



DELETION OF REGISTERED TRADEMARKS ON THE MINISTER'S INITIATIVE REGARDING THE SAPTA DARMA TRADEMARK DISPUTE (TRADE REGISTERED TRUST FLOW)

Rizky Aditya Pratama¹, Ade Adhari²

^{1,2}Faculty of Law, Tarumanagara University, Jakarta

Article Info

Received: 10/10/2025

Approve: 26/12/2025

Keywords:

Trademark Dispute, Sapta Darma, Trademark Appeal Commission, Cancellation of Registered Trademark, Minister's Initiative.

Abstract

This study discusses the authority of the Trademark Appeal Commission in the Cancellation of a Registered Trademark on the Minister's Initiative concerning the trademark dispute of Sapta Darma, which is a belief system, based on the provisions outlined in Act No. 20 Year 2016 concerning Trademarks and Geographical Indications and Government Regulation No. 90 of 2019 on Procedures for Applications, Examination, and Appeal Settlement at the Trademark Appeal Commission. In this context, the Cancellation of a Registered Trademark on the Minister's Initiative can serve as an alternative dispute resolution for trademark issues. However, there is no clear and structured guideline to serve as a reference for the administrative process of submitting such cancellation requests. The analysis results indicate that the Sapta Darma trademark meets the elements of "morality of religion" as outlined in Article 72 paragraph (7) of the Trademark Law in conjunction with Article 33 paragraph (1) of Government Regulation No. 90 of 2019, due to its similarity or resemblance to the symbol of the Sapta Darma belief system. Therefore, the Trademark Appeal Commission was correct in recommending the cancellation to the Minister, who subsequently issued a decision to cancel the trademark, as recorded on the official trademark search website of the Directorate General of Intellectual Property (DJKI). This study recommends the development of more comprehensive guidelines for the process of cancellation of registered trademarks on the initiative of the Minister, as well as enhancing public understanding of this process.

This is an open access article under the [CC BY](#) license.



Corresponding Author:

Rizky Aditya Pratama

E-mail: rizunsa@gmail.com

I. INTRODUCTION

In Indonesia, regulations related to trademarks are regulated by Law Number 20 of 2016 concerning Trademarks and Geographical Indications (MIG Law). The MIG Law also explains the legal remedies that can be carried out by third parties with interests related to registered trademarks if they are proven to violate, feel disadvantaged, or violate elements of the MIG Law. Trademarks are one element of economic activity/business ventures, therefore trademark disputes are resolved in the Commercial Court, a special court that handles cases related to trade law, including trademarks. With this, it is hoped that trademark disputes can be resolved more quickly (Saidin, 2024).

Articles 72 to 79 of the MIG Law explain the Submission of a Lawsuit to the Commercial Court regarding a Lawsuit for Deletion or a Lawsuit for Cancellation, where the Lawsuit for Deletion is based on Article 74 paragraph (1) of the MIG Law in conjunction with Constitutional Court Decision Number 144/PUU-XXI/2023 submitted to registered trademarks that have not been used for 5 consecutive years in trade activities. Meanwhile, the Lawsuit for Cancellation is submitted based on Article 76 "Lawsuits for cancellation of Trademarks are filed by interested parties based on the provisions of Article 20 and/or Article 21" of the MIG Law.

With the existence of the articles explained, it not only provides an opportunity for the public, namely third parties who feel negatively impacted by a registered brand, but also provides a means or media for resolving the brand dispute itself, in this case through litigation or judicial institutions. The interesting brand dispute to discuss is the Sapta Darma/Sapto Darma Brand dispute, where Sapta Darma is a Belief Stream recognized by the Republic of Indonesia since 1967 with reference to a letter issued by the Ampera Cabinet dated July 19, 1967 and strengthened by a letter from the Attorney General of the Republic of Indonesia dated April 8, 1972 and a Registration Certificate at the Yogyakarta District Attorney's Office dated November 12, 1976.

