



Challenges in Competition Law Enforcement Against Data Monopoly in Indonesia's Digital Economy

Nada Ulya Qinvi^{1*}, Nurul Laylan Hsb²

Institut Bakti Nusantara¹, Jambi University²

*Corresponding author's email: nadaqinvi88@email.com

Abstract

The rapid development of the platform economy has positioned data as a strategic asset that determines competitiveness. However, the massive data control by large-scale digital platforms raises concerns about data monopoly practices that may hinder innovation and create barriers to market entry. Law Number 5 of 1999 concerning the Prohibition of Monopolistic Practices and Unfair Business Competition was enacted before the digital economy era; thus, the relevance of its norms needs to be reassessed in addressing big data issues. This research aims to analyze the qualification of massive data control as a dominant position and formulate adaptive competition law policy recommendations in the digital era. The research methodology employed is normative juridical with a statute approach, conceptual approach, and comparative approach. The research findings indicate that normatively, massive data control can be qualified as a dominant position because it creates market dependency and network effects. Data monopoly in the platform economy requires a new legal approach that is not solely based on price indicators but also on data accessibility. Legal policies are needed to incorporate Digital Market Power clauses in the revision of the Competition Law. This includes dominant position criteria measured not only by market share but also by massive data control and user dependency on the platform.

Keywords: *Law Enforcement, Competition Law, Data Monopoly, Digital Economy.*

Introduction

The development of digital technology has fundamentally transformed the global economic landscape, including in Indonesia. The digital economy era, characterized by the dominance of digital platforms, has created new business models that differ significantly from the conventional economy. Digital platforms such as marketplaces, social media, online transportation services, and various other applications have become important infrastructure connecting millions of users with goods and service providers. This transformation has not only changed how society conducts transactions but has also created complex market dynamics with unique characteristics, particularly regarding the control and utilization of big data.

The platform economy constitutes economic activities that occur within digital platforms, such as companies that utilize various methods to leverage online platforms to connect buyers with sellers. The platform economy operates based on the principle of network effects, where the platform's value increases exponentially as the number of users grows. In this context, data becomes a strategic asset with a central role in maintaining and strengthening the dominant position of platform business actors. Data collected from user activities can range from consumption preferences and behavioral patterns to personal information that can be processed into high-value business insights. The control of big data enables platforms to refine algorithms, improve predictions of user behavior, personalize services, and ultimately create high barriers to entry for new competitors. Platforms that control large amounts of data can leverage it to strengthen their dominant position, creating nearly impenetrable entry barriers for new competitors, especially for startups and MSMEs that do not have access to data on a similar scale. This phenomenon creates serious concerns about healthy business competition, as it may lead to data-based monopoly practices that potentially harm consumers, small businesses, and innovation in the digital market.

Indonesia has established a competition law framework through Law Number 5 of 1999 concerning the Prohibition of Monopolistic Practices and Unfair Business Competition. This law was enacted in the pre-digital era and designed to regulate business competition practices in the context of a conventional economy based on traditional parameters such as market share control, production capacity, and physical assets. However, after more than two decades in effect, Law Number 5 of 1999 is considered no longer adequate in addressing modern economic challenges, particularly the phenomenon of dual role digital platforms that pose competition risks not adequately regulated, such as data-based anti-competitive behavior and algorithmic discrimination. Article 25 of Law Number 5 of 1999 regulates the abuse of dominant position with criteria that a business actor has a dominant position if they control 50% or more of the market share for one type of goods or services, or if two or three business actors control 75% or more of the market share. However, in the context of the digital

Challenges in Competition Law Enforcement Against Data Monopoly in Indonesia's Digital Economy

platform economy, determining dominant position can no longer rely solely on traditional market share parameters. Companies with big data will possess significant market power, and this situation can form a monopoly position through discrimination against certain parties. The control of big data by digital platforms creates new complexity in assessing dominant position. Big data can enable a business actor possessing it to monopolize the market and hold a dominant position, potentially leading to abuse of dominant position.

