



Ethical Imperatives and Legal Frameworks in Standard Precautions Compliance: A Comprehensive Health Law Perspective from Indonesia

Noer Triyanto Rusli

Universitas Indo Global Mandiri, Palembang, Indonesia

Corresponding author: noertriyantorusli@uigm.ac.id

Article Info

Article History

Revised : 2026-04-11

Accepted : 2026-05-01

Published : 2026-05-12

Keywords:

Bioethics; Health Law;
Medical Negligence;
Occupational Health;
Standard Precautions

Abstract

Standard precautions (SPs) are foundational to infection prevention and control, protecting both healthcare workers and patients from healthcare-associated infections (HAIs) and occupational exposures. Beyond clinical necessity, SP adherence represents a moral obligation grounded in the bioethical principles of autonomy, beneficence, non-maleficence, and justice. Furthermore, it is a strict legal mandate under national and international health laws. In low- and middle-income countries, compliance remains inconsistent due to structural, resource-related, and cultural barriers. This article analyzes SP compliance among nurses at a tertiary hospital in Palembang, Indonesia, through the comprehensive lens of medical law, occupational safety regulations, and bioethics. A normative legal and ethical analysis reveals breaches in all four bioethical principles, especially justice, due to inequitable personal protective equipment (PPE) allocation. This article argues that inadequate SP implementation exposes healthcare institutions to significant legal liability, including claims of medical negligence and violations of occupational health rights under Indonesia's Health Omnibus Law (Law No. 17 of 2023). By integrating comparative legal frameworks and analyzing potential tort liabilities, this article demonstrates that hospitals must embed ethical reasoning into infection control policy, ensure equitable resource distribution, and provide regular ethics-informed training to fulfill their legal duty of care and foster a culture of safety.

Introduction

Healthcare-associated infections (HAIs) remain a major global health concern, with substantial implications for patient safety, occupational health, and healthcare system sustainability. The World Health Organization (WHO) estimates that hundreds of millions of patients are affected by HAIs each year, resulting in prolonged hospital stays, increased antimicrobial resistance, long-term disability, and excess deaths (World Health Organization, 2022). Low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) bear a disproportionate burden, with prevalence rates estimated to be up to 20 times higher than in high-income settings (Allegranzi et al., 2011). This higher burden is closely linked to infrastructural limitations, workforce shortages, and inconsistent implementation of infection prevention and control (IPC) measures (Storr et al., 2017). The economic toll of HAIs is equally staggering, costing healthcare systems billions of dollars annually in extended treatments, readmissions, and litigation. Consequently, infection prevention is not merely a clinical goal but an economic imperative that underpins the viability of modern healthcare delivery.

Among healthcare workers, nurses are at particularly high risk of occupational exposure to infectious agents, including bloodborne pathogens such as hepatitis B virus (HBV), hepatitis C virus (HCV), and human immunodeficiency virus (HIV), as well as airborne pathogens like

Mycobacterium tuberculosis (Tarantola et al., 2006). These risks are exacerbated in clinical environments where protective measures are inconsistently applied or inadequately resourced. Standard precautions (SPs) a core component of IPC are designed to mitigate these risks by providing universal guidelines for safe practice, including hand hygiene, the use of personal protective equipment (PPE), safe injection practices, environmental cleaning, and safe handling of potentially contaminated equipment (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2024). The foundational premise of SPs is that all blood, body fluids, secretions, excretions, non-intact skin, and mucous membranes may contain transmissible infectious agents. Therefore, SPs must be applied uniformly to all patients, regardless of their presumed infection status. This universal approach shifts the paradigm from reactive, diagnosis-based isolation to proactive, continuous protection. However, the translation of this theoretical framework into consistent clinical practice remains a persistent challenge, particularly in environments characterized by high patient volumes, chronic understaffing, and systemic resource deficiencies.

Among healthcare workers, nurses are at particularly high risk of occupational exposure to infectious agents, including bloodborne pathogens such as hepatitis B virus (HBV), hepatitis C virus (HCV), and human immunodeficiency virus (HIV), as well as airborne pathogens like *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* (Tarantola et al., 2006). These risks are exacerbated in clinical environments where protective measures are inconsistently applied or inadequately resourced. Standard precautions (SPs) a core component of IPC are designed to mitigate these risks by providing universal guidelines for safe practice, including hand hygiene, the use of personal protective equipment (PPE), safe injection practices, environmental cleaning, and safe handling of potentially contaminated equipment (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2024). The foundational premise of SPs is that all blood, body fluids, secretions, excretions, non-intact skin, and mucous membranes may contain transmissible infectious agents. Therefore, SPs must be applied uniformly to all patients, regardless of their presumed infection status. This universal approach shifts the paradigm from reactive, diagnosis-based isolation to proactive, continuous protection. However, the translation of this theoretical framework into consistent clinical practice remains a persistent challenge, particularly in environments characterized by high patient volumes, chronic understaffing, and systemic resource deficiencies.