The Sapta Darma Belief Stream has also been registered and inventoried by the Republic of Indonesia at the Ministry of Education and Culture of the Republic of Indonesia Number I./135/F.3/NII/1980, which was issued in accordance with the Certificate of Spiritual Culture Exposure from the Directorate of Development of Belief in Belief in the One Almighty God, Director General of Culture, Ministry of Education and Culture Number P.001/F.6/No.5/1988 with the Certificate of Spiritual Culture Exposure dated November 22, 1988. In addition, the Registered Certificate No. 120/D.III.3/XI/2008 by the Ministry of Home Affairs, Director General of Kesbangpol, shows that the Sapta Darma Citizens' Association (PERSADA) has been accommodated and included in the ORGANIZATION OF BELIEF IN THE ONE ALMIGHTY GOD which was formed based on the Law of the Republic of Indonesia No. 8 of 1985 concerning Community Organizations.

Based on these facts, the Sapta Darma Faith Management filed a Trademark Cancellation lawsuit at the Surabaya Commercial Court on the basis that the Defendant registered the Sapta Darma trademark and its variants on the basis of Bad Faith with Case Number 9/Pdt.Sus-HKI/Merek/2020/PN.Niaga.Sby. Where the Defendant without the Plaintiff's permission (Sapta Darma Faith Management) registered the name and image/logo of Sapta Darma/Sapta Darma as a trademark. However, as the trial progressed, the Panel of Judges at the Surabaya Commercial Court issued a Decision stating in essence that the Plaintiff's lawsuit was unacceptable because the Defendant was not proven to have registered his Sapta Darma trademarks with elements of Bad Faith.

The settlement of the dispute through the Commercial Court was deemed not to have provided a fair decision to the Plaintiff in this case (Adherents of the Sapta Darma Belief System). The Administrators of the Sapta Darma Belief System submitted a request for the Deletion of Registered

Trademarks on the Minister's Initiative to the Minister of Law and Human Rights at the Directorate General of Intellectual Property. Based on Article 72 paragraph (6) of the MIG Law, it explains that the Deletion of Registered Trademarks on the Minister's initiative can be carried out if the Trademark Appeal Commission Council has provided a recommendation for deletion. Where the Trademark Appeal Commission is an independent special body within the ministry with the authority to carry out government activities in the legal field. In addition, it is also stated in Article 72 paragraph (7) of the MIG Law which states that the Trademark Appeal Commission has the authority to propose recommendations for the Deletion of Registered Trademarks on the Minister's Initiative based on several elements that have been determined in the MIG Law. First, the recommendation can be given if the registered trademark fulfills the element of having similarities in principle and/or as a whole with Geographical Indications that have been protected and recognized by law. Second, if the trademark is proven to contain elements that conflict with the state ideology of the Republic of Indonesia, laws, morality, religion and belief, decency, and public order. Third, if the trademark has elements that are generally similar to traditional cultural expressions, intangible cultural heritage, or names or symbols that are part of traditional traditions.

Based on the basis of this Article, the Sapta Darma Trademark dispute can be qualified as a Trademark that violates morals and religious beliefs in accordance with Article 72 paragraph (7) of the MIG Law letter b, therefore the Sapta Darma Trademark dispute is considered interesting and important to study, especially in relation to the Application for Deletion of Registered Trademarks on the Minister's Initiative through the Recommendation proposed by the Trademark Appeal Commission and what the legal implications are for the registered Sapta Darma trademark and its variants.

II. RESEARCH METHOD

The research method in this study is normative juridical. This means that this research is based on analysis by observing, thinking about and reviewing legal rules in statutes, legal doctrines, and legal principles. This research prioritizes secondary data, namely data from primary legal materials, namely legal rules or laws that are relevant to the problem and secondary legal materials that contain the views of legal experts. The first approach, with an approach to related laws (Statute Approach). The approach to legislation is a research approach by reviewing rules and or regulations (Marzuki, 2005), which are relevant or related to the problem being analyzed, namely Law Number 20 of 2016 concerning Trademarks and Geographical Indications and Government Regulation Number 90 concerning Procedures for Applications, Examination, and Settlement of Appeals at the Trademark Appeal Commission. Second, Case Approach Method (Case Approach) Approach to ongoing or completed legal disputes, processes, or events, namely in particular the Sapta Darma Trademark Dispute Case and its variants both in Commercial Court Lawsuits and Applications for Deletion of Registered Trademarks on the Minister's Initiative. By examining the views, opinions and doctrines of legal science, it is hoped

that it can produce ideas and give birth to concepts and or principles related to the problems analyzed, especially the Deletion of Registered Trademarks on the Minister's Initiative (Amiruddin & Asikin, 2005).

