

**CONSUMER RIGHTS PROTECTION IN GROUP ORDER PRACTICES: LEGAL ANALYSIS OF SELLER LIABILITY****Diva Rafi Anjani<sup>1\*</sup>, Ayun Novita Wulandari<sup>2</sup>, Alifiana Arif Rahmah Aulia<sup>3</sup>**<sup>1,2,3</sup>Faculty of Law, Universitas Mulawarman, Samarinda, Indonesia<sup>1</sup>divarafi315@gmail.com<sup>1\*</sup>, ayunnovita072@gmail.com<sup>2</sup>, alifianaarh07@gmail.com<sup>3</sup>

## Abstract

This study analyzes legal protection for consumers and seller liability in the practice of Group Order (GO), a collective ordering mechanism popular in the digital era but often gives rise to problems such as default, delays, non-conforming goods, and fraud. Using normative legal research methods through analysis of the Civil Code, Commercial Code, Consumer Protection Law, and expert doctrines, this study assesses the legal relationship between GO admins, sellers, and consumers as a contractual relationship that gives rise to rights and obligations. Forms of default include non-delivery of goods, goods not as described, or unjustified delays. Both sellers and GO admins can be held accountable and consumers have the right to obtain compensation, refunds, or settlement through the BPSK or litigation channels. This study emphasizes the need for strengthening regulations and supervision so that GO practices are more transparent, accountable, and able to provide legal certainty for consumers.

Keywords: Commercial Law, Consumer Rights Protection, Group Order, Default, Seller's Liability

**INTRODUCTION**

The development of popular culture and the increasing intensity of social media use in the digital era have given birth to so many innovations in various aspects of life, especially in the business sector, one of the most popular innovations is the Group Order phenomenon or commonly called GO. Group Order (GO) is a practice of collective ordering mechanisms carried out by an organizer, either an individual or a group, to facilitate the purchase of certain products or goods such as certain goods that are usually only available abroad or on certain platforms. This phenomenon is very popular among modern society, especially in the K-Pop and Japanese fan communities. For these communities, GO is a means to obtain exclusive merchandise, limited edition albums, to fandom products (fan communities) that are difficult to access through conventional channels. The popularity of GO has enormous benefits including providing accessibility to purchase desired goods to the efficiency of shipping costs.

However, the development of business practices Group orders are not entirely smooth sailing, with numerous reports of GO-related issues emerging over time. One common issue is default, including delayed goods that do not match estimates, items that do not match descriptions or photos, damaged goods, and even cases of fraud by irresponsible GO providers. Contract ambiguity, a lack of formal transaction evidence, including check-out reports (transaction receipts), and legal relationships built solely on trust between parties can leave consumers vulnerable to losses. These issues become even more complex if GO providers lack business legality or fail to fulfill administrative obligations as business actors generally do, leading to legal uncertainty regarding who should be held responsible in the event of a dispute or default.

To overcome these problems, commercial law and civil law are present as guidelines for resolving problems that arise in trade practices. Group Order (GO). Civil law specifically regulates obligations and breaches of contract, as stipulated in the Civil Code (KUHPer), including the rights and obligations of parties in conducting sales transactions. Meanwhile, commercial law will serve as a guideline for understanding the provisions regarding electronic transactions and consumer protection, and will form the basis for the rules for relations between business actors and consumers in the modern trade space. Thus, the benefits of analyzing seller liability and consumer rights protection in Group Order (GO) practices can provide legal certainty while encouraging the creation of healthy, safe, transparent, and accountable trade.

**RESEARCH METHODS**

This paper uses a normative legal research method or doctrinal research, which is an approach that relies on a literature study of applicable legal norms, both those written in laws and regulations and in doctrines and court decisions. This method was chosen because the main focus of the discussion is the analysis of seller liability and consumer rights based on the positive legal principles applicable in Indonesia, such as the Civil Code (KUHPer), the Commercial Code (KUHD), the 1945 Constitution, as well as various implementing regulations and relevant international conventions. This research also refers to the opinions of commercial law experts, such as Ahmad Ichsan (1976), Munir Fuady (1995), and Prof. Subekti (1980), who provide in-depth interpretations of commercial law related to the definition of commercial law, regulations governing trade and commerce mechanisms, the rights and responsibilities of business actors, and regulates how to handle problems that arise in trade practices.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION****Rights and Obligations of Sellers and Buyers According to Positive Law**

