

Consumer Legal Protection Against Food Order Discrepancies on Digital Platforms Based on Electronic Agreements in Samarinda City

Nur Paridah Mey Yulia¹, Asnawi Mubarak², Rio Arif Pratama³

¹²³ Bachelor Of Law Study Program, Faculty Of Law, Muhammadiyah University Of East Kalimantan

* Correspondence e-mail; yuliawhb2004@gmail.com, am764@umkt.ac.id, rioarifpratama@umkt.ac.id

Article history

Submitted: 2026/04/01; Revised: 2026/05/11; Accepted: 2026/07/12

Abstract

The development of information and communication technology in the digital era has brought fundamental changes in the patterns of economic interaction in society, especially in electronic-based trading activities (e-commerce). This is marked by the increasing use of digital platforms as transaction media, including in the online food ordering service sector. The purpose of this study is to analyze the legal status and force of electronic agreements in food ordering transactions on digital platforms in Samarinda City. To examine the form and division of responsibility of business actors and digital platform providers based on electronic agreements for consumer losses due to inconsistencies in food orders. This study uses an empirical legal research method with a sociological legal nature. In this study, an empirical approach is used to directly examine the practice of food ordering transactions through digital platforms in Samarinda City. The conclusion of this study is the position of electronic agreements in food ordering transactions on digital platforms regarding order inconsistencies is that electronic agreements have an important position in regulating the rights and obligations between consumers, platforms, and merchants. However, there are still shortcomings in consumer understanding of these electronic agreements. The form of responsibility of business actors and platforms for consumer losses due to inconsistencies in orders is that business actors and platforms have a responsibility to handle consumer complaints and provide solutions to inconsistencies in orders. However, there are still shortcomings in complaint handling, such as slow responses and inadequate compensation.

Keywords

Consumer Legal Protection, Food Order Discrepancies, Digital Platforms



© 2026 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY SA) license, <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>.

INTRODUCTION

The development of information and communication technology in the digital era has brought fundamental changes to the patterns of economic interaction in

society, especially in electronic commerce (e-commerce) (Mubarok & Jayabalan, 2023). This is marked by the increasing use of digital platforms as a medium for transactions, including in the online food ordering sector. Digitalization has also created new legal relationships based on electronic agreements. These electronic agreements are valid as long as they meet the requirements stipulated in laws and regulations, such as the Electronic Information and Transactions Law (UU ITE). Law Number 19 of 2016, which amended Law Number 11 of 2008, which was later updated through Law Number 1 of 2024, contains various provisions regarding Electronic Information and Transactions in Indonesia (Aprilianti, 2024; Audina, 2026; Putri et al., 2024).

In the context of digital platform-based food ordering services, these electronic agreements form the basis of the legal relationship between consumers, businesses and platform providers, giving rise to legal challenges when orders are not fulfilled (Mahayani et al., 2022; Rahayu et al., 2025). In practice, the use of digital platforms for food ordering has shown a significant increase in various regions, including Samarinda City. Ease of access, a variety of menu options, and time efficiency are key factors driving people to switch to these services (LILIK, 2024). However, despite this convenience, consumers often face various problems, one of which is the discrepancy between the order placed and the product received. These discrepancies can include different types of food, incorrect portions, and orders that do not match the description. These discrepancies not only cause economic losses for consumers but also create legal challenges for those responsible for digital platform-based transactions. Electronic transactions not only provide benefits, but the products received also have the potential to harm consumers due to discrepancies between the product received and the description offered (Owen & Manalu, 2026).

Legal issues in digital platform-based food ordering transactions are not only related to consumer compensation, but also involve the complexity of the legal relationship between the parties involved: merchants, consumers, and digital platform providers as transaction intermediaries. The legal relationship between these parties is governed by electronic agreements, often standard contracts, which tend to weaken consumers' legal standing. Furthermore, determining who is responsible for consumer losses is a complex issue, especially when orders are inconsistent. Both implementation and enforcement of regulations are often ineffective. In this context, consumer protection mechanisms, such as refunds or other legal remedies, are essential digital platforms (Undang-Undang, 1999). Therefore, it is necessary to observe the practices that occur in the field with the

applicable legal provisions, particularly in Law Number 1 of 2024 concerning Electronic Information and Transactions, Law Number 8 of 1999 concerning Consumer Protection, and Government Regulation Number 71 of 2019, to assess whether these practices are carried out with the principles of consumer protection, particularly in Law Number 1 of 2024 concerning Electronic Information and Transactions which is the latest revision of the ITE, as well as Law Number 8 of 1999 concerning Consumer Protection and Government Regulation Number 71 of 2019, to ensure the extent to which these actions are carried out in accordance with the principles of consumer protection (Arifin et al., 2025; Oktafianto et al., 2026). Regarding the effectiveness of consumer protection and the ideal division of responsibilities among the parties in electronic transactions in Samarinda City, this indicates the need for a more in-depth study of legal responsibilities in electronic agreements on digital platforms (Adelia & Zahra, 2025)