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 The Authority of the Trademark Appeal Commission in the Deletion of Registered Trademarks on the Minister's Initiative regarding the Sapta Darma trademark dispute and its variants

Authority (authority, gezag) is an official power derived from the law and then handed over to officials or the government, but authority (competence, bevoegheid) is related to the "onderdeel" (part) of the form of authority itself. In authority consists of authorities (rechtsbevoegdheden). Authority is part of the implementation of general law. The scope of government authority, not only includes the authority to issue government decisions (bestuur), but also includes authority related to carrying out tasks, and handing over authority as well as the division of authority stipulated in laws and regulations (Syafudin, 2000). The Trademark Appeal Commission is an independent special body within the ministry authorized to carry out government activities in the legal field with one of its functions, compiling and submitting recommendations to the Minister to carry out the removal of registered Trademarks that are proven to meet elements that are contrary to the state ideology of the Republic of Indonesia, laws, morality, religion and beliefs, decency, and public order (Article; 32 of Law No. 20 of 2016). Members of the Trademark Appeal Commission are appointed and dismissed by the Minister for a term of 3 years, where the chairman and deputy are appointed from and by the members of the Trademark Appeal Commission itself (Article 33 of Law No. 20 of 2016).

Complete provisions regarding the Trademark Appeal Commission are regulated in Government Regulation No. 90 of 2019 concerning Procedures for Applications, Examination, and Settlement of Appeals at the Trademark Appeal Commission (PP 90 of 2019). PP 90 of 2019 explains in more detail the duties and functions of the Appeal Commission. First, the Trademark Appeal Commission is obliged to receive, examine, and resolve Appeal Applications against rejections of Trademark registration applications, especially based on substantive reasons for rejection. Second, the Trademark Appeal Commission is also authorized to receive, examine, and decide on Appeal Applications against objections to rejections of Trademark extension applications. Third, the Trademark Appeal Commission functions to submit recommendations for the Deletion of Registered Trademarks on the Minister's Initiative if they meet certain elements. Fourth, the Trademark Appeal Commission also has the responsibility to receive, examine, and decide on Appeal Applications against rejections of applications for registration of Geographical Indications which are intellectual property protection against the geographical origin of a product (Article 9 of PP No. 90 of 2019).

In addition to this, the Trademark Appeal Commission has other special powers which are also very important, namely, conducting examinations, studies and proposing recommendations to the Minister regarding the Application for Deletion of Registered Trademarks on the Minister's Initiative which can be used as an alternative resolution of trademark disputes. As explained in Article 72 paragraph (7) of the MIG Law in conjunction with Article 33 paragraph (1) of PP 90 of 2019, the Trademark Appeal Commission in submitting recommendations for the Deletion of Registered Trademarks on the Minister's Initiative can be implemented if the registered trademark: First, has fulfilled the elements of having similarities in principle and/or in their entirety with Geographical Indications that have been protected and legally recognized. Second, if it is proven that the trademark has elements that are contrary to the ideology of the Republic of Indonesia, laws, morality, religion and beliefs, decency, and public order. Third, if a trademark has elements of similarity in its entirety with traditional cultural expressions, intangible cultural heritage, or names or symbols of hereditary traditions.

The ex officio authority was previously regulated within the authority of the DJKI itself, where the legitimacy of this authority is needed so that the government does not have difficulty in dealing with trademark problems that have already been registered based on the old provisions and legal system (Soelistyo, 2017). This explanation is in accordance with the Attribute Authority theory which explains that, Attribute Authority comes from the division of powers stipulated in legislation, government organizations receive this responsibility directly through the provisions of certain articles in legislation (Ridwan, 2010). The implementation of attribute authority is carried out directly by the apparatus or agency listed in its basic regulations. Responsibility and accountability for attributive authority are fully attached to the officials or agencies mentioned in the regulations (Winanmo, 2008).

The Deletion of Registered Trademarks on the Minister's Initiative can be used as an Alternative for Trademark Dispute Resolution not only because it has been regulated in the MIG Law but also has several advantages compared to the Trademark Dispute Resolution in general which goes through litigation. The Deletion of Registered Trademarks on the Minister's Initiative has several advantages including low cost (free), a relatively faster process, private (not open to the public), and more effective. In line with this, Marc Galenter in his Theory of Justice In Many Rooms states that justice does not always have to be achieved through judicial institutions, but can be obtained through forums or other dispute resolution institutions according to needs (Triana, 2019).