In the Civil Code, a sales and purchase agreement covers the rights and obligations of the seller and buyer. A sales and purchase agreement is a form of economic transaction that has a strong legal basis in the Civil Code (KUHPerdata). In the Civil Code, a sale and purchase is an agreement in which the seller binds himself to the obligation to deliver an item, and the buyer binds himself to the obligation to pay the price of the item in cash. Sales and purchases are regulated in Articles 1457 to 1590 of the Civil Code. There are general principles, rights, and obligations of the seller and buyer in a sales and purchase agreement in these articles. According to the Civil Code (KUHPerdata), a sales and purchase agreement is considered valid if it meets the elements and requirements of a valid agreement according to the Civil Code:

1. **Agreement:** The parties making the agreement must agree, the agreement must be serious and in good faith from both parties.
2. **Legal capacity:** The parties entering into an agreement must possess legal capacity. This means having the capacity to enter into an agreement. This can be influenced by age, mental condition, and certain legal circumstances.
3. **Certain cause:** An agreement is made with a valid reason to do so. This reason must not violate the law or morality.
4. **A lawful cause:** In an agreement, the object of the agreement must be legally valid and transferable. The object of the agreement must not be contrary to law or morality.

When entering into an agreement, the parties involved must ensure there is agreement, legal capacity, a specific cause, and a lawful cause. These elements are crucial for the validity and enforceability of an agreement under Indonesian civil law. By fulfilling the aforementioned elements and conditions, the parties can ensure that the sale and purchase agreement has a strong legal basis for effective and mutually beneficial implementation.

In addition to the elements and conditions of a valid agreement, there are also rights and obligations of the parties in a sale and purchase agreement according to the Civil Code. Rights are the authority granted to an individual or group to do something or obtain something. Rights can be defined as a legally recognized demand to do or not do something, or to obtain something. Rights can be distinguished between civil rights and natural rights. Meanwhile, obligations are responsibilities that must be carried out by an individual or group where the action is mandated by law and is expected to be carried out or avoided by the individual or certain party. Obligations can be legal, contractual, moral, or social, and failure to fulfill these obligations will result in legal sanctions.

**The seller's rights according to the Civil Code are:**

1. The right to receive payment in accordance with the agreement made by the seller and buyer (Article 1457 of the Civil Code)
2. The right to goods sold until the buyer pays in full, known as the right of retention or right of ownership (Article 1458 of the Civil Code)

**The seller's obligations according to the Civil Code are:**

1. Obligation to deliver goods to the buyer in accordance with the agreement that has been made
2. agree (Article 1459 of the Civil Code)
3. Obligation to guarantee the quality of goods sold (Article 1467 of the Civil Code)
4. Obligation to provide evidence or a receipt to the buyer as proof of the transaction (Article 1467 of the Civil Code)

**Buyer's rights according to the Civil Code:**

- a) The right to receive goods in accordance with the contents of the agreed agreement (Article 1473 of the Civil Code).
- b) The right to demand compensation if the goods do not comply with the agreed specifications, the buyer has the right to demand compensation (Article 1484 of the Civil Code)
- c) The right to postpone payment if the goods do not match what was agreed upon, the buyer can postpone payment or renegotiate the selling price (Article 1503 of the Civil Code)

**Buyer's obligations according to the Civil Code:**

1. The buyer's payment obligation is to pay the selling price according to the agreement (Article 1493 of the Civil Code)
2. Obligation to receive goods and pay according to the agreement (Article 1474 of the Civil Code)
3. Obligation to provide proof or receipt of payment (Article 1493 of the Civil Code)

The validity and validity of a sales and purchase agreement are very important as stipulated in the Civil Code, such as a serious agreement between the seller and the buyer, good faith to avoid elements of fraud or cheating in the agreement, complying with provisions regarding objects, prices, and legal capacity, the importance of the legal capacity of the parties which is an important factor in determining the validity of the agreement, and the relationship with civil law in Indonesia (Mondoringin, 2023).