Although consumer protection regulations for electronic transactions exist in Indonesia, their implementation remains hampered by low legal awareness regarding public rights and complaint mechanisms, as well as weak law enforcement and oversight of digital businesses. Consumer protection issues in electronic transactions can be triggered by suboptimal regulations, a lack of good faith from business actors, and a lack of preventative measures against violations and legal protection through legal remedies provided by the government. This situation results in legal protection, which should be preventive and repressive, not being optimally implemented (Windi Arini et al., 2025). Although consumer protection in electronic transactions has been widely studied globally, previous research has generally focused on macro aspects such as personal data and general security systems. There is a significant research gap regarding the specific issue of food order discrepancies on digital platforms from the perspective of e-commerce companies. Furthermore, the normative approach in previous research often ignores empirical conditions on the ground. Therefore, more contextual research and relevant studies are needed to address this gap, particularly in response to the rapid growth of the digital economy in Samarinda City (Ham & Hukum, n.d.).

METHODS

This study employs an empirical legal research method with a sociological-legal nature. In this study, an empirical approach is used to directly examine the practice of food ordering transactions through digital platforms in Samarinda City. This research was conducted in Samarinda City, East Kalimantan. This location was selected due to the high use of digital platform-based food ordering services,

allowing researchers to directly examine the implementation of electronic agreements and the problems that arise, particularly related to order discrepancies. The informant selection technique used purposive sampling, selecting informants based on certain criteria relevant to the research. These criteria include parties who have been or are currently involved in food ordering transactions through digital platforms, so they can provide information on the implementation of electronic agreements and the division of responsibilities between parties. This study was conducted using a semi-structured interview method, in which the researcher provided a list of questions as a guide, but still allowed informants the freedom to provide broad answers based on their experiences. Interviews were conducted directly with consumers, business actors (traders), and delivery service providers involved in food ordering transactions through digital platforms. Data and information collected from the research results, both from field studies and subsequent library research, were analyzed descriptively. Qualitatively, namely a data analysis method by classifying and selecting data obtained from field studies based on their quality and facts.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Result

The Position of Electronic Agreements in Food Ordering Transactions on Digital Platforms Regarding Order Discrepancies

Legal liability is the legal consequence of losses suffered by one party due to the negligence, error, or unlawful actions of another party. In the context of online buying and selling transactions, business actors are legally obliged to protect consumer interests and be responsible for the products or services they market. In the e-commerce sphere, business actors include not only direct sellers but also platform providers that facilitate transactions between sellers and buyers. This adds complexity to determining liability, especially when the situation involves third parties such as logistics service providers or electronic payment providers (Andrea et al., 2025).

Based on the results of the interview with Aiman, he did not understand about electronic agreements in food ordering transactions on digital platforms (Aiman, May 18, 2026). He only knew that he had to pay the listed price and receive the food accordingly. This shows that Aiman lacks understanding of electronic contracts. Iqbal also has a similar understanding. He doesn't understand electronic contracts, but he knows that he has to pay the listed price (Iqbal, May 21, 2026). Kiki has a slightly better understanding of the electronic agreement. She knows she has to pay

the listed price and get the food she deserves, but she doesn't fully understand the details of the electronic agreement (Kiki, May 21, 2026). Mute does not understand about electronic agreements and only knows that he has to pay according to the listed price (Mute, May 21, 2026). Nadyla has a similar understanding to Mute. She doesn't understand electronic contracts and only knows that she has to pay the stated price (Nadyla, May 18, 2026). Hasmilawati had a slightly better understanding of the electronic agreement. She knew she had to pay the listed price and receive the food, but she didn't fully understand the details of the electronic agreement. Sandi had a similar understanding to Hasmilawati (Hasmilawati & Sandi, May 18, 2026). He knew he had to pay the listed price and receive the food, but he didn't fully understand the details of the electronic agreement.