Among healthcare workers, nurses are at particularly high risk of occupational exposure to infectious agents, including bloodborne pathogens such as hepatitis B virus (HBV), hepatitis C virus (HCV), and human immunodeficiency virus (HIV), as well as airborne pathogens like *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* (Tarantola et al., 2006). These risks are exacerbated in clinical environments where protective measures are inconsistently applied or inadequately resourced. Standard precautions (SPs) a core component of IPC are designed to mitigate these risks by providing universal guidelines for safe practice, including hand hygiene, the use of personal protective equipment (PPE), safe injection practices, environmental cleaning, and safe handling of potentially contaminated equipment (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2024). The foundational premise of SPs is that all blood, body fluids, secretions, excretions, non-intact skin, and mucous membranes may contain transmissible infectious agents. Therefore, SPs must be applied uniformly to all patients, regardless of their presumed infection status. This universal approach shifts the paradigm from reactive, diagnosis-based isolation to proactive, continuous protection. However, the translation of this theoretical framework into consistent clinical practice remains a persistent challenge, particularly in environments characterized by high patient volumes, chronic understaffing, and systemic resource deficiencies.

Among healthcare workers, nurses are at particularly high risk of occupational exposure to infectious agents, including bloodborne pathogens such as hepatitis B virus (HBV), hepatitis

C virus (HCV), and human immunodeficiency virus (HIV), as well as airborne pathogens like *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* (Tarantola et al., 2006). These risks are exacerbated in clinical environments where protective measures are inconsistently applied or inadequately resourced. Standard precautions (SPs) a core component of IPC are designed to mitigate these risks by providing universal guidelines for safe practice, including hand hygiene, the use of personal protective equipment (PPE), safe injection practices, environmental cleaning, and safe handling of potentially contaminated equipment (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2024). The foundational premise of SPs is that all blood, body fluids, secretions, excretions, non-intact skin, and mucous membranes may contain transmissible infectious agents. Therefore, SPs must be applied uniformly to all patients, regardless of their presumed infection status. This universal approach shifts the paradigm from reactive, diagnosis-based isolation to proactive, continuous protection. However, the translation of this theoretical framework into consistent clinical practice remains a persistent challenge, particularly in environments characterized by high patient volumes, chronic understaffing, and systemic resource deficiencies.

Among healthcare workers, nurses are at particularly high risk of occupational exposure to infectious agents, including bloodborne pathogens such as hepatitis B virus (HBV), hepatitis C virus (HCV), and human immunodeficiency virus (HIV), as well as airborne pathogens like *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* (Tarantola et al., 2006). These risks are exacerbated in clinical environments where protective measures are inconsistently applied or inadequately resourced. Standard precautions (SPs) a core component of IPC are designed to mitigate these risks by providing universal guidelines for safe practice, including hand hygiene, the use of personal protective equipment (PPE), safe injection practices, environmental cleaning, and safe handling of potentially contaminated equipment (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2024). The foundational premise of SPs is that all blood, body fluids, secretions, excretions, non-intact skin, and mucous membranes may contain transmissible infectious agents. Therefore, SPs must be applied uniformly to all patients, regardless of their presumed infection status. This universal approach shifts the paradigm from reactive, diagnosis-based isolation to proactive, continuous protection. However, the translation of this theoretical framework into consistent clinical practice remains a persistent challenge, particularly in environments characterized by high patient volumes, chronic understaffing, and systemic resource deficiencies.

Materials and Methods

To evaluate the practical application of these legal and ethical frameworks, a descriptive-analytic cross-sectional study was conducted between March and April 2021 at a 600-bed tertiary referral hospital in Palembang, Indonesia. The hospital provides a full range of medical, surgical, and critical care services and maintains an established IPC program in line with national regulatory requirements.

Study Population and Sampling

The study population consisted of 120 registered nurses engaged in direct patient care, selected through proportional stratified random sampling to reflect different clinical contexts: operating theatres (30), emergency departments (18), intensive care units (12), and general wards (60). The sample size was calculated using the Epi Info software to ensure a 95% confidence level and a 5% margin of error. Inclusion criteria required participants to have a minimum of six months of clinical experience at the institution and to be actively engaged in patient care during the study period. Nurses on administrative duties or extended leave were excluded from the study.

Data Collection Instruments

Data collection utilized two primary instruments. First, an observation checklist adapted from WHO and Indonesian Ministry of Health guidelines, covering hand hygiene, use of PPE, safe injection practices, and environmental cleaning. Second, a structured self-administered questionnaire based on the Health Belief Model to assess perceived susceptibility, severity, benefits, barriers, and self-efficacy. The questionnaire was pilot-tested on a sub-sample of 20 nurses to ensure cultural appropriateness and clarity, yielding a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.85, indicating high internal consistency.

Procedure and Ethical Considerations

Observation was conducted by trained IPCNs who were not in a supervisory role, minimizing observer bias and the Hawthorne effect. Observations occurred during routine shifts across all departments without prior notification to the participants. The study was approved by the Institutional Review Board of the hospital and the affiliated university ethics committee. Informed consent was obtained from all participants prior to data collection, with assurances of confidentiality and anonymity.