Currently, dispute resolution through litigation or the courts, particularly through the Commercial Court for trademark disputes, is often very time-consuming and expensive, but not always effective for the parties. The hope is that the public will obtain legal certainty and true justice effectively and efficiently. Alternative Dispute Resolution is a method of resolving disputes other than through the courts and aims to produce benefits for all parties involved (Salmon et al., 2025).

M. Yahya Harahap explains that there are several key factors underlying the importance of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) in resolving legal issues. First, the increasingly complex business world requires faster and more efficient solutions. Second, criticism often arises of judicial institutions, which are considered less responsive to evolving legal dynamics. Third, the traditional justice system is sometimes unable to provide effective solutions due to lengthy processes and high costs, which often fail to address the core of the problem. Furthermore, judges are perceived as having only general abilities and may lack the specialized skills needed to resolve certain disputes. Negative statements or perceptions about the court's image often further undermine public trust in the justice system. Finally, efforts to prevent disputes before they occur can be a strategic step to reduce the potential for future conflict by creating a more conducive atmosphere for more peaceful and efficient problem resolution (Harahap, 1996).

From the explanation above, the Application for Removal of Registered Trademarks on the Minister's Initiative can be said to be in line with the Alternative Theory of Dispute Resolution based on Expert Assessment. Expert Assessment is an opinion from experts related to technical matters in accordance with the expected specific field of expertise. The role of expert assessment is also needed as a view to see problems related to a dispute resolution process that requires certain expertise (Masruchiyah, 2018). This is strengthened by the provision that the Trademark Appeal Commission consists of senior (main) Trademark Examiners and Experts in the field of Trademarks as members so that it can be ensured that the Trademark Appeal Commission Panel consists of experts in the field of Trademarks themselves (Article 2 of PP No. 90 of 2019). So that the Appeal Commission in submitting recommendations for the Removal of Registered Trademarks on the Minister's Initiative based on the request from the Minister can be said to be an Expert Assessment. Where in proposing recommendations, the Appeal Commission conducts research in the form of a study on the registered Trademark whose Removal is requested. The examination is carried out within a maximum period of 3 (three) months calculated from the request by the Minister is received. In the results of the examination of the Trademark for which the deletion request does not fulfill the elements in Article 72 paragraph (7) of the MIG Law in conjunction with Article 33 paragraph (1) of PP 90 of 2019 above, the Appeal Commission proposes that the deletion recommendation not be carried out, and vice versa. If it is proven to fulfill the provisions in the article, the Appeal Commission will submit a recommendation for deletion to the Minister.

It can be said that the Authority of the Trademark Appeal Commission regarding the Application for Deletion of Registered Trademarks on the Minister's Initiative against the Sapta Darma Trademark and its variants, is a form of Alternative Trademark Dispute Resolution in the form of recommendations based on Expert Assessment of the examination and study conducted by the Trademark Appeal Commission itself which is based on the provisions of Article 72 paragraph (7) of the MIG Law in conjunction with Article 33 paragraph (1) of PP 90 of 2019 which is given to the

Minister which contains a recommendation to issue an Official Decision on Deletion or not to delete the registered Trademark Sapta Darma and its variants.

Based on the explanation above, we can see that the authority of the Trademark Appeal Commission in the Deletion of Registered Trademarks on the Minister's Initiative can be used as an alternative resolution of trademark disputes in the form of an Expert Opinion from the Appeal Commission Panel itself. However, neither the MIG Law nor PP 90 of 2019 contains or provides a detailed explanation regarding the procedures, requirements, and/or detailed guidelines for third parties (applicants) in submitting applications for Deletion of Registered Trademarks on the Minister's Initiative. This lack of clarity creates confusion and limited information for third parties (applicants) who wish to submit applications for Deletion of Registered Trademarks on the Minister's Initiative, due to the lack of comprehensive and structured guidelines as a reference in the administrative process. Therefore, there is a need for further regulatory provisions or instructions that can provide clarity for interested parties, so that this procedure can run more openly, efficiently, and in line with the principles and provisions of applicable regulations..