Most consumers don't understand the concept of electronic agreements in food ordering transactions on digital platforms. They only know that they have to pay the listed price and receive the food. According to an interview with a Jakarta Chicken Noodle Wonton Business Owner (Chicken Noodle Dumpling Business Jakarta, May 16, 2026), Warung Pecel Family 1 (Warung Pecel Family 1, May 16, 2026), Chaniago Restaurant (Chaniago Restaurant, May 20, 2026), Sakera Grilled Chicken, Indomaret, Maknyozz Seblak, Karaos Bright Moon Martabak (Sakera Grilled Chicken, Indomaret, Seblak Maknyozz, Martabak Terang Bulan Karaos, May 20, 2026). They understand that in-app transactions constitute electronic agreements and are obligated to fulfill customer orders as requested. Based on the results of interviews with drivers, such as Shopeefood Bustomi, Reza Klik Indomaret (Shopeefood Bustomi & Reza Klik Indomaret, May 18, 2026), Farhan Gojek, Baga Shopeefood (Farhan Gojek & Baga Shopeefood, May 21, 2026), Wildan Sobri Grab (Wildan Sobri Grab, May 20, 2026), Wildan and Hendra Shopeefood (Wildan & Hendra Shopeefood, May 22, 2026) they understand that they must follow the procedures set by the platform and ensure that orders are processed according to consumer requests. Advances in information technology have fundamentally changed the way businesses buy and sell, particularly through e-commerce platforms like Shopee. Processes that were once conducted face-to-face are now conducted through internet-based electronic systems. This transition requires a robust legal framework to ensure legal certainty, adequate consumer protection, and clarity regarding business responsibilities in every electronic transaction.

Under this regulation, business actors are required to provide accurate, clear, and honest information regarding identity, product specifications, prices, and consumer complaint mechanisms. Furthermore, business actors are also required to

be responsible for losses suffered by consumers due to the use of goods that do not comply with the agreement. This provision aims to create legal certainty and protect consumers in electronic transactions. The validity of a sales and purchase agreement according to the Criminal Code, including those conducted through Shopee, refers to Article 1320, which requires four elements. First, there must be an agreement between the parties as a deliberate meeting, which in the transaction is realized when the consumer places an order and makes payment through the system platform. Second, legal capacity, meaning the parties are not in a condition declared by law as incompetent. Third, the specific object, namely the goods traded, must be clear and determinable, as reflected in the product description, specifications, and price displayed. Fourth, legitimate cause, meaning the content and purpose of the agreement must not conflict with law, morality, or common conversation. If all these requirements are met, then sales and purchase transactions through Shopee are valid and binding on the parties as a general agreement (Wardana, 2023).

Business Actors and Platforms' Responsibilities for Consumer Losses Due to Order Inconsistencies

Consumers experienced discrepancies in their food orders and filed complaints with the merchant or platform. Aiman was dissatisfied with the handling of his complaint because he was only offered a refund, which he felt was insufficient. Iqbal was satisfied with the food placement and price of the order, indicating that effective complaint handling can improve customer satisfaction. Kiki was satisfied with the prompt response from customer service, but sometimes did not receive a refund, indicating that there are still shortcomings in complaint handling. Mute and Nadya were dissatisfied with the complaint handling because they only received an apology, indicating that ineffective complaint handling can decrease customer satisfaction. Hasmilawati and Sandi were satisfied with the food arrangement, indicating that effective complaint handling can improve customer satisfaction (Sakdiyah, 2021).

Companies have procedures in place to handle consumer complaints, such as apologizing, replacing food, and providing compensation. However, there are still shortcomings in complaint handling, such as slow responses and inadequate compensation. Drivers have a role in handling consumer complaints, such as contacting merchants and ensuring orders meet consumer requirements. However, there are still shortcomings in complaint handling, such as a lack of communication with consumers. Businesses and platforms have a responsibility to address consumer complaints and provide solutions to order discrepancies. However, there are still

shortcomings in handling consumer complaints, so transparency and education about complaint handling procedures are needed for consumers (Susilo, 2025).

The legal liability of business actors in cases of non-conforming goods in online transactions can be classified as civil liability, which focuses on breach of contract. According to Article 1457 of the Indonesian Criminal Code, a sales and purchase agreement is an agreement in which one party (the seller) promises to deliver goods, and the other party (the buyer) promises to pay the agreed price. Meanwhile, Article 1458 of the Indonesian Criminal Code states that a sales and purchase agreement is considered valid if an agreement has been reached regarding the goods and price, and the goods have been delivered to the buyer. If the business actor fails to deliver the goods as agreed, a breach of contract has occurred, which gives the consumer the right to demand fulfillment of obligations, cancellation of the agreement, or compensation.