Data Analysis

Data analysis was performed using SPSS version 26.0. Descriptive statistics summarized participant characteristics and compliance rates. Logistic regression was used to identify predictors of good compliance. Qualitative data from the open-ended questionnaire responses were analyzed thematically, focusing on themes related to autonomy, justice, beneficence, non-maleficence, and moral distress. The legal analysis integrated these empirical findings with normative legal research, examining relevant Indonesian statutes, international guidelines, and bioethical literature.

Results

Compliance Rates across Departments

The empirical findings from the Palembang hospital highlight significant disparities in compliance rates across different clinical departments. While the overall compliance rate with standard precautions was approximately 55%, a detailed breakdown revealed that nurses in high-risk units, such as the Intensive Care Unit (ICU) and the Operating Theatre (OT), demonstrated significantly higher adherence (over 75%) compared to their counterparts in general wards (below 45%). This disparity was particularly pronounced in the consistent use of personal protective equipment (PPE) and the adherence to hand hygiene protocols between patient contacts. The observational data indicated that the availability of PPE was directly correlated with compliance; departments with robust supply chains exhibited higher adherence rates regardless of the nurses' individual knowledge levels.

The empirical findings from the Palembang hospital highlight significant disparities in compliance rates across different clinical departments. While the overall compliance rate with standard precautions was approximately 55%, a detailed breakdown revealed that nurses in high-risk units, such as the Intensive Care Unit (ICU) and the Operating Theatre (OT), demonstrated significantly higher adherence (over 75%) compared to their counterparts in general wards (below 45%). This disparity was particularly pronounced in the consistent use of personal protective equipment (PPE) and the adherence to hand hygiene protocols between patient contacts. The observational data indicated that the availability of PPE was directly correlated with compliance; departments with robust supply chains exhibited higher adherence rates regardless of the nurses' individual knowledge levels.

The empirical findings from the Palembang hospital highlight significant disparities in compliance rates across different clinical departments. While the overall compliance rate with

standard precautions was approximately 55%, a detailed breakdown revealed that nurses in high-risk units, such as the Intensive Care Unit (ICU) and the Operating Theatre (OT), demonstrated significantly higher adherence (over 75%) compared to their counterparts in general wards (below 45%). This disparity was particularly pronounced in the consistent use of personal protective equipment (PPE) and the adherence to hand hygiene protocols between patient contacts. The observational data indicated that the availability of PPE was directly correlated with compliance; departments with robust supply chains exhibited higher adherence rates regardless of the nurses' individual knowledge levels.

The empirical findings from the Palembang hospital highlight significant disparities in compliance rates across different clinical departments. While the overall compliance rate with standard precautions was approximately 55%, a detailed breakdown revealed that nurses in high-risk units, such as the Intensive Care Unit (ICU) and the Operating Theatre (OT), demonstrated significantly higher adherence (over 75%) compared to their counterparts in general wards (below 45%). This disparity was particularly pronounced in the consistent use of personal protective equipment (PPE) and the adherence to hand hygiene protocols between patient contacts. The observational data indicated that the availability of PPE was directly correlated with compliance; departments with robust supply chains exhibited higher adherence rates regardless of the nurses' individual knowledge levels.

The empirical findings from the Palembang hospital highlight significant disparities in compliance rates across different clinical departments. While the overall compliance rate with standard precautions was approximately 55%, a detailed breakdown revealed that nurses in high-risk units, such as the Intensive Care Unit (ICU) and the Operating Theatre (OT), demonstrated significantly higher adherence (over 75%) compared to their counterparts in general wards (below 45%). This disparity was particularly pronounced in the consistent use of personal protective equipment (PPE) and the adherence to hand hygiene protocols between patient contacts. The observational data indicated that the availability of PPE was directly correlated with compliance; departments with robust supply chains exhibited higher adherence rates regardless of the nurses' individual knowledge levels.

Discussion

Legal Frameworks and Ethical Imperatives in Infection Control

The International Legal and Normative Framework

The implementation of standard precautions is governed by a complex interplay of international guidelines, national legislation, and fundamental bioethical principles. Understanding this framework is essential for evaluating the compliance of healthcare institutions, the rights of healthcare workers, and the potential for legal liability. At the international level, the World Health Organization (WHO) and the International Labour Organization (ILO) have established clear standards for occupational health and safety in healthcare settings. The WHO's 2022 guidelines on standard precautions emphasize that these measures aim to protect both health workers and patients by reducing the risk of transmission of microorganisms from both recognized and unrecognized sources (World Health Organization, 2022). These guidelines establish SPs as the minimum standard of infection prevention and control practices that must be utilized by all healthcare workers, during the care of all patients, at all times, and in all settings. The ILO further reinforces this standard by framing safe working conditions as a fundamental human right. Occupational health services are essential to ensuring that healthcare workers are not subjected to preventable harm in the course of their duties. This international consensus provides the normative foundation upon which national legal frameworks are built, establishing a baseline standard of care that courts may reference in negligence claims.