**Views on Law No. 8 of 1999 concerning Consumer Protection**

UU no. 8 of 1999 concerning Consumer Protection is the main basis for protecting consumer rights in Indonesia. The existence of this Law is to ensure legal certainty to provide protection to consumers from dishonest trade practices from sellers. Consumer protection is based on benefits, justice, balance, consumer security and safety, as well as legal certainty. The importance of understanding how Law no. 8 of 1999 Article 3 Paragraph 5 is applied in commercial law practice in Indonesia. This article reads "To increase the awareness of business actors regarding the importance of consumer protection so that an honest and responsible attitude in business develops" (UU NO. 8, 1999).

This law provides fundamental rights to consumers, such as the right to obtain concrete information on the goods and services they will purchase, the right to be protected from unsafe or dangerous products, the right to file complaints and obtain compensation, and the right to receive education and information regarding consumer protection. This law stipulates obligations for parties such as producers, distributors, and traders to ensure that the goods and services they offer comply with expected safety and quality standards and to provide clear and accurate information to consumers. This law also regulates procedures for resolving disputes between consumers and business actors, either through mediation, arbitration, or litigation.

Law No. 8 of 1999 also stipulates the role of the Consumer Protection Supervisory Agency and the public in overseeing unfair or detrimental business practices for consumers. The rule of law is intended to protect violated consumer rights and also regulates sanctions for businesses that violate consumer protection provisions, such as fines, revocation of business licenses, or criminal charges according to the severity of the violation (Maysela, VA, & Yusuf, H, 2024).

**Digital contracts/freedom of contract**

Electronic contracts are contracts that emerged as a result of advances in technology and information, allowing sales and purchase transactions to be conducted electronically. Electronic contracts can also be classified as legally binding contracts. If a business actor fails to fulfill its obligations, the consumer is entitled to compensation for losses caused by the business actor's negligence. Likewise, if the consumer fails to fulfill their obligations as stipulated in the electronic contract, the consumer is entitled to compensation (Pratama, 2024).

One indicator that demonstrates the rapid increase in consumption of goods and services is the development of national and international trade activities, characterized by the increasing flow of goods and/or services into and out of a country. Advances in science, technology, and information, as well as modern modes of transportation, provide the freedom to move goods and/or services across national borders. This situation provides many benefits for consumers, as their needs for goods and/or services can be met and consumers have the freedom to choose the type and quality of goods and/or services that suit their capabilities. From the perspective of business actors, this condition can have a negative impact on consumers. Business activities such as advertising tips, promotions, sales methods, and the implementation of standard agreements can be detrimental to consumers.

**Seller's responsibilities in trade transactions according to Indonesian laws and regulations**

The rapid development in the field of information and telecommunications has had an impact on the development of information technology which has made everyday human life easier, from basic to complex matters. The development of technology has made it easier to conduct transactions such as buying and selling transactions via the internet which are regulated by law with the principle of freedom of contract in Article 1338 Paragraph (1) of the Civil Code. In this article, the parties are free to conduct buying and selling transactions as long as they do not conflict with what is regulated in Article 1337 of the Civil Code.

Electronic commerce, commonly referred to as e-commerce, refers to buying and selling conducted online. E-commerce simplifies transactions because it's more practical and efficient. However, there are also drawbacks to online transactions, such as the use of unscrupulous individuals who engage in illegal transactions, leading to legal issues. This issue necessitates the need for consumer rights protections related to e-commerce transactions with sellers.

E-commerce is an online contract agreement based on the same principles as a regular agreement, with the only difference being the medium used to create the agreement. Agreements applicable to e-commerce must comply with Book III of the Civil Code on Contracts. Article 1233 of the Civil Code states that contracts are formed through agreement or law.

In online buying and selling, defaults are inevitable, where one factor contributes to the failure to fulfill contractual obligations. However, sometimes defaults occur because someone truly lacks the ability to fulfill their obligations or because of coercion that prevents them from fulfilling those obligations (Santoso, B., & Rahmadani, S., 2021).