Interviews revealed that consumers lack a clear understanding of electronic agreements in food ordering transactions on digital platforms. They only know that they must pay the listed price and receive the food they want. Businesses understand that in-app transactions constitute electronic agreements and are obligated to fulfill consumer orders as requested. Drivers understand that they must follow the procedures established by the platform and ensure that orders meet consumer requirements. In the context of consumer protection, Law Number 8 of 1999 concerning Consumer Protection regulates consumer rights, business obligations, the prohibition on selling substandard goods, and liability for compensation. Article 4 addresses consumer rights, namely the right to receive accurate and honest information about traded goods or services. Article 7 addresses business obligations, namely the obligation to provide accurate and honest information about traded goods or services.

Article 38 of Law Number 11 of 2008 concerning Electronic Information and Transactions (ITE) states that "Any person may file a lawsuit against any party that organizes an Electronic System and/or uses Information Technology that causes losses." By following the steps outlined in this article, the public can sue the computer system provider responsible for the losses to the system using legal channels established by law or regulations. Furthermore, Article 39 of the ITE Law stipulates that "Civil lawsuits are conducted in accordance with the provisions of the Law and Regulations. In addition to settlement through civil lawsuits, the parties may also resolve disputes through arbitration, or other alternative resolution institutions in accordance with the provisions of the Law and Regulations."

Arbitration and other alternative conflict resolution institutions are available to the parties in addition to civil litigation in court, as determined by applicable law.

Electronic agreements made on the Gojek, ShopeeFood, and Grab platforms in Samarinda City have valid and binding legal standing. The agreement is created when the consumer clicks the "Order Now" button, the business owner confirms the order, and the platform processes the transaction. This form of agreement fulfills the elements of Article 1320 of the Civil Code, namely agreement, capacity, specific object, and lawful cause. This legal basis is reinforced by Article 18 of the Electronic Information and Transactions Law, which states that electronic information and electronic documents are recognized as valid evidence in court.

Business actors' responsibilities are based on Article 7 of Law No. 8 of 1999 concerning Consumer Protection. Business actors are required to act in good faith and provide accurate information and services. If an order does not match, the form of responsibility includes replacing the item with a new one, a full refund, or providing a voucher in accordance with Article 19 of the Consumer Protection Law. The excuse of "driver error" does not eliminate the business actor's responsibility because the legal relationship directly exists between the consumer and the business actor. The driver is the party appointed by the business actor to carry out the performance.

The responsibilities of digital platforms Gojek, ShopeeFood, and Grab are twofold. First, as electronic system providers, they are obligated to maintain error-free systems in accordance with Article 26 of the ITE Law. Second, as marketplace managers, they are obligated to provide complaint and mediation services in accordance with Article 15 of Government Regulation No. 80 of 2019 concerning PMSE. Platforms hold consumer funds in escrow, requiring them to process refunds if orders are proven to be non-compliant. Drivers have internal responsibilities to the platform in the form of rating reductions, suspensions, or salary deductions if proven negligent. However, drivers are not directly parties to consumer lawsuits unless there is an element of intent or criminality.

Discussion

Electronic agreements in online food delivery transactions in Samarinda City generally satisfy the legal validity requirements established under Article 1320 of the Indonesian Civil Code. Consumer acceptance is demonstrated through order confirmation and payment completion, while business actors express consent by accepting and processing orders through the digital platform. Interview findings reveal that most consumers have limited awareness of the legal nature of electronic

contracts and primarily perceive their obligations as paying for and receiving ordered products. Business actors, however, recognize that every confirmed transaction creates a legally binding electronic agreement, although the standardized contractual format significantly limits consumers' bargaining power despite formal compliance with the legal requirements.

Legal capacity also represents an essential element in determining the validity of electronic agreements. Digital platforms require users, merchants, and driver partners to meet minimum legal age requirements and complete account verification before accessing platform services. Existing verification mechanisms, however, do not completely eliminate the possibility of account use by individuals lacking legal capacity, creating potential challenges regarding contractual validity. Electronic agreements involving legally incompetent parties remain subject to cancellation under applicable civil law principles because contractual capacity constitutes a fundamental requirement for enforceable legal relationships.