The implementation of standard precautions is governed by a complex interplay of international guidelines, national legislation, and fundamental bioethical principles. Understanding this framework is essential for evaluating the compliance of healthcare institutions, the rights of healthcare workers, and the potential for legal liability. At the international level, the World Health Organization (WHO) and the International Labour Organization (ILO) have established clear standards for occupational health and safety in healthcare settings. The WHO's 2022 guidelines on standard precautions emphasize that these measures aim to protect both health workers and patients by reducing the risk of transmission of microorganisms from both recognized and unrecognized sources (World Health Organization, 2022). These guidelines establish SPs as the minimum standard of infection prevention and control practices that must be utilized by all healthcare workers, during the care of all patients, at all times, and in all settings. The ILO further reinforces this standard by framing safe working conditions as a fundamental human right. Occupational health services are essential to ensuring that healthcare workers are not subjected to preventable harm in the course of their duties. This international consensus provides the normative foundation upon which national legal frameworks are built, establishing a baseline standard of care that courts may reference in negligence claims.

The implementation of standard precautions is governed by a complex interplay of international guidelines, national legislation, and fundamental bioethical principles. Understanding this framework is essential for evaluating the compliance of healthcare institutions, the rights of healthcare workers, and the potential for legal liability. At the international level, the World Health Organization (WHO) and the International Labour Organization (ILO) have established clear standards for occupational health and safety in healthcare settings. The WHO's 2022 guidelines on standard precautions emphasize that these measures aim to protect both health workers and patients by reducing the risk of transmission of microorganisms from both recognized and unrecognized sources (World Health Organization, 2022). These guidelines establish SPs as the minimum standard of infection prevention and control practices that must be utilized by all healthcare workers, during the care of all patients, at all times, and in all settings. The ILO further reinforces this standard by framing safe working conditions as a fundamental human right. Occupational health services are essential to ensuring that healthcare workers are not subjected to preventable harm in the course of their duties. This international consensus provides the normative foundation upon which national legal frameworks are built, establishing a baseline standard of care that courts may reference in negligence claims.

The implementation of standard precautions is governed by a complex interplay of international guidelines, national legislation, and fundamental bioethical principles. Understanding this framework is essential for evaluating the compliance of healthcare institutions, the rights of healthcare workers, and the potential for legal liability. At the international level, the World Health Organization (WHO) and the International Labour Organization (ILO) have established clear standards for occupational health and safety in healthcare settings. The WHO's 2022 guidelines on standard precautions emphasize that these measures aim to protect both health workers and patients by reducing the risk of transmission of microorganisms from both recognized and unrecognized sources (World Health Organization, 2022). These guidelines establish SPs as the minimum standard of infection prevention and control practices that must be utilized by all healthcare workers, during the care of all patients, at all times, and in all settings. The ILO further reinforces this standard by framing safe working conditions as a fundamental human right. Occupational health services are essential to ensuring that healthcare workers are not subjected to preventable harm in the course of their duties. This international consensus provides the normative foundation upon

which national legal frameworks are built, establishing a baseline standard of care that courts may reference in negligence claims.

The implementation of standard precautions is governed by a complex interplay of international guidelines, national legislation, and fundamental bioethical principles. Understanding this framework is essential for evaluating the compliance of healthcare institutions, the rights of healthcare workers, and the potential for legal liability. At the international level, the World Health Organization (WHO) and the International Labour Organization (ILO) have established clear standards for occupational health and safety in healthcare settings. The WHO's 2022 guidelines on standard precautions emphasize that these measures aim to protect both health workers and patients by reducing the risk of transmission of microorganisms from both recognized and unrecognized sources (World Health Organization, 2022). These guidelines establish SPs as the minimum standard of infection prevention and control practices that must be utilized by all healthcare workers, during the care of all patients, at all times, and in all settings. The ILO further reinforces this standard by framing safe working conditions as a fundamental human right. Occupational health services are essential to ensuring that healthcare workers are not subjected to preventable harm in the course of their duties. This international consensus provides the normative foundation upon which national legal frameworks are built, establishing a baseline standard of care that courts may reference in negligence claims.

Indonesian National Legislation and the Health Omnibus Law

In Indonesia, the legal framework governing healthcare worker safety has evolved significantly, culminating in the enactment of Law Number 17 of 2023 concerning Health (the Health Omnibus Law). This comprehensive legislation replaced several previous health-related laws and introduced stricter regulations aimed at enhancing the caliber of the healthcare system and providing greater legal protection for medical personnel (Government of the Republic of Indonesia, 2023). Under the Health Omnibus Law, medical professionals and health workers are explicitly granted the right to legal protection in the performance of their duties, provided they act in accordance with professional standards, service standards, standard operating procedures, and professional ethics (Ginting, 2023). This represents a crucial legal mandate for the implementation of standard precautions, as SPs are integral to established professional and service standards. Furthermore, occupational safety and health (Keselamatan dan Kesehatan Kerja or 'K3') is mandated across all sectors by Law No. 1 of 1970 concerning Occupational Safety, and reinforced by the Manpower Law (Government of the Republic of Indonesia, 1970). In the healthcare sector, this translates to a legal obligation for hospital administrators to provide adequate resources, including personal protective equipment, and to implement robust infection prevention and control programs. The Ministry of Health mandates the presence of dedicated Infection Prevention and Control Nurses (IPCNs) and hospital committees responsible for policy enforcement.