One case demonstrating the relevance and urgency of data monopoly issues in Indonesia occurred in January 2025 when the Business Competition Supervisory Commission (KPPU) ruled that Google LLC was proven to have conducted monopolistic practices and abused its dominant position to restrict the market and hinder technological development, imposing a fine of Rp 202.5 billion, which became the largest fine in KPPU's history. In this case, Google LLC legally violated Article 17 and Article 25 letter b of Law Number 5 of 1999, though there was insufficient evidence for violations of Article 19 letters a and b and Article 25 paragraph 1 letter a of Law Number 5 of 1999. Google Play Store controls more than 50 percent of the market share and requires application developers to use Google Play Billing System, causing losses to application developers due to difficulties in transferring user data and losing reputation.

The Google LLC case illustrates how user data control and platform ecosystem can create a lock-in effect that hinders competition. Application developers who have built a user base on Google Play Store face very high switching costs if they must move to another platform because they would lose access to user data, ratings, and reputation they have built. This situation provides platforms with the freedom to implement potentially anti-competitive policies.

Following the Google LLC case, the Press Council and KPPU signed an MoU in December 2025 to protect the national press ecosystem from threats of domination and monopolistic practices by digital platforms, as monopoly by digital platforms has the potential to eliminate the business sustainability of local press companies. This demonstrates that data monopoly problems occur not only in the context of application distribution but also threaten various other industry sectors. KPPU assesses that the old approach in evaluating market dominance focusing on price and production volume is no longer relevant because in the current digital era, dominance is built through data ownership, algorithms, and platform control. These phenomena underscore the urgent need to review Indonesia's competition law framework to effectively handle data-based monopoly practices.

Data monopoly by digital platforms, particularly those owned by multinational corporations, also raises issues regarding national data sovereignty. The data of Indonesian

citizens is utilized without balanced benefits for the domestic economy, thereby threatening national data sovereignty. Data collected from the activities of millions of Indonesian users is frequently processed and monetized abroad, while the economic benefits received by Indonesia remain relatively limited.

Furthermore, data monopoly impacts the unfair distribution of economic value. The value created by millions of users through network effects is often not offset by equivalent rewards, but is instead absorbed into the profits of dominant platforms. Practices such as non-transparent commission settings by e-commerce platforms or self-preferencing (prioritizing the platform's own products) disadvantage small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) that rely on these platforms.

In the context of national economic development, data monopoly can hinder the growth of Indonesian digital startups and MSMEs. High barriers to entry resulting from data dominance restrict innovation, as the primary strengths of startups and MSMEs lie in agility and innovation, rather than large-scale data mastery. This inequality could slow down the digital transformation of Indonesia's economy and reduce the competitiveness of local business actors

Based on the above explanation, the research problems are: how is the legal qualification of massive data (Big Data) control as a form of dominant position under Law Number 5 of 1999 concerning the Prohibition of Monopolistic Practices and Unfair Business Competition? And what are the recommended future competition law policies to address anti-competitive impacts of data monopoly in Indonesia?

Methods

This research employs normative legal research with a conceptual approach, statute approach, and comparative approach. The research type used is reform-oriented research, which intensively evaluates the fulfillment of existing provisions and recommends changes to any necessary regulations. This research type is descriptive and tends to use in-depth analysis. This research is descriptive-analytical, depicting existing laws and regulations related to legal theories as research objects.

In this research, the author connects the effectiveness of Law Number 5 of 1999 concerning the Prohibition of Monopolistic Practices and Unfair Business Competition regarding business actors and law enforcement challenges related to data monopoly in the digital economy, KPPU decisions regarding monopolistic practices in the digital sector, particularly the Google LLC case and other relevant cases, as well as harmonizing with other regulations such as Law Number 27 of 2022 concerning Personal Data Protection.