Contractual validity further depends on the existence of a clearly identifiable object within every electronic transaction. Digital food ordering applications provide comprehensive information regarding menu descriptions, product images, prices, portion sizes, and additional customer instructions, enabling parties to identify the agreed object with reasonable certainty. Differences between ordered products and delivered items constitute breaches of contractual obligations and provide consumers with legal remedies under Article 19 of the Consumer Protection Law. Consumers therefore possess the right to obtain replacement products, refunds, or other appropriate compensation whenever the delivered performance fails to correspond with the agreed contractual object.

Lawful purpose completes the final requirement for establishing valid electronic agreements in digital food delivery transactions. Transactions conducted through online platforms remain legally enforceable as long as contractual objects comply with statutory provisions, public order, and moral principles. Standard contractual clauses that exclude platform liability for mistakes committed by merchants or driver partners require careful examination because such provisions may conflict with Article 18 of the Consumer Protection Law and potentially reduce consumer protection. Electronic agreements within food delivery platforms in Samarinda City therefore demonstrate formal legal validity under the Civil Code and the Information and Electronic Transactions Law, although limited consumer understanding continues to reduce meaningful and fully informed contractual consent.

Subekti's Theory of Contracts provides a comprehensive framework for analyzing the legal relationships established through digital food delivery platforms. Subekti defines a contract as an event in which one person promises another person, or two parties mutually agree to perform a particular obligation. Digital platform transactions involve consumers, business actors, and platform providers as interconnected legal subjects within a single electronic transaction. Interview findings demonstrate that the participation of these three parties creates greater complexity in determining legal responsibility whenever discrepancies arise between ordered and delivered goods.

Expressions of intention constitute an essential element in the formation of valid agreements according to Subekti's contractual theory. Electronic consent is manifested through the acceptance of platform terms and conditions by selecting the agreement option provided within the application. Interview results indicate that most consumers in Samarinda City approve contractual terms without reading or fully understanding their legal implications. Such circumstances suggest that contractual consent formally exists, although substantive freedom of intention remains limited because service access depends entirely on acceptance of standardized contractual provisions.

Contractual validity also depends upon the existence of a clearly identifiable object that can be legally traded. Digital food delivery applications specify contractual objects through menu descriptions, product photographs, prices, portion sizes, and additional customer instructions. Compliance with these specifications represents an important indicator of proper contractual performance between consumers and business actors. Delivery of products that differ from agreed specifications constitutes a breach of contract and creates legal consequences for the responsible party.

Lawful objectives represent another fundamental requirement within Subekti's contractual framework. Digital food delivery transactions pursue legitimate objectives by fulfilling consumers' daily food consumption needs through electronic commerce. Good faith must guide every stage of contractual implementation, including order processing, delivery, and complaint resolution. Practices that intentionally hinder consumer complaints or avoid legal responsibility may violate the principle of good faith and weaken the legal protection guaranteed under Indonesian consumer protection legislation.

CONCLUSION

The conclusion of this study is that the role of electronic agreements in food ordering transactions on digital platforms related to order discrepancies is that electronic agreements play a crucial role in regulating the rights and obligations between consumers, platforms, and merchants. However, there are still gaps in consumers' understanding of these electronic agreements. The form of responsibility of business actors and platforms for consumer losses due to order discrepancies is that business actors and platforms have a responsibility to handle consumer complaints and provide solutions to order discrepancies. However, there are still shortcomings in complaint handling, such as slow responses and the absence of adequate compensation.