In Indonesia, the legal framework governing healthcare worker safety has evolved significantly, culminating in the enactment of Law Number 17 of 2023 concerning Health (the Health Omnibus Law). This comprehensive legislation replaced several previous health-related laws and introduced stricter regulations aimed at enhancing the caliber of the healthcare system and providing greater legal protection for medical personnel (Government of the Republic of Indonesia, 2023). Under the Health Omnibus Law, medical professionals and health workers are explicitly granted the right to legal protection in the performance of their duties, provided they act in accordance with professional standards, service standards, standard operating procedures, and professional ethics (Ginting, 2023). This represents a crucial legal mandate for the implementation of standard precautions, as SPs are integral to established professional and service standards. Furthermore, occupational safety and health (Keselamatan dan Kesehatan

Kerja or 'K3') is mandated across all sectors by Law No. 1 of 1970 concerning Occupational Safety, and reinforced by the Manpower Law (Government of the Republic of Indonesia, 1970). In the healthcare sector, this translates to a legal obligation for hospital administrators to provide adequate resources, including personal protective equipment, and to implement robust infection prevention and control programs. The Ministry of Health mandates the presence of dedicated Infection Prevention and Control Nurses (IPCNs) and hospital committees responsible for policy enforcement.

In Indonesia, the legal framework governing healthcare worker safety has evolved significantly, culminating in the enactment of Law Number 17 of 2023 concerning Health (the Health Omnibus Law). This comprehensive legislation replaced several previous health-related laws and introduced stricter regulations aimed at enhancing the caliber of the healthcare system and providing greater legal protection for medical personnel (Government of the Republic of Indonesia, 2023). Under the Health Omnibus Law, medical professionals and health workers are explicitly granted the right to legal protection in the performance of their duties, provided they act in accordance with professional standards, service standards, standard operating procedures, and professional ethics (Ginting, 2023). This represents a crucial legal mandate for the implementation of standard precautions, as SPs are integral to established professional and service standards. Furthermore, occupational safety and health (Keselamatan dan Kesehatan Kerja or 'K3') is mandated across all sectors by Law No. 1 of 1970 concerning Occupational Safety, and reinforced by the Manpower Law (Government of the Republic of Indonesia, 1970). In the healthcare sector, this translates to a legal obligation for hospital administrators to provide adequate resources, including personal protective equipment, and to implement robust infection prevention and control programs. The Ministry of Health mandates the presence of dedicated Infection Prevention and Control Nurses (IPCNs) and hospital committees responsible for policy enforcement.

In Indonesia, the legal framework governing healthcare worker safety has evolved significantly, culminating in the enactment of Law Number 17 of 2023 concerning Health (the Health Omnibus Law). This comprehensive legislation replaced several previous health-related laws and introduced stricter regulations aimed at enhancing the caliber of the healthcare system and providing greater legal protection for medical personnel (Government of the Republic of Indonesia, 2023). Under the Health Omnibus Law, medical professionals and health workers are explicitly granted the right to legal protection in the performance of their duties, provided they act in accordance with professional standards, service standards, standard operating procedures, and professional ethics (Ginting, 2023). This represents a crucial legal mandate for the implementation of standard precautions, as SPs are integral to established professional and service standards. Furthermore, occupational safety and health (Keselamatan dan Kesehatan Kerja or 'K3') is mandated across all sectors by Law No. 1 of 1970 concerning Occupational Safety, and reinforced by the Manpower Law (Government of the Republic of Indonesia, 1970). In the healthcare sector, this translates to a legal obligation for hospital administrators to provide adequate resources, including personal protective equipment, and to implement robust infection prevention and control programs. The Ministry of Health mandates the presence of dedicated Infection Prevention and Control Nurses (IPCNs) and hospital committees responsible for policy enforcement.

In Indonesia, the legal framework governing healthcare worker safety has evolved significantly, culminating in the enactment of Law Number 17 of 2023 concerning Health (the Health Omnibus Law). This comprehensive legislation replaced several previous health-related laws and introduced stricter regulations aimed at enhancing the caliber of the healthcare system and providing greater legal protection for medical personnel (Government of the Republic of Indonesia, 2023). Under the Health Omnibus Law, medical professionals and health workers are explicitly granted the right to legal protection in the performance of their duties, provided

they act in accordance with professional standards, service standards, standard operating procedures, and professional ethics (Ginting, 2023). This represents a crucial legal mandate for the implementation of standard precautions, as SPs are integral to established professional and service standards. Furthermore, occupational safety and health (Keselamatan dan Kesehatan Kerja or 'K3') is mandated across all sectors by Law No. 1 of 1970 concerning Occupational Safety, and reinforced by the Manpower Law (Government of the Republic of Indonesia, 1970). In the healthcare sector, this translates to a legal obligation for hospital administrators to provide adequate resources, including personal protective equipment, and to implement robust infection prevention and control programs. The Ministry of Health mandates the presence of dedicated Infection Prevention and Control Nurses (IPCNs) and hospital committees responsible for policy enforcement.