Challenges in Competition Law Enforcement Against Data Monopoly in Indonesia's Digital Economy

Legal material sources in this research consist of three groups. First, primary legal materials such as legislation, implementation guidelines, and KPPU decisions related to abuse of dominant position practices. Second, secondary legal materials such as legal books, academic journals, research results, KPPU decisions, KPPU annual reports, and other relevant documents. Third, tertiary legal materials, including legal dictionaries, encyclopedias, and other supporting sources explaining legal terms or concepts used in the analysis.

Data is collected through library research by examining relevant literature and legal documents. The data analysis technique uses qualitative analysis with legal interpretation and legal reasoning methods. Analysis is conducted by interpreting positive legal provisions and connecting them with market power and digital competition law theories to assess the extent to which regulations qualify massive data (Big Data) control as a form of dominant position within the framework of Law Number 5 of 1999 concerning the Prohibition of Monopolistic Practices and Unfair Business Competition and how to reconstruct future competition law policies to address anti-competitive impacts of data monopoly in Indonesia. Analysis results are then systematically arranged to provide a comprehensive overview of law enforcement challenges regarding data monopoly in the digital era, while providing normative recommendations for more adaptive and responsive legal policy reforms in addressing anti-competitive impacts of data monopoly in Indonesia.

Results and Discussion

A. Legal Qualification of Massive Data (Big Data) Control as a Form of Dominant Position Under Law Number 5 of 1999 Concerning the Prohibition of Monopolistic Practices and Unfair Business Competition

1. Dominant Position of Big Data Control in the Digital Economy Context

Dominant position is a fundamental concept in competition law useful for maintaining market stability to prevent monopolistic practices and competition distortion. Based on Article 1 number 4 of Law Number 5 of 1999, dominant position or monopoly is defined as a situation where a business actor has no other competitors in the related market regarding the controlled market share, or a condition where a business actor holds the highest position among its competitors in the market such that they have financial capability, access capability to supply or sales, and capability to adjust supply or demand for certain goods or services.

Thus, dominant position can be legally neutral in economic conditions but can become an object of violation if the activity is accompanied by anti-competitive behavior in the market. Dominant position in practice can be formed through various means such as competitive

advantage (natural monopoly) and vertical integration, business mergers (merger and acquisition) based on business strategy, and control over strategic production factors. Dominant position has criteria under Indonesian law regulated in Article 25 Paragraph 2 of Law Number 5 of 1999, which states that a business actor or group of business actors is considered to have a dominant position if they control 50% or more of the market share, or if two or three business actors together control 75% or more of the market share for a certain type of goods or services. However, the market share-based approach has limitations in the digital economy context, because modern market power often cannot be measured merely based on sales volume magnitude, but also on control over data, technology, and user networks (network effect), which become main factors in forming dominance in the digital market.

This creates significant problems when applied to the digital platform economy. This research finds that the existing dominant position concept has limitations in reaching the massive data control phenomenon because the dominant position definition in Law Number 5 of 1999 still stands on the traditional economy paradigm that measures market dominance through conventional indicators such as market share, financial capability, and control over goods or services supply. Although Law Number 5 of 1999 does not explicitly mention "data" as an element of dominant position, through extensive interpretation, data constitutes an intangible asset providing competitive advantage. Data control meets the "dominant position" qualification if the platform can act independently without regard for competitors, customers, or consumers.

