fear of accusations of judicial activism. By anchoring the invalidation of abusive contracts in the universal ethical imperatives of data dignity, digital conscience, and digital honesty, adjudicators can confidently dismantle unlawful exoneration clauses and come up with appropriate penal sanctions. This doctrinal operationalization bridges the dangerous gap between abstract normative prohibitions and actionable judicial remedies, ensuring that statutory consumer protections are vigorously enforced in every courtroom (Bublienė & Selvestravičiūtė, 2022).

Integrating this advanced tripartite model into international consumer jurisprudence fundamentally alters the trajectory of legal conflict resolution in an increasingly digitized world. The universal applicability of the Noetic Tech Triumvirate ensures that courts across diverse legal traditions can effectively counter the rising tide of predatory corporate practices that exploit structural vulnerabilities and weaponize civil contracts to commit corporate crimes. Adopting this progressive framework prevents national judiciaries from facilitating corporate abuse and restores the law's foundational purpose as an instrument of human emancipation. The model's comprehensive theoretical elaboration meets the rigorous scholarly demands for universally applicable penal policies by offering an innovative jurisprudential solution to a pervasive global crisis. By fusing Irfani intuition with robust doctrinal mechanics, the Triumvirate empowers judges to look past the cold text of unconscionable standard contracts and deliver absolute substantive justice and corporate criminal accountability to the citizens they are sworn to protect.

CONCLUSION

Mechanical jurisprudence and rigid legal formalism inflict severe structural injuries upon modern legal systems by separating statutory interpretation from empirical socioeconomic realities. Through the integrated application of Bayani and Burhani epistemological frameworks, the critical evaluation of Decision Number 772 Pdt Sus BPSK 2025 PN Jkt Brt exposes a profound ontological failure within contemporary adjudication. When courts categorize coercive utility contracts and abusive exoneration clauses as mere civil defaults, they actively insulate dominant corporate entities from mandatory penal statutory scrutiny under Article 18 of the Consumer Protection Law. This formalistic avoidance mechanism triggers substantial procedural and protective gaps that systematically strip vulnerable consumers of legal recourse while normalizing extreme corporate coercion, economic extortion, and monopolistic exploitation as legitimate business practices.

Overcoming this persistent jurisprudential stagnation requires a radical epistemological evolution that infuses legal reasoning with forensic rigor and ethical criminal accountability. The Irfani-inspired Noetic Tech Triumvirate model establishes an indispensable universal penal policy framework for modern consumer

and digital utility disputes. By institutionalizing Data Dignity, Digital Conscience, and Digital Honesty, this progressive framework empowers adjudicators to delve deeper into deceptive formalistic fictions of freedom of contract to expose latent corporate criminality. It forces the judiciary to confront structural power asymmetries and recognize that consent extracted under the threat of utility termination constitutes a severe defect of will and clear evidence of corporate mens rea warranting the immediate invalidation of the agreement and the initiation of criminal prosecution under the modern doctrine of abuse of circumstances.

The transition from mechanical positivism to substantive penal adjudication determines whether the legal apparatus serves as a shield for human dignity or an enforcer of corporate dominance. Integrating the Noetic Tech Triumvirate into international consumer jurisprudence ensures that national courts stop passively facilitating predatory economic crimes. By fusing rigorous doctrinal mechanics with profound moral consciousness, this study successfully elevates a localized judicial controversy into a universal blueprint for substantive penal policy reform. This comprehensive synthesis provides an actionable pathway toward a more just, equitable, and human-centric legal order capable of prosecuting modern corporate extortion across global digital ecosystems.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors express their profound gratitude to the Muhammadiyah University of Surakarta and MY University Islamabad for providing the essential institutional support and academic resources required to conduct this comprehensive legal and philosophical research. Special appreciation is directed toward the Consumer Dispute Resolution Agency and the West Jakarta District Court for granting access to the critical case documents fundamental to this study. The researchers also extend their sincere thanks to the anonymous reviewers and the editorial board of Justitia Jurnal Hukum for their rigorous intellectual critiques that significantly elevated the substantive depth and analytical precision of this manuscript..

REFERENCES

Ariawan, I. G. K. (2013). Metode Penelitian Hukum Normatif. *Kertha Widya*, *1*(1).

Brenncke, M. (2024). A Theory of Exploitation for Consumer Law: Online Choice Architectures, Dark Patterns, and Autonomy Violations: M. Brenncke. *Journal of Consumer Policy*, *47*(1), 127–164.

Bublienė, D., & Selvestravičiūtė, A. (2022). European Consumer Law Rationale in Light of New Challenges. *Teisė*, *125*, 56–71.

Cortés, P. (2010). *Online dispute resolution for consumers in the European Union*. Taylor &

Francis.

Dari-Mattiacci, G., & Marotta-Wurgler, F. (2022). Learning in standard-form contracts: Theory and evidence. *Journal of Legal Analysis*, *14*(1), 244–314.

Dawwas, A. (2023). Exemption clauses: a comparative review of the UNIDROIT Principles and the Qatar Civil Code. *Uniform Law Review*, *28*(1), 20–36.

De Elizalde, F. (2025). Fragmenting consumer law through data protection and digital market regulations: The DMA, the DSA, the GDPR, and EU consumer law. *Journal of Consumer Policy*, *48*(3), 355–389.