Analysis of Institutional Liability and Negligence

The failure to adhere to standard precautions is not merely an administrative oversight; it carries severe implications under tort law and medical malpractice frameworks. The legal liability associated with inadequate infection control extends to both individual healthcare providers and the institutions that employ them. In cases where a patient acquires a healthcare-associated infection (HAI) due to lapses in standard precautions, the hospital may be held liable under the legal doctrine of *respondeat superior* (vicarious liability) or direct corporate negligence (Zieliński et al., 2022). If a patient can demonstrate that their infection was proximately caused by a healthcare worker's failure to perform hand hygiene or use sterile equipment, the hospital can be sued for medical malpractice. Furthermore, if the failure to comply with SPs is rooted in institutional deficiencies such as chronic understaffing, failure to provide adequate PPE, or lack of mandatory training the hospital may be directly liable for corporate negligence. The findings from the Palembang hospital, which indicate systemic shortages of PPE and uneven training distribution, represent precisely the types of institutional failures that plaintiff attorneys utilize to establish a breach of the standard of care. Healthcare workers who contract infectious diseases due to inadequate institutional protection also have legal recourse. While workers' compensation systems typically cover occupational injuries, cases of gross negligence or willful violation of safety standards (such as intentional withholding of PPE) can sometimes pierce the corporate veil, allowing for direct civil lawsuits against the employer (Siracusa et al., 2019). Under Indonesia's Health Omnibus Law and Law No. 1 of 1970 on Occupational Safety (Government of the Republic of Indonesia, 1970), hospitals have a non-delegable duty to provide a safe working environment. The moral distress reported by nurses in the study stemming from an inability to protect themselves due to resource constraints highlights a significant legal vulnerability for the hospital (Jameton, 1984). Failure to address these known hazards constitutes a breach of statutory duty, potentially leading to administrative sanctions, fines, or civil litigation.

The failure to adhere to standard precautions is not merely an administrative oversight; it carries severe implications under tort law and medical malpractice frameworks. The legal liability associated with inadequate infection control extends to both individual healthcare providers and the institutions that employ them. In cases where a patient acquires a healthcare-associated infection (HAI) due to lapses in standard precautions, the hospital may be held liable under the legal doctrine of *respondeat superior* (vicarious liability) or direct corporate negligence (Zieliński et al., 2022). If a patient can demonstrate that their infection was proximately caused by a healthcare worker's failure to perform hand hygiene or use sterile equipment, the hospital can be sued for medical malpractice. Furthermore, if the failure to comply with SPs is rooted in institutional deficiencies such as chronic understaffing, failure to provide adequate PPE, or lack of mandatory training the hospital may be directly liable for corporate negligence. The findings from the Palembang hospital, which indicate systemic

shortages of PPE and uneven training distribution, represent precisely the types of institutional failures that plaintiff attorneys utilize to establish a breach of the standard of care. Healthcare workers who contract infectious diseases due to inadequate institutional protection also have legal recourse. While workers' compensation systems typically cover occupational injuries, cases of gross negligence or willful violation of safety standards (such as intentional withholding of PPE) can sometimes pierce the corporate veil, allowing for direct civil lawsuits against the employer (Siracusa et al., 2019). Under Indonesia's Health Omnibus Law and Law No. 1 of 1970 on Occupational Safety (Government of the Republic of Indonesia, 1970), hospitals have a non-delegable duty to provide a safe working environment. The moral distress reported by nurses in the study stemming from an inability to protect themselves due to resource constraints highlights a significant legal vulnerability for the hospital (Jameton, 1984). Failure to address these known hazards constitutes a breach of statutory duty, potentially leading to administrative sanctions, fines, or civil litigation.

The failure to adhere to standard precautions is not merely an administrative oversight; it carries severe implications under tort law and medical malpractice frameworks. The legal liability associated with inadequate infection control extends to both individual healthcare providers and the institutions that employ them. In cases where a patient acquires a healthcare-associated infection (HAI) due to lapses in standard precautions, the hospital may be held liable under the legal doctrine of *respondeat superior* (vicarious liability) or direct corporate negligence (Zieliński et al., 2022). If a patient can demonstrate that their infection was proximately caused by a healthcare worker's failure to perform hand hygiene or use sterile equipment, the hospital can be sued for medical malpractice. Furthermore, if the failure to comply with SPs is rooted in institutional deficiencies such as chronic understaffing, failure to provide adequate PPE, or lack of mandatory training the hospital may be directly liable for corporate negligence. The findings from the Palembang hospital, which indicate systemic shortages of PPE and uneven training distribution, represent precisely the types of institutional failures that plaintiff attorneys utilize to establish a breach of the standard of care. Healthcare workers who contract infectious diseases due to inadequate institutional protection also have legal recourse. While workers' compensation systems typically cover occupational injuries, cases of gross negligence or willful violation of safety standards (such as intentional withholding of PPE) can sometimes pierce the corporate veil, allowing for direct civil lawsuits against the employer (Siracusa et al., 2019). Under Indonesia's Health Omnibus Law and Law No. 1 of 1970 on Occupational Safety (Government of the Republic of Indonesia, 1970), hospitals have a non-delegable duty to provide a safe working environment. The moral distress reported by nurses in the study stemming from an inability to protect themselves due to resource constraints highlights a significant legal vulnerability for the hospital (Jameton, 1984). Failure to address these known hazards constitutes a breach of statutory duty, potentially leading to administrative sanctions, fines, or civil litigation.