3.2 Legal Implications of the Deletion of Registered Trademarks on the Minister's Initiative regarding the Sapta Darma Trademark Dispute and its Variants

According to Satjipto Rahardjo, legal protection is an effort to protect an individual's rights by handing over the rights or authority to act on his behalf (Rahardjo, 2012). Philipus M. Hadjon explains two forms of legal protection theory, namely, the first is preventive legal protection where an individual or society as a legal subject has the opportunity to express objections or views before a government decision becomes definitive or permanent. The main purpose of this legal protection is to prevent disputes. Preventive legal protection is needed for a government based on freedom of will, where preventive legal protection supports the government to always be careful in making every decision based on its authority. Legal protection is generally structured as written legislation so that it is binding and results in penalties that must be given to those who violate it.

Next, repressive legal protection is specifically used to resolve disputes. This type of legal protection is administered through the District Courts and Administrative Courts in Indonesia. Legal protection against government policies is fundamentally rooted in the recognition and protection of human rights. The recognition and protection of human rights aims to limit and impose obligations on society and the government itself (Hadjon, 1987).

Based on the explanation of the Legal Protection theory, it is then linked to how the legal implications of the Removal of Registered Trademarks on the Minister's Initiative against the Sapta Darma brands that are requested to be removed can be said that it is a form of repressive Legal Protection where the Administrators or Leaders of the Sapta Darma Belief Sect submit an Application

for Removal of Registered Trademarks on the Minister's Initiative to the Minister which is a form of government action in recognizing and protecting the rights of Followers of the Sapta Darma Belief Sect. We have previously known that, Sapta Darma is in fact the name of the official Belief Sect and is recognized by the State of Indonesia. If we look at Article 72 paragraph (7) of the MIG Law in conjunction with. Article 33 paragraph (1) of PP 90 of 2019 further explains that the Sapta Darma brand has fulfilled the elements in letter b, namely "contrary to the ideology of the Republic of Indonesia, laws, morality, religion and beliefs, decency, and public order" especially "religious morality" this clearly fulfills the criteria of the view expressed by Philipus M. Hadjon regarding preventive legal protection.

In line with this, Endang Purwaningsih emphasized that legal protection for trademarks is crucial for several reasons. First, legal protection provides assurance and certainty for inventors, owners, or trademark holders, allowing them to feel secure and respected in their intellectual property rights. Second, this protection serves as a preventative measure to prevent infringement or misuse of trademark rights by irresponsible parties. Furthermore, trademark protection also provides broad benefits to society by encouraging more businesses or individuals to register their trademarks (Purwaningsih, 2013).

Decision in Case Number 9/Pdt.Sus-HKI/Merek/2020/PN.Niaga.Sby. at the Surabaya Commercial Court which stated that the registration of the Sapta Darma brand and its variants did not contain elements of Bad Faith. This is not entirely wrong, considering that in the arguments of the lawsuit the Plaintiff (Management of the Sapta Darma Belief Sect) used the elements of Bad Faith as stated in Article 76 paragraph (1) in conjunction with Article 21 paragraph (3) of the MIG Law. Where in fact, the Plaintiff in the arguments of his lawsuit used the basis of Article 20 letter a which states "contrary to the ideology of the Republic of Indonesia, laws, morality, religion and beliefs, decency, and public order".

In further explanation of Article 21 paragraph (3) of the MIG Law, it is explained: "An applicant with bad intentions" is an individual or someone who is reasonably suspected or suspected when applying for registration of his trademark intends to imitate, piggyback, or copy another registered trademark in order to benefit his business, thereby creating unfair business competition, deceiving, or confusing consumers. " So from this explanation it can be said, the context of using Article 21 paragraph (3) of the MIG Law as the basis for a cancellation lawsuit is to cancel or strike out a registered trademark that has similarities and is deliberately registered to imitate, plagiarize or copy another party's trademark that has been registered first. This is clearly very irrelevant when associated with Sapta Darma as the name of a belief system which is not a registered trademark.

In line with this, Henry Soelistyo stated that someone with bad intentions is generally reflected in their actions of copying, piggybacking, or imitating another brand, including registering a similar brand with the DJKI. Brands that have similarities in principle or similarity have the potential to mislead

or confuse consumers. Such actions, if carried out intentionally (by purpose), are considered to be in bad faith and are feared to disrupt public order (Soelistyo, 2007).