REFERENCES

- Adelia, M. P., & Zahra, Y. K. (2025). Perlindungan Konsumen dalam Transaksi Elektronik di Indonesia. *Journal of Economic and Management (JEM)*, 2(1), 1–13.
- Andrea, R., Kamiliya, C. S., & Nasution, F. (2025). Upaya Perlindungan Konsumen Dalam Tinjauan Hukum Perjanjian: Sengketa Transaksi Secara Daring. *Jurnal Riset Multidisiplin Edukasi*, 2(11), 1049–1061.
- Aprilianti, A. (2024). Efektivitas dan implementasi Undang-Undang Informasi dan Transaksi Elektronik sebagai hukum siber di Indonesia: Tantangan dan solusi. *Begawan Abioso*, 15(1), 41–50.
- Arifin, Z., Fernando, Z. J., & Handayani, E. P. (2025). Implikasi Hukum Perubahan Kedua Undang-Undang Informasi dan Transaksi Elektronik: Menyeimbangkan Kebebasan Berpendapat dan Partisipasi Publik dalam Demokrasi Digital. *Jurnal Litigasi*, 26(1), 192–227.
- Audina, W. (2026). Kajian Yuridis Normatif terhadap Pengaturan Tindak Pidana Siber dalam Undang-Undang Informasi dan Transaksi Elektronik di Indonesia. *Al-Zayn: Jurnal Ilmu Sosial & Hukum*, 4(2), 7374–7386.
- Ham, J., & Hukum, I. (n.d.). Jurnal HAM dan Ilmu Hukum (Jurisprudential) | <https://jurisprudential.bunghatta.ac.id/>. *Jurnal Jurisprudential*, 4(2), 21–31.
- LILIK, L. (2024). *Tinjauan Yuridis Terhadap Tindak Pidana Penipuan Menurut Undang-Undang Nomor 19 Tahun 2016 Tentang Perubahan Atas Undang-Undang Nomor 11 Tahun 2008 Tentang Informasi Dan Transaksi Elektronik*. UNIVERSITAS ABDURACHMAN SALEH SITUBONDO.
- Mahayani, S., Zuhairi, A., & Saleh, M. (2022). Tanggung jawab pelaku usaha terhadap barang yang cacat setelah melakukan transaksi ditinjau dari perspektif hukum perlindungan konsumen. *Commerce Law*, 2(1).
- Mubarok, A., & Jayabalan, S. (2023). The Relationship Of State Law And Customary

- Law:: Reinforcement And Protection Of Customary Law In Constitutional Court Judgment. *Jurnal Jurisprudence*, 188–204.
- Oktafianto, A., Toyyiba, E. N., Rosita, E., & Istighfarin, N. (2026). Perlindungan Hukum Terhadap Konsumen Atas Penyebaran Data Pribadi Oleh Aplikasi Pinjaman Online Ilegal Ditinjau Dari Undang-Undang Informasi Dan Transaksi Elektronik No. 1 Tahun 2024 Tentang Perubahan Kedua Atas Undang-Undang No 11 Tahun 2008 Tentang I. *FENOMENA*, 20(01), 193–202.
- Owen, J., & Manalu, G. (2026). *Perlindungan Hukum bagi Konsumen dalam Transaksi Jual Beli Online Ditinjau dari Undang-Undang Nomor 1 Tahun 2024 tentang Perubahan Kedua Atas Undang-Undang Nomor 11 Tahun 2008 tentang Informasi dan Transaksi Elektronik*.
- Putri, S. N. P., Saputro, H. D., & Amanita, A. (2024). Perlindungan Hukum Bagi Korban Pornografi Cyberstalking Menurut Undang-Undang Nomor 1 Tahun 2024 Tentang Informasi Dan Transaksi Elektronik. *Rechtswetenschap: Jurnal Mahasiswa Hukum*, 2(1).
- Rahayu, L. P. N., Mahadewi, K. J., Sutrisni, K. E., & Nandari, N. P. S. (2025). Perlindungan Konsumen Atas Kerugian Ekonomi Akibat Pertamina Oplosan Dalam Perspektif Undang-Undang Perlindungan Konsumen. *Al-Zayn: Jurnal Ilmu Sosial & Hukum*, 3(5), 6124–6135.
- Sakdiyah, L. H. (2021). Kerjasama Pelaku Usaha dengan Aplikasi Grabfood Merchant Menurut Undang-Undang dan Kompilasi Hukum Ekonomi Syariah. *Journal of Islamic Business Law*, 5(3), 62–73.
- Subekti, R., & Tjitrosudibio, R. (2003). Kitab Undang-undang Hukum Perdata (KUH Perdata). *Jakarta: Pradnya Paramita*.
- Susilo, Y. J. (2025). Implementasi Kontrak Elektronik Dalam Bisnis: Melihat Tantangan dan Risiko di Era Digital. *JURNAL ILMIAH NUSANTARA*, 2(2), 280–286.
- Undang-Undang. (1999). Undang-Undang Nomor 8 Tahun 1999 Perlindungan Konsumen. *Undang-Undang Nomor 8 Tahun 1999*, 8, 1–19.
- Wardana, Y. K. (2023). Analisis aspek hukum dan implikasi kontrak elektronik dalam perjanjian bisnis. *Journal Sains Student Research*, 1(1), 776–786.
- Windi Arini, Zahra Nabila Mua'la, Ulfa Nur Arifah, Leni Fadhilah Islamiyah, & Pindisi Tabuni. (2025). Perlindungan Hukum Terhadap Konsumen Dalam Transaksi Elektronik. *LAWYER: Jurnal Hukum*, 3(1), 11–19. <https://doi.org/10.58738/lawyer.v3i1.757>