The failure to adhere to standard precautions is not merely an administrative oversight; it carries severe implications under tort law and medical malpractice frameworks. The legal liability associated with inadequate infection control extends to both individual healthcare providers and the institutions that employ them. In cases where a patient acquires a healthcare-associated infection (HAI) due to lapses in standard precautions, the hospital may be held liable under the legal doctrine of *respondeat superior* (vicarious liability) or direct corporate negligence (Zieliński et al., 2022). If a patient can demonstrate that their infection was proximately caused by a healthcare worker's failure to perform hand hygiene or use sterile equipment, the hospital can be sued for medical malpractice. Furthermore, if the failure to comply with SPs is rooted in institutional deficiencies such as chronic understaffing, failure to provide adequate PPE, or lack of mandatory training the hospital may be directly liable for corporate negligence. The findings from the Palembang hospital, which indicate systemic

shortages of PPE and uneven training distribution, represent precisely the types of institutional failures that plaintiff attorneys utilize to establish a breach of the standard of care. Healthcare workers who contract infectious diseases due to inadequate institutional protection also have legal recourse. While workers' compensation systems typically cover occupational injuries, cases of gross negligence or willful violation of safety standards (such as intentional withholding of PPE) can sometimes pierce the corporate veil, allowing for direct civil lawsuits against the employer (Siracusa et al., 2019). Under Indonesia's Health Omnibus Law and Law No. 1 of 1970 on Occupational Safety (Government of the Republic of Indonesia, 1970), hospitals have a non-delegable duty to provide a safe working environment. The moral distress reported by nurses in the study stemming from an inability to protect themselves due to resource constraints highlights a significant legal vulnerability for the hospital (Jameton, 1984). Failure to address these known hazards constitutes a breach of statutory duty, potentially leading to administrative sanctions, fines, or civil litigation.

The failure to adhere to standard precautions is not merely an administrative oversight; it carries severe implications under tort law and medical malpractice frameworks. The legal liability associated with inadequate infection control extends to both individual healthcare providers and the institutions that employ them. In cases where a patient acquires a healthcare-associated infection (HAI) due to lapses in standard precautions, the hospital may be held liable under the legal doctrine of *respondeat superior* (vicarious liability) or direct corporate negligence (Zieliński et al., 2022). If a patient can demonstrate that their infection was proximately caused by a healthcare worker's failure to perform hand hygiene or use sterile equipment, the hospital can be sued for medical malpractice. Furthermore, if the failure to comply with SPs is rooted in institutional deficiencies such as chronic understaffing, failure to provide adequate PPE, or lack of mandatory training the hospital may be directly liable for corporate negligence. The findings from the Palembang hospital, which indicate systemic shortages of PPE and uneven training distribution, represent precisely the types of institutional failures that plaintiff attorneys utilize to establish a breach of the standard of care. Healthcare workers who contract infectious diseases due to inadequate institutional protection also have legal recourse. While workers' compensation systems typically cover occupational injuries, cases of gross negligence or willful violation of safety standards (such as intentional withholding of PPE) can sometimes pierce the corporate veil, allowing for direct civil lawsuits against the employer (Siracusa et al., 2019). Under Indonesia's Health Omnibus Law and Law No. 1 of 1970 on Occupational Safety (Government of the Republic of Indonesia, 1970), hospitals have a non-delegable duty to provide a safe working environment. The moral distress reported by nurses in the study stemming from an inability to protect themselves due to resource constraints highlights a significant legal vulnerability for the hospital (Jameton, 1984). Failure to address these known hazards constitutes a breach of statutory duty, potentially leading to administrative sanctions, fines, or civil litigation.

The failure to adhere to standard precautions is not merely an administrative oversight; it carries severe implications under tort law and medical malpractice frameworks. The legal liability associated with inadequate infection control extends to both individual healthcare providers and the institutions that employ them. In cases where a patient acquires a healthcare-associated infection (HAI) due to lapses in standard precautions, the hospital may be held liable under the legal doctrine of *respondeat superior* (vicarious liability) or direct corporate negligence (Zieliński et al., 2022). If a patient can demonstrate that their infection was proximately caused by a healthcare worker's failure to perform hand hygiene or use sterile equipment, the hospital can be sued for medical malpractice. Furthermore, if the failure to comply with SPs is rooted in institutional deficiencies such as chronic understaffing, failure to provide adequate PPE, or lack of mandatory training the hospital may be directly liable for corporate negligence. The findings from the Palembang hospital, which indicate systemic