Private liability related to the responsibilities of business actors is regulated in Law Number 8 of 1999 concerning Consumer Protection. Based on Articles 19 to 28, the existence of defective goods or services is not the sole basis for business actor liability (Riung, 2015).

**Forms of Default or Acts That Give Rise to Liability for the Seller**

In Group Order (GO) practice, the seller is obligated to fulfill the agreement they have made with the buyer. Failure to fulfill this obligation constitutes a breach of contract or an act that could give rise to legal liability. These breaches can arise under several circumstances.

1. The seller fails to deliver the ordered goods, either through negligence or intent. If the seller fails to deliver the goods within the promised timeframe, this constitutes a breach of contract, as the buyer has made payment and is entitled to receive the goods on time.
2. The goods delivered do not conform to the agreement: for example, they are of a different type, of inferior quality, or of an incomplete quantity. This non-conformity constitutes a failure to fulfill the obligations stipulated in Article 1239 of the Civil Code.
3. The seller delays delivery without justifiable reason, such as intentionally **delaying** without notice. Delays that cannot be objectively accounted for constitute negligence and may result in losses for the buyer.
4. Actions such as losing goods, embezzling payment funds, or providing false information are actions that give rise to liability under the unlawful act (PMH) as stipulated in Article 1365 of the Civil Code. These actions not only violate the agreement but also cause direct harm to the buyer.

Thus, GO sellers can be held legally liable if they engage in actions that violate contractual obligations or general legal norms. Buyers have the right to seek compensation, rescind the agreement, or fulfill the obligations under applicable regulations.

**Dispute Resolution Mechanism**

Although GO is often conducted informally through social media, legally, the binding relationship between the seller or GO organizer and the buyer remains a legal agreement between the business actor and the buyer as a consumer. Therefore, several dispute resolution mechanisms regulated in Indonesian Positive Law include:

**1. Non-Litigation**

The first step that can be taken by both traders is to communicate directly between the disputing parties, this communication includes requests for clarification, refunds, or compensation. If an agreement is not reached, consumers can bring the dispute to the Consumer Dispute Resolution Agency (BPSK), BPSK is a non-litigation institution tasked with handling and resolving disputes between business actors and consumers outside of general courts (litigation). After fulfilling the requirements stipulated in the Consumer Protection Law which are specifically referred to in Minister of Trade Regulation Number 72 of 2020 concerning BPSK, BPSK will exercise its authority in carrying out the handling and resolution of consumer disputes. BPSK will provide consumer protection consultations and supervise the inclusion of standard clauses and report to general investigators if there is a violation of the provisions of the Consumer Protection Law, summon business actors suspected of violating consumer protection to present witnesses, expert witnesses, and/or any person deemed to know about violations of the Consumer Protection Law to carry out dispute resolution efforts through mediation, arbitration and conciliation.

**2. Litigation**

If the GO organizer or business actor does not comply with the BPSK decision and consumers feel seriously harmed by the business actor's lack of cooperation, litigation through the courts can be taken through a lawsuit for breach of contract under the Civil Code. At this stage, the court assesses whether the GO organizer actually violated the agreement, such as not delivering goods, delivering goods that do not match, or withholding funds without reason. GOs involving many buyers allow for the use of class action lawsuits,

especially if the losses are uniform and originate from the actions of the same organizer, such as cases of fictitious GOs or embezzlement of collective funds.

### **Application of Responsibility in Conventional Transactions**

In conventional transactions, the legal relationship between the seller and buyer occurs directly, so the seller's obligations can be clearly observed through the delivery process. The seller is obliged to deliver goods according to the promised quality, quantity, and condition. If the delivered goods are found to be non-conforming, damaged, or unusable, the seller is obligated to provide redress to the buyer. This redress can take the form of replacement of the goods, a refund, or other agreed-upon form of compensation. This settlement model aligns with the principles of propriety and good faith, which are the foundation of any contractual relationship.

In practice, common issues include late delivery of goods, specification errors, or hidden defects. These situations place the seller in the position of having to restore the original condition to the buyer. This principle of accountability is further reinforced by consumer protection regulations, which require businesses to provide accurate information and redress losses without delay. Thus, seller accountability in conventional transactions can be realized directly through communication and resolution mechanisms between the two parties.