In the digital economy, massive data control can create dominant positions undetected through these traditional parameters. Digital platforms may have relatively small market shares but control critical data providing sustainable competitive advantage. Additionally, big data has unique characteristics as a strategic asset different from traditional economic resources. Data is non-rivalrous, meaning it can be used repeatedly without diminishing its value, has strong network effects, and creates high barriers to entry for competitors. This control of large-scale user data enables platforms to conduct precise targeting, service personalization, and product innovation difficult for new competitors to match. Another problem arising in platform economy operating as multi-sided markets is that data control from one side of the market can be used to dominate other market sides. For example, in e-commerce platforms, platforms controlling consumer behavior data can use that information to compete unfairly with merchants selling on their own platform. In the context of digital marketplace companies, this market power emerges not from physical asset control but from the platform's ability to control search algorithm data and consumer preferences. Through internally designed algorithm systems, marketplace companies can determine which products are more visible to consumers and which products tend to be hidden. Thus, massive data

Challenges in Competition Law Enforcement Against Data Monopoly in Indonesia's Digital Economy

control by platforms creates network effects. The more data controlled, the more accurate their algorithms, making it difficult for new competitors to enter the market without equivalent data access.

2. Application of KPPU Regulations in Addressing Data Monopoly

The Business Competition Supervisory Commission (KPPU) has issued several regulations to respond to digital economy dynamics, particularly KPPU Regulation Number 3 of 2011 concerning Guidelines for Article 19 letter d of Law Number 5 of 1999 concerning the Prohibition of Monopolistic Practices and Unfair Business Competition and more specific regulations supporting law enforcement such as KPPU Regulation Number 1 of 2022 concerning Business Competition Compliance Programs. KPPU itself is an independent institution with delegated competition supervision and significant responsibility to ensure business competition occurs in a healthy and competitive environment. However, these regulations still have gaps in specifically regulating data control as a form of market power. Analysis of recent KPPU regulations shows that although there is recognition of data importance in the digital economy, there is no comprehensive framework for qualifying massive data control as a form of dominant position. Existing regulations still use traditional indicator approaches with minimal adjustments to digital market characteristics.

KPPU in several cases has also attempted to apply dominant position provisions to digital platforms, but KPPU faces difficulties in proving market power sourced from data control. This is because available legal instruments do not explicitly regulate data as a determining factor for dominant position.

3. Challenges in Competition Law Enforcement Against Data Monopoly

Along with rapid digital technology development and the emergence of online platforms, global economic perspectives have changed differently. Economic sectors previously limited to geographical and physical boundaries are now increasingly open and connected to provide great opportunities for innovation and efficiency. However, behind these benefits, digitalization also presents new challenges that become highlights regarding business competition and anti-monopoly law application. Online platforms and large technology companies including e-commerce, digital service providers, and social media often have the ability to dominantly control markets, influence prices, and control consumer data, which can harm healthy business competition. One major impact of digitalization is the creation of "winner-takes-all markets" or markets favoring domination by several large companies such as

Google, Amazon, Facebook, and Alibaba that not only compete locally but can also dominate global markets. Through algorithms, data, and infrastructure they possess, these large companies can easily rearrange market structures, monopolize consumer access, or even regulate business ecosystems that make smaller competitors or new business actors struggle to compete and fall behind. This increasingly worsens economic inequality and threatens diversity in market competition. Anti-monopoly law application in this digital era requires companies and new business actors to face unprecedented challenges. Existing competition law, generally developed before the digital era, is often not comprehensive enough to resolve problems arising in the rapidly changing digital world. Many existing regulations, both in Indonesia and internationally, have not fully accommodated specific characteristics of digital platforms such as data-based economy, network-based business models, or interoperability between different digital services. Thus, one major challenge faced by supervisory institutions such as the Business Competition Supervisory Commission (KPPU) in Indonesia is how to align existing regulations to monitor and address monopolistic practices that may occur in the digital economy realm. Large technology companies often rely on data collection and analysis on a very large scale, giving them extraordinary competitive advantage such as e-commerce companies being able to use consumer transaction data to adjust prices in real-time, or social media platforms that can control information flow and influence consumer behavior. In this context, data monopoly where one company controls access to very large data can become a very powerful tool to maintain dominant position.