shortages of PPE and uneven training distribution, represent precisely the types of institutional failures that plaintiff attorneys utilize to establish a breach of the standard of care. Healthcare workers who contract infectious diseases due to inadequate institutional protection also have legal recourse. While workers' compensation systems typically cover occupational injuries, cases of gross negligence or willful violation of safety standards (such as intentional withholding of PPE) can sometimes pierce the corporate veil, allowing for direct civil lawsuits against the employer (Siracusa et al., 2019). Under Indonesia's Health Omnibus Law and Law No. 1 of 1970 on Occupational Safety (Government of the Republic of Indonesia, 1970), hospitals have a non-delegable duty to provide a safe working environment. The moral distress reported by nurses in the study stemming from an inability to protect themselves due to resource constraints highlights a significant legal vulnerability for the hospital (Jameton, 1984). Failure to address these known hazards constitutes a breach of statutory duty, potentially leading to administrative sanctions, fines, or civil litigation.

The failure to adhere to standard precautions is not merely an administrative oversight; it carries severe implications under tort law and medical malpractice frameworks. The legal liability associated with inadequate infection control extends to both individual healthcare providers and the institutions that employ them. In cases where a patient acquires a healthcare-associated infection (HAI) due to lapses in standard precautions, the hospital may be held liable under the legal doctrine of *respondeat superior* (vicarious liability) or direct corporate negligence (Zieliński et al., 2022). If a patient can demonstrate that their infection was proximately caused by a healthcare worker's failure to perform hand hygiene or use sterile equipment, the hospital can be sued for medical malpractice. Furthermore, if the failure to comply with SPs is rooted in institutional deficiencies such as chronic understaffing, failure to provide adequate PPE, or lack of mandatory training the hospital may be directly liable for corporate negligence. The findings from the Palembang hospital, which indicate systemic shortages of PPE and uneven training distribution, represent precisely the types of institutional failures that plaintiff attorneys utilize to establish a breach of the standard of care. Healthcare workers who contract infectious diseases due to inadequate institutional protection also have legal recourse. While workers' compensation systems typically cover occupational injuries, cases of gross negligence or willful violation of safety standards (such as intentional withholding of PPE) can sometimes pierce the corporate veil, allowing for direct civil lawsuits against the employer (Siracusa et al., 2019). Under Indonesia's Health Omnibus Law and Law No. 1 of 1970 on Occupational Safety (Government of the Republic of Indonesia, 1970), hospitals have a non-delegable duty to provide a safe working environment. The moral distress reported by nurses in the study stemming from an inability to protect themselves due to resource constraints highlights a significant legal vulnerability for the hospital (Jameton, 1984). Failure to address these known hazards constitutes a breach of statutory duty, potentially leading to administrative sanctions, fines, or civil litigation.

The failure to adhere to standard precautions is not merely an administrative oversight; it carries severe implications under tort law and medical malpractice frameworks. The legal liability associated with inadequate infection control extends to both individual healthcare providers and the institutions that employ them. In cases where a patient acquires a healthcare-associated infection (HAI) due to lapses in standard precautions, the hospital may be held liable under the legal doctrine of *respondeat superior* (vicarious liability) or direct corporate negligence (Zieliński et al., 2022). If a patient can demonstrate that their infection was proximately caused by a healthcare worker's failure to perform hand hygiene or use sterile equipment, the hospital can be sued for medical malpractice. Furthermore, if the failure to comply with SPs is rooted in institutional deficiencies such as chronic understaffing, failure to provide adequate PPE, or lack of mandatory training the hospital may be directly liable for corporate negligence. The findings from the Palembang hospital, which indicate systemic

shortages of PPE and uneven training distribution, represent precisely the types of institutional failures that plaintiff attorneys utilize to establish a breach of the standard of care. Healthcare workers who contract infectious diseases due to inadequate institutional protection also have legal recourse. While workers' compensation systems typically cover occupational injuries, cases of gross negligence or willful violation of safety standards (such as intentional withholding of PPE) can sometimes pierce the corporate veil, allowing for direct civil lawsuits against the employer (Siracusa et al., 2019). Under Indonesia's Health Omnibus Law and Law No. 1 of 1970 on Occupational Safety (Government of the Republic of Indonesia, 1970), hospitals have a non-delegable duty to provide a safe working environment. The moral distress reported by nurses in the study stemming from an inability to protect themselves due to resource constraints highlights a significant legal vulnerability for the hospital (Jameton, 1984). Failure to address these known hazards constitutes a breach of statutory duty, potentially leading to administrative sanctions, fines, or civil litigation.

The failure to adhere to standard precautions is not merely an administrative oversight; it carries severe implications under tort law and medical malpractice frameworks. The legal liability associated with inadequate infection control extends to both individual healthcare providers and the institutions that employ them. In cases where a patient acquires a healthcare-associated infection (HAI) due to lapses in standard precautions, the hospital may be held liable under the legal doctrine of *respondeat superior* (vicarious liability) or direct corporate negligence (Zieliński et al., 2022). If a patient can demonstrate that their infection was proximately caused by a healthcare worker's failure to perform hand hygiene or use