### **Implementation of Accountability in Electronic Commerce (E-Commerce)**

Advances in information technology have brought changes to transaction patterns, but they have not altered the substance of the relationship between sellers and consumers. In electronic transactions, consumers place orders without physically seeing the goods, placing a greater responsibility on sellers to provide accurate information about the goods they offer. This principle aligns with the obligation for businesses to avoid misleading consumers and to provide clear information about the products they sell.

In e-commerce practice, seller liability is evident when a buyer receives goods that do not match the description, are damaged, or are delivered late. In these circumstances, the seller is obligated to provide a solution in the form of a replacement, refund, or appropriate compensation. Although marketplace platforms provide refund and return features, these features serve only as a technical tool to facilitate consumers, not a transfer of legal responsibility from the seller to the platform. The seller remains responsible for recovering losses. This aligns with the characteristics of electronic agreements, which remain subject to the principle of valid agreements as recognized in civil law.

The use of a shipping service in electronic transactions does not alter the seller's liability. Consumers have no contractual relationship with the shipping company, so if damage occurs during shipping, complaints are still directed to the seller. Furthermore, the seller can hold the shipping company accountable based on their agreement. This pattern demonstrates that the presence of a third party does not eliminate the seller's responsibility to the consumer.

### **Implementation of Accountability in Group Order (GO) Practice**

The group order (GO) model exhibits a more complex transaction pattern because it involves an intermediary, the GO admin, who collects orders and coordinates payments. In practice, the GO admin acts as a bridge between consumers and the primary seller. By receiving payments, managing orders, and communicating with sellers, the GO admin essentially performs the functions of a business actor. Therefore, the GO admin is responsible for ensuring that the goods received by consumers are as ordered, including in terms of quantity, condition, and completeness.

Accountability in GO is apparent when goods received are not as described, damaged, or partially undelivered. Consumers typically file complaints with the GO admin, the party directly in contact with them. The GO admin then forwards the complaint to the primary seller to resolve the issue. This pattern creates a hierarchical relationship of responsibility, but the point of redress remains with the GO admin, the party receiving the funds and managing the transaction. Thus, even though the transaction involves more parties, the principle that consumers have the right to receive goods as agreed remains the basis for implementing responsibility.

Collective shipping of goods via an expedition does not eliminate the responsibility of the GO admin or the primary seller. In the event of delays or damage, consumers can still file a claim with the GO admin. The GO admin or primary seller can then fulfill their obligations to the expedition through the pre-established contractual relationship. This pattern demonstrates that consumer protection remains a central concern in GO, as it is in other transactions.

### **Synthesis of the Application of Seller Responsibility**

Considering these various transaction patterns, seller accountability is consistent across all forms of transactions. Sellers are obligated to deliver goods as agreed, provide accurate information, and reimburse consumers for losses if the goods are not as expected or defective. Although transaction mechanisms have evolved, the underlying responsibility remains with the seller or the party receiving payment from the consumer. The existence of digital platforms, GO admins, or shipping companies is merely supportive and does not divert primary responsibility. Therefore, implementing seller accountability is a crucial element in maintaining consumer trust and ensuring fair trade practices.

### **Obstacles and Challenges in Enforcing Consumer Rights and Implementing Seller Accountability**

Enforcing consumer rights in commercial transactions still faces various obstacles, including regulatory, institutional, social, and technical aspects. Although the legal framework provides a basis for consumer protection, as stated by experts that business actors have greater responsibilities in unequal relationships, the reality on the ground shows that not all of these provisions can be implemented effectively. The development of transaction patterns through e-commerce and the group order (GO) model also adds to the complexity of implementing seller responsibilities due to the emergence of intermediaries and the variety of transaction forms that are not all clearly covered by existing legal regulations. Therefore, it is important to identify emerging obstacles so that the fulfillment of consumer rights can be optimally realized.