The emerging supervisory challenge is how to define market dominance regarding data, and whether data control by several large players is sufficient to threaten competition, although on the other hand, the company does not have significant price power or market share according to traditional standards. This aligns with research conducted by Andani and Indarta showing that business model complexity owned by online platforms also becomes an obstacle in anti-monopoly law application. Many digital companies operate with premium models (free services with paid premium features), which obscure analysis related to prices and cost structures. For example, digital services like Google or Facebook where these services function to offer products free to users, but they still obtain main revenue from advertisements sold to third parties. These large profits obtained are often not visible to consumers and competitors, which can make it difficult for supervisory institutions to assess whether these practices harm the market or indirectly reduce competition. Additionally, dependence on technology and innovation makes many giant technology companies innovate very quickly, often through acquisitions of small companies having new technology or large user bases. Based on this, new challenges arise in supervision, because technology or data acquisition does not always appear like traditional monopolies involving market power

Challenges in Competition Law Enforcement Against Data Monopoly in Indonesia's Digital Economy

consolidation in one industry. Conversely, these mergers and acquisitions often aim to eliminate potential threats from smaller competitors, hindering innovation development that can improve market competitiveness.

Competition law enforcement against data monopoly in Indonesia faces several fundamental challenges such as Indonesian competition law not yet adopting the concept of data as an essential facility or critical input in digital service production. This results in massive data control not yet being categorized as a form of market power that can be abused. Additionally, Law Number 5 of 1999 does not explicitly list data control as one of the dominant position indicators. Article 25 paragraph (2) of the Law establishes dominant position thresholds based on market share (50% for one business actor or 75% for 2-3 business actors), which is not relevant for measuring data-based dominance.

Technically, there are challenges that need to be faced by law enforcement in data monopoly cases in the digital era such as measuring data concentration and its impact on competition requiring special methodology not yet developed in Indonesian competition law enforcement practice. Unlike market share which can be calculated relatively easily, data control involves qualitative dimensions such as data type, granularity, and analytical capability that are difficult to quantify. Additionally, many digital platforms dominating the Indonesian market are multinational companies operating across jurisdictions. This data control often occurs on servers located outside Indonesia, raising jurisdictional and enforcement issues.

B. Recommended Future Competition Law Policies to Address Anti-Competitive Impacts of Data Monopoly in Indonesia

Data monopoly issues also have inseparable personal data protection dimensions. Synergy between the Antimonopoly Law and Personal Data Protection Law is not optional but necessary to realize a market where every business actor receives equal benefits. Indonesia has Law No. 27 of 2022 concerning Personal Data Protection (PDP Law) regulating data portability rights. However, effective implementation of this right still faces various obstacles. Data portability is an important instrument for reducing lock-in effects and increasing digital market contestability. By ensuring users can easily move their data between platforms, switching barriers can be reduced, making competition healthier. However, PDP Law revision must strengthen and facilitate the implementation of portability rights, transforming data from monopolized private assets to resources that can flow to encourage healthy competition.

The intersection between competition law and personal data protection creates regulatory complexity requiring a holistic approach such as one example being cross-platform personal data merging practices that can simultaneously violate user privacy provisions and

create unfair competitive advantage. Therefore, future competition law policy reconstruction must consider integration with personal data protection regulations.

Thus, this research finds that to address these challenges, amendments to Law Number 5 of 1999 or specific sectoral regulations are needed that explicitly regulate massive data control as a form of dominant position considering criteria such as volume and variety of controlled data, exclusivity level of data access, ability to use data to create barriers to entry, and potential to leverage data from one market to another.