There is a more relevant article to be used as the basis for the lawsuit for the Cancellation of the Sapta Darma Trademark and its variants by the Plaintiff, namely, Article 20 letter a of the MIG Law which states that a Trademark cannot be registered: "contrary to the state ideology of the Republic of Indonesia, laws, morality, religion and beliefs, decency, and public order". This explains that if a registered trademark violates these provisions it will clearly disturb public order or morality. For example, the sign of the cross, the shape of a mosque, a temple or other religious symbols are used for a brand. It is unimaginable if these signs are used for underwear products, carpets that are stepped on every day, including sandals or socks (Indriyanto & Yusnita, 2017).

The use of religious terms in a product can be considered inappropriate. As explained in Article 20 letter a, a brand that conflicts with religious beliefs is defined as a word, symbol, image, or shape that could harm the feelings and peace of certain religious communities, and is feared to cause chaos or unrest in society. Therefore, this article was formulated to anticipate the occurrence of chaos among religious communities (Indriyanto & Yusnita, 2017).

Based on these explanations, the Application for the Deletion of Registered Trademarks on the Minister's Initiative for the Sapta Darma Trademark and its variants has fulfilled the provisions of the elements in Article 33 paragraph (1) letter b of PP 90 of 2019, namely: The Appeal Commission submits a recommendation to the Minister to delete registered Trademarks related to the results of the assessment which if it produces the fact that a Trademark: "is contrary to the ideology of the Republic of Indonesia, laws, morality, religion and beliefs, decency, and public order."

The Trademark Appeal Commission, in this case the body established by law, has the authority to examine and review the Application for Deletion of Registered Trademarks on the Minister's Initiative, and to propose recommendations to the Minister to issue a Decision to delete the Sapta Darma Trademark and its variants from the list of registered Trademarks as referred to in the provisions of Article 72 paragraph (7) and Article 72 paragraph (8) of the MIG Law.

However, like any other state administrative decision, it is not free from errors or mistakes due to abuse of power. The MIG Law provides an instrument or means for registered trademark owners who object to the Decision to Delete a Registered Trademark on the Minister's Initiative. They can file a lawsuit with the State Administrative Court. They can then proceed to the next stage of the appeal process at the Supreme Court if they still object to the State Administrative Court's decision (Soelistyo, 2007).

Comparison Table of Sapta Darma Symbols and Brands

Symbol of the Sapta Darma Belief	Some examples of Sapta Darma Brands
	 SAPTA DARMA Registration Number: IDM000634724 (TM) Dihapuskan Atas Prakarsa Menteri
	 APOTEK SAPTO DARMO Registration No: IDM000971411 (TM) Dihapuskan Atas Prakarsa Menteri
	 SAPTO DARMO Registration Number: IDM000634723 (TM) Dihapuskan Atas Prakarsa Menteri

If we look at the comparison of the Sapta Darma Belief Symbol with several examples of Sapta Darma Brand variants registered above. It is clear that there are similarities and or similarities in terms of image elements, colors, and wording or names. In addition, the Ministerial Decree on the Sapta Darma brand and its variants on the recommendation of the Trademark Appeal Commission shows its Executorial nature where the decision to Delete the Brands is effective at the time the Ministerial Decree is issued. We can see from the search for registered brands on the official website of DJKI <https://pdki-indonesia.dgip.go.id/search> the results of the legal implications of the Delete of Registered Brands on the Minister's Initiative regarding the Sapta Darma brand dispute and its variants make the status of the brands "Deleted on the Minister's Initiative".

IV. CONCLUSION

Based on the discussion, it can be concluded that the authority of the Trademark Appeal Commission in the Removal of Registered Trademarks on the Minister's Initiative regarding the Sapta Darma trademark dispute and its variants has been regulated in Law Number 20 of 2016 concerning Trademarks and Geographical Indications and Government Regulation No. 90 of 2019 concerning Procedures for Applications, Examination, and Settlement of Appeals at the Trademark Appeal Commission. It is known that the Removal of Registered Trademarks on the Minister's Initiative can be used as an Alternative for Resolving Trademark Disputes. Until now, there have been no provisions, regulations, or instructions that explicitly explain the comprehensive and structured guidelines as a reference in the administrative process of the application for Removal of Registered Trademarks on the Minister's Initiative.