### **Normative Barriers and the Absence of Specific Regulations for New Transaction Models**

One of the main obstacles lies in regulatory aspects that have not fully adapted to the development of modern transactions. Current consumer protection regulations are still general and do not specifically accommodate transaction patterns involving intermediaries, such as GOs. Therefore, the responsibility relationship between consumers, GO administrators, and primary sellers is not clearly delineated. This situation creates uncertainty regarding who is obligated to recover consumer losses in the event of defective goods, delays, or mismanagement of orders. This lack of specific regulations also requires every dispute to be interpreted on a case-by-case basis based on the factual relationship between the parties, thus weakening legal certainty for consumers who are harmed.

Furthermore, transactions via social media and other informal platforms have not been fully integrated into the trade oversight system, resulting in many businesses operating without legal standing or clear business identities. This makes it difficult for consumers to file claims or complaints to demand fulfillment of seller obligations.

### **Institutional Barriers in Consumer Dispute Resolution**

The next obstacle arises from the institutional aspects of consumer protection. The Consumer Dispute Resolution Agency (BPSK), the institution that receives and resolves consumer disputes, is not yet evenly distributed across all regions and lacks strong enforcement powers. Many decisions cannot be immediately implemented because business actors are uncooperative or lack a physical presence that can be contacted. In the context of e-commerce and online transactions, this problem is exacerbated because the exact whereabouts of business actors are often unknown, making the mechanism for summoning or enforcing decisions difficult.

In addition to the BPSK, trade supervisory agencies also face limitations in reaching digital transactions that cross platforms and are not formally recorded. This limited oversight has resulted in low business compliance with consumer protection obligations, creating room for practices that are detrimental to consumers.

### **Social Barriers and Low Consumer Literacy Regarding Their Rights**

Consumers' low level of understanding of their basic rights also poses a significant challenge in enforcing consumer protection. Many consumers are unaware of their rights to appropriate goods, their right to file a complaint, and their right to seek redress when they experience losses. In online transactions, consumers tend to be passive and accept the risk of loss as part of the online transaction. This is exacerbated by a culture of reluctance to sue because the transaction value is perceived as small or because consumers feel the dispute resolution procedures are too complicated. Consumers' reliance on trust and social connections within the GO community often leaves them confused about who is truly responsible for losses—the GO admin or the primary seller. This weakens consumers' position in defending their rights.

### **Technical Obstacles in Proving and Identification of Business Actors**

Technical barriers are also a significant factor, particularly regarding the evidentiary process in digital transaction disputes. Much of the evidence consumers possess consists of screenshots, brief conversations, or incomplete product descriptions, making it difficult to verify its authenticity when brought to the dispute resolution process. The difference in evidentiary standards between conventional and electronic transactions puts consumers at a disadvantage when it comes to proving their losses.

Beyond providing proof, the identities of business actors are often unclear or even hidden. In transactions conducted through social media or online platforms, sellers or online platform administrators use informal identities without complete addresses, preventing consumers from effectively seeking redress when disputes arise. This identification difficulty prevents many consumers from proceeding with complaints, leaving their losses unaddressed.

### **Challenges of Compliance and Enforcement of Responsibilities by Business Actors**

The final obstacle relates to business compliance. Many businesses ignore consumer requests for replacements or returns, particularly in digital transactions that lack strict oversight systems. This low level of compliance is also driven by limited sanction mechanisms applied to businesses that fail to fulfill their responsibilities. In the context of GO, administrators often lack the capacity or commitment to resolve consumer claims,

particularly when items are unavailable, data entry errors occur, or the primary seller is difficult to contact.

This uncertainty in enforcing liability leaves consumers in a vulnerable position, often forced to bear losses without adequate redress. Therefore, law enforcement and consumer education efforts are crucial to balancing the relationship between businesses and consumers.

### **Synthesis of Obstacles and Challenges**

Based on the description above, the obstacles faced in enforcing consumer rights and implementing seller accountability include:

1. lack of adequate regulation: for new transaction models such as GO, the capacity of dispute resolution institutions is weak
2. low consumer understanding: regarding their rights
3. difficulties in proving and identifying business actors and low levels of business actor compliance: These obstacles as a whole indicate that consumer protection still requires strengthening in terms of regulation, supervision, and increasing consumer literacy so that fair and just trade practices can be realized.