Based on analysis in this research, several legal policy steps are recommended to strengthen competition law enforcement against data monopoly in the future such as first, amendments to Law Number 5 of 1999 are needed to explicitly include data control as one of the dominant position indicators. Quantitative and qualitative criteria for measuring data-based dominance need to be developed, including data volume, access exclusivity, and leverage capability. Second, KPPU needs to be given broader authority in accessing business actors' digital data, including authority to conduct dawn raids on servers and digital systems, and authority to request data in machine-readable format. Third, technical guidelines are needed regarding relevant market determination in the context of multi-sided markets and zero-pricing economy, adopting best practices from other jurisdictions more advanced in handling digital economy cases. Fourth, KPPU technical capacity enhancement is needed through recruitment of expert personnel in data science, digital economics, and computer science, as well as establishment of special units handling digital economy cases. Fifth, case handling timeframes need to be extended for cases involving complex data analysis, and KPPU needs to be given authority to impose interim measures to prevent irreversible damage to market structure. Sixth, administrative sanctions need to be strengthened and can be calculated based on percentage of turnover or company valuation, thus having significant deterrence effects. Additionally, KPPU needs to be given authority to impose structural remedies in certain cases. Seventh, strengthened international cooperation with competition authorities in other countries is needed to handle cross-jurisdictional cases, including mutual legal assistance in evidence collection and coordination in imposing sanctions.

Conclusion

Based on the above explanation, it can be concluded that rapid platform economy development has positioned data as a strategic asset determining competitiveness. However, massive data control by large-scale digital platforms raises concerns about data monopoly practices that may hinder innovation and create barriers to market entry. Thus, this research finds that to address these challenges, amendments to Law Number 5 of 1999 or specific sectoral regulations are needed that explicitly regulate massive data control as a form of

Challenges in Competition Law Enforcement Against Data Monopoly in Indonesia's Digital Economy

dominant position considering criteria such as volume and variety of controlled data, exclusivity level of data access, ability to use data to create barriers to entry, and potential to leverage data from one market to another. It is recommended that KPPU develop new guidelines not solely based on price but on quality, innovation, and data access. This is important so that "free" platforms monopolizing data can still be reached by competition law. Additionally, KPPU is expected to establish a special Digital Forensics unit capable of auditing platform algorithms. This aims to detect self-preferencing practices or data-based price discrimination difficult to prove with conventional evidence, and regulations are needed to enhance synergy between KPPU and personal data protection supervisory institutions. This collaboration is important to ensure privacy data policies are not used by large companies as shields to close data access for small competitors. In policy recommendations, the government and Parliament are expected to soon include clauses regarding "Digital Market Power" in the Competition Law revision. This includes dominant position criteria measured not only by market share but also by massive data control and user dependency on the platform.

References

- Amiruddin and Zainal Asikin. (2012). *Pengantar Metode Penelitian Hukum*, Jakarta: Rajawali Press.
- Andani, D. K., & Indarta, D. W. (2023). *Pengawasan Hukum Platform E-Commerce Tiktok dan UMKM oleh KPPU Berdasarkan UU Nomor 5 Tahun 1999*. Al-Manhaj: Jurnal Hukum Dan Pranata Sosial Islam, Volume 5 Nomor 2, ISSN 2393-2408.
- Devina Tanzil and Kristianto P.H. Silalahi. (2022). *Pelindungan Data Pribadi Dalam Analisis Penyalahgunaan Posisi Dominan Berdasarkan Hukum Persaingan Usaha*, Gloria Justitia 2 No. 1, Juni halaman 1--18, <https://doi.org/10.25170/gloriajustitia.v2i1.3359>.
- DewanPers. (2025). Dewan Pers dan KPPU Perkuat Pengawasan Platform Digital Lewat MoU Cegah Monopoli Di Ekosistem Pers, link <https://dewanpers.or.id/read/news/19-12-2025-dewan-pers-dan-kppu-perkuat-pengawasan-platform-digital-lewat-mou-cegah-monopoli-di-ekosistem-pers>
- EBSCO Knowledge Advantage, *Platform Economy*, <https://www.ebsco.com/research-starters/technology/platform-economy>.
- Geofani Milthree Saragih, (2022). *Pancasila Sebagai Landasan Filosofis Pembentukan Peraturan Perundang-Undangan Di Indonesia*, Jurnal Pancasila dan Kewarganegaraan 2, Nomor 1.
- IDN Financial (20205). *Terbukti Monopoli KPPU Denda Google LLC Rp.202,5 Miliar*,