The Sapta Darma brand clearly fulfills the elements in Article 72 paragraph (7) of the MIG Law in conjunction with Article 33 paragraph (1) of PP 90 of 2019, namely "religious morality". Where the Sapta Darma brand clearly has similarities and/or similarities in terms of image elements, colors, and wording or names with the Sapta Darma Belief Symbol. Therefore, the Trademark Appeal Commission should properly propose a "Deletion" recommendation as stated in Article 72 paragraph (8) of the MIG Law to the Minister. And based on this recommendation, the Minister issued a Decision to delete the Sapta Darma brand and its variants, which in fact we can see on the official DJKI website <https://pdki-indonesia.dgip.go.id/search> which explains that the status of these brands is "Deleted on the Minister's Initiative".

In order to improve the quality of DJKI services, especially the Trademark Appeal Commission as an institution appointed by law with the authority to examine, review, research and propose recommendations for the Deletion of Registered Trademarks on the Minister's Initiative, there are several suggestions that can be considered. First, the Ministry of Law through the Directorate General of Intellectual Property should continue to improve supervision and improve services for trademark registration applications, especially those related to the state ideology of the Republic of Indonesia, laws, morality, religion and beliefs, decency, and public order. This is to prevent the recurrence of trademark registrations related to religion or beliefs which will certainly cause chaos and disrupt public order in general. Second, it is currently necessary to prepare clearer and more structured guidelines regarding the administrative procedures for applications for Deletion of Registered Trademarks on the Minister's Initiative, so that the process is more transparent and easier to follow by applicants. And Third, DJKI, the Trademark Appeal Commission and related parties need to increase socialization regarding the procedure for Deletion of Registered Trademarks on the Minister's Initiative, especially to trademark holders or parties involved in trademark disputes, so that more parties are aware of their rights and obligations..

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Book

- Agung Indriyanto & Irnie Mela Yusnita, Legal Aspects of Trademark Registration, Jakarta: Rajawali Pers, 2017
- Amiruddin and Zainal Asikin, Introduction to Legal Research Methods, Jakarta: Raja Grafindo, (2004)
- Endang Purwaningsih, Intellectual Property Rights, Traditional Knowledge, and Folklore, Surabaya: Jenggala Pustaka Utama, 2013
- Harly Clifford Jonas Salmon, et al., Alternative Law for Dispute Resolution, Bandung, Widina Media Utama, 2025
- Henry Soelistyo, Bad Faith in Trademark Law (Yogyakarta: Maharsa, 2017)
- Hery Firmansyah, Legal Protection of Trademarks, Yogyakarta: Pustaka Yustisia, 2011
- OK Saidin, Legal Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights, Depok: Rajawali Pers, 2023
- M. Yahya Harahap, Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) is the Answer to the Future of International Trade Dispute Resolution, paper, National Seminar on Business Law, Faculty of Law, UKSW, Salatiga, 1996
- Nieke Masruchiyah, Settlement of Construction Contract Disputes Through Arbitration & APS, Depok: Rajawali Pers, 2018
- Nita Triana, Alternative Dispute Resolution: Alternative Dispute Resolution Using Mediation, Arbitration, Negotiation, and Conciliation Models (Yogyakarta: Kaizen Sarana Edukasi, 2019)
- Nur Basuki Winanrno, Abuse of Authority and Criminal Acts of Corruption, Laksbang Mediatama, Yogyakarta, 2008
- Philipus M. Hadjon, Legal Protection for the Indonesian People, Surabaya: PT. Bina Ilmu, 1987
- Peter Mahmud Marzuki, Legal Research, Jakarta: Kencana, (2005)
- Ridwan HR, State Administrative Law, Rajawali Pers, Jakarta, 2010
- Satjipto Rahardjo, Legal Studies, Bandung: Citra Aditya Bakti, 2012

Journal

- Ateng Syafrudin, Towards the Implementation of Clean and Responsible State Governance, Pro Justisia Journal, Edition IV, Bandung, Parahiyangan University, 2000

Legislation

- Law Number 20 of 2016 concerning Trademarks and Geographical Indications
- Government Regulation No. 90 of 2019 concerning Procedures for Application, Examination, and Settlement of Appeals at the Trademark Appeal Commission

Surabaya Commercial Court. Decision Number 9/Pdt. Sus-HKI/Merek/2020/PN.Niaga.Sby. Saekoen Partowijono Against Judo Setyo Wardojo and the Ministry of Law and Human Rights of the Republic of Indonesia cq. Directorate General of Intellectual Property cq. Directorate of Trademarks and Geographical Indications (2020).

Website

<https://pdki-indonesia.dgip.go.id/search> accessed October 4, 2025