Durovic, M., & Poon, J. (2023). Consumer Vulnerability, Digital Fairness, and the European Rules on Unfair Contract Terms: What Can Be Learnt from the Case Law Against TikTok and Meta? M. Durovic, J. Poon. *Journal of Consumer Policy*, *46*(4), 419–443.

Durovic, M., & Willett, C. (2023). A legal framework for using smart contracts in consumer contracts: machines as servants, not masters. *The Modern Law Review*, *86*(6), 1390–1421.

Ginestri, M. (2026). *The Consequences of the Unfairness of Contract Terms in Business-to-Consumer Contracts: A Study of Directive 93/13/EEC in the Context of Foreign Currency Loans*.

Grundmann, S., & Badenhoop, N. (2023). Foreign Currency Loans and the Foundations of European Contract Law–A Case for Financial and Contractual Crisis? *European Review of Contract Law*, *19*(1), 1–36.

Harder, S. (2024). The territorial scope of Australia's unfair contract terms provisions. *The University of Queensland Law Journal*, *43*(2), 227–260.

Hillman, R. A. (2017). Consumer internet standard form contracts in India: A proposal. *National Law School of India Review*, *29*(1), 70–85.

Howells, G. G. (2017). The European Union's influence on English consumer contract law. *Geo. Wash. L. Rev.*, *85*, 1904.

Hulmák, M. (2022). The consequences of unfair terms in consumer contracts. *The Lawyer Quarterly*, *12*(1).

Korobkin, R. (2003). Bounded rationality, standard form contracts, and unconscionability. *U. Chi. L. Rev.*, *70*, 1203.

Lagioia, F., Jabłonowska, A., Liepina, R., & Drazewski, K. (2022). AI in Search of Unfairness in Consumer Contracts: The Terms of Service Landscape: F. Lagioia et al. *Journal of Consumer Policy*, *45*(3), 481–536.

Lee, K., Bart, Y., & Cauffman, C. (2026). Consumer vulnerability within digital platforms as service ecosystems. *Journal of Services Marketing*, *40*(3), 285–302.

Marzuki, P. M. (2019). *Penelitian Hukum* (Cetakan Ke). Kencana.

Mende, M., Bradford, T. W., Roggeveen, A. L., Scott, M. L., & Zavala, M. (2024). Consumer vulnerability dynamics and marketing: Conceptual foundations and future research opportunities. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, *52*(5),

1301–1322.

Mišćenić, E., Tereszkiewicz, P., & Infantino, M. (2023). The interplay between the CJEU and national courts in the case law on unfair contract terms in foreign currency loans: a comparative overview. *European Review of Contract Law*, *19*(4), 346–374.

Monye, F. N. (2022). A Ray of Hope for Consumers in Nigeria as Exemption Clauses Slide towards Extinction. *IJCLP*, *10*, 42.

Mouttotos, N. (2022). Control of unfair terms under Cypriot contract law. *Liverpool Law Review*, *43*(2), 311–338.

Mucha, J. (2025). 13 Protection of financial consumers in the EU against unfair contract terms in foreign currency loans. *Financial Inclusion Law and Over-Indebtedness*.

Namysłowska, M. (2025). The silent death of EU consumer law and its resilient revival: Reinventing consumer protection against unfair digital commercial practices. *Journal of Consumer Policy*, *48*(3), 317–336.

Özsöker, G. (2024). Tüketici Sözleşmelerinde Usûle İlişkin Haksız Şartlar. *Ankara Üniversitesi Hukuk Fakültesi Dergisi*, *73*(1), 251–308.

Pałka, P., Porębski, A., Pałosz, R., & Wiśniewska, K. (2025). Do foreign service providers simply ignore the EU consumer law? An empirical study of 100 online terms of service. *Journal of Consumer Policy*, *48*(3), 233–268.

Pascal, M. (2025). Consumer protection against unfair contract terms: a comparative analysis between Moldovan law, Armenian law and European law. *Competitivitatea Şi Inovarea În Economia Cunoaşterii*, 790–797.

Patterson, M. R. (2010). Standardization of standard-form contracts: competition and contract implications. *Wm. & Mary L. Rev.*, *52*, 327.

Razavi, S. M. (2024). Consumer Protection Against Unfair Contract Terms in the Age of Smart Contracts. *Scientific Journal of Law and Modern Studies*, *5*(1), 1–40.

Reich, N., & Micklitz, H.-W. (2014). The court and sleeping beauty: the revival of the Unfair Contract Terms Directive (UCTD). *Common Market Law Review*, *51*(3).

Rieländer, F. (2025). Policing consumer contract terms under US and EU law: A comparative analysis of the directive 93/13/EEC on unfair terms in consumer contracts and the Restatement of Consumer Contracts. *German Law Journal*, *26*(5), 766–789.

Rijadi, J. E. and P. (2022). *Metode Penelitian Hukum Normatif Dan Empiris, 2nd ed.* Prenada Media Group.

Runge, J., Wentzel, D., Huh, J. Y., & Chaney, A. (2023). "Dark patterns" in online services: a motivating study and agenda for future research. *Marketing Letters*, *34*(1), 155–160.

Serafin, R. (2023). The Court of Justice on Unfair Terms and Supplementation of the Contract: How Far Is Too Far? *EUCML*, *12*(4), 150–158.