### **CONCLUSIONS**

This study confirms that the Group Order (GO) practice, despite its popularity and ease of consumer access to certain goods, still carries significant legal risks, particularly related to default, non-conformity of goods, delays, and potential fraud. Based on an analysis of the Civil Code, Commercial Code, and Consumer Protection Law, the relationship between the GO admin, the main seller, and the consumer is a contractual relationship that gives rise to rights and obligations that must be fulfilled.

Both sellers and GO administrators essentially act as business actors, and therefore are responsible for delivering goods as agreed, providing accurate information, and reimbursing consumers for any losses they incur in the event of a violation. Consumers also have the right to compensation, refunds, settlement through the BPSK (Procurement and Distribution Agency), and even litigation.

This research shows that consumer protection still faces obstacles, including a lack of specific regulations for GO, weak dispute resolution mechanisms, low consumer literacy, and difficulties in proving and identifying business actors. Therefore, strengthening regulations, oversight, and consumer education is needed to ensure GO practices are safer, more transparent, and provide legal certainty.

### **ACKNOWLEDGMENT**

The author would like to express his gratitude to all parties who have supported the completion of this research, including fellow students at the Faculty of Law, Mulawarman University, for their constructive academic discussions, and the lecturers who provided guidance and input throughout the writing process. He also expresses his gratitude to his family and friends for their continued moral support, which enabled him to successfully complete this research.

### **REFERENCES**

- Fadhilah, R., & Arifin, Z. (2023). Pelindungan konsumen dalam model transaksi melalui perantara digital. *Indonesian Journal of Consumer Law*, 3(1), 22–40.
- Hartono, S. R. (2000). Aspek-aspek hukum perlindungan konsumen pada era perdagangan bebas. Dalam *Hukum Perlindungan Konsumen*.
- Lestari, N., & Firmansyah, T. (2022). Analisis tanggung jawab penjual terhadap kerusakan barang dalam pengiriman. *Jurnal Legislasi Indonesia*, 19(3), 312–326.

- Maysela, V. A., & Yusuf, H. (2024). Perlindungan konsumen dalam hukum dagang (Studi Undang-Undang No. 8 Tahun 1999 Pasal 3 Ayat 5 tentang perlindungan konsumen terhadap kecurangan penjual perspektif hukum positivisme). *Jurnal Intelek Insan Cendikia*, 1(5), 1442–1451.
- Mondoringin, J. F. (2023). Tinjauan hukum tentang hak dan kewajiban penjual dan pembeli dalam perjanjian jual beli menurut KUH-Perdata. *Lex Privatum*, 11(4).
- Nasution, A. (1995). *Konsumen dan hukum: Tinjauan sosial, ekonomi dan hukum pada perlindungan konsumen Indonesia*.
- Nugroho, S. A. (2008). *Proses penyelesaian sengketa konsumen ditinjau dari hukum acara serta kendala implementasinya*.
- Pratama, A. R. (2024). Perkembangan dan efisiensi penerapan kontrak elektronik pada era digital. *Jurnal Ilmiah Multidisiplin*, 2(2), 90–96.
- Pratomo, A., & Lubis, F. (2021). Perlindungan konsumen dalam transaksi perdagangan melalui sistem elektronik. *Jurnal Hukum Responsif*, 9(2), 145–162.
- Putri, R., & Sihombing, R. (2022). Peran marketplace dalam penyelesaian sengketa konsumen pada transaksi daring. *Jurnal Hukum & Pembangunan Ekonomi*, 14(2), 233–248.
- Riung, C. M. (2015). Tanggung jawab pelaku usaha terhadap kerugian konsumen dalam transaksi melalui e-commerce. *Lex Privatum*, 3(1).
- Santoso, B., & Rahmadani, S. (2021). Tantangan penegakan hak konsumen pada transaksi e-commerce di Indonesia. *Jurnal Rechtsvinding*, 10(1), 89–104.
- Sjahdeini, S. R. (2001). E-commerce tinjauan dari perspektif hukum. *Jurnal Hukum Bisnis*.
- Waskito, A., & Nurhayati. (2020). Pertanggungjawaban pelaku usaha atas barang yang tidak sesuai dalam transaksi online. *Jurnal Yuridis*, 8(1), 57–71.