<https://www.idnfinancials.com/id/news/52154/terbukti-monopoli-kppu-denda-google-llc-rp202-5-miliar>

- Komisi Pengawas Persaingan Usaha. (2009). *Buku Ajar Hukum Persaingan Usaha Antara Teks dan Konteks*, Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ) GmbH, Oktober.
- Komisi Pengawas Persaingan Usaha, *Google Terbukti Melanggar, KPPU Jatuhkan Denda Rp. 202,5 Miliar*, <https://kppu.go.id/blog/2025/01/google-terbukti-melanggar-kppu-jatuhkan-denda-rp-2025-miliar/>
- Komisi Pengawas Persaingan Usaha Republik Indonesia. (2024). *Persaingan Usaha Dalam Rangkaian Kata: Kompilasi Pemikiran Konstruktif Untuk Navigasi Kebijakan Persaingan Pada Era Ekonomi Modern Cetakan ke 1*, Desember.
- Mangatur Nainggolan Law Firm, *Proses Hukum Acara Penanganan Perkara Praktik Monopoli dan Persaingan Usaha Tidak Sehat Oleh KPPU*, link <https://mnllaw.co.id/proses-hukum-acara-penanganan-perkara-praktik-monopoli-dan-persaingan-usaha-tidak-sehat-oleh-komisi-pengawas-persaingan-usaha-kppu/>
- M. Raihan Mappuji dan Lingga Wisnu Wardana. (2023). *Fintech Competition Compliance: Analisis Pelaku Usaha Fintech dalam Menjalankan Program Kepatuhan Persaingan Usaha KPPU*, Jurnal Studia Legalia: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum Volume 4 Nomor 1 Mei.
- Mukti Fajar Nur Dewata dan Yulianto Achmad. (2010). *Dualisme Penelitian Normatif dan Empiris*, Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Novanto Yudistira. (2021). *Peran Big data dan Deep Learning Untuk Menyelesaikan Permasalahan Secara Komprehensif*, EXPERT Jurnal Manajemen Sistem Informasi dan Teknologi, Vol 2 27 Desember, <https://media.neliti.com/media/publications/392185-none-a9a8ca62.pdf>
- Ratna Dewi, Rendita Andriani, Joflin Gunawan, Siti Nuri Salamatuddaroen, Jeany Indriati. (2025). *Penyalahgunaan Posisi Dominan Oleh Perusahaan Digital Marketplace di Indonesia*, Rio Law Jurnal Volume 6 Nomor 2 Agustus-Desember, ISSN 2722-9602
- Saryana, Totok Tumangkar, Darmawan Tri Budi Utomo, Mieke Anggraeni, Munira, *Penerapan Hukum Anti Monopoli Dalam Menjaga Persaingan Usaha Yang Sehat*, Jurnal Kolaboratif Sains Volume 7 Nomor 11 November 2004, 4090-4095
- Sisca Ferawati Burhanuddin. (2024). *Penerapan Hukum Persaingan Usaha Untuk Mencegah Praktik Monopoli di Lingkungan Bisnis Perusahaan*, Journal of Interdisciplinary Legal Perspektif, Volume 1 Number 1 Desember.
- Sri Yulia Safira, Andi Maysarah. (2025). *Efektivitas Hukum Persaingan Usaha Dalam Menjaga Keadilan Pasar di Era Ekonomi Digital*, Universitas Dharmawangsa Volume 19 Nomor 4 Oktober.

Challenges in Competition Law Enforcement Against Data Monopoly in Indonesia's Digital Economy

Zainuddin Ali. (2014). *Metode Penelitian Hukum*, Jakarta: Sinar Grafika.

Zainuddin Ali. (2009). *Metode Penelitian Hukum Cetakan Ke 1*, Jakarta: Sinar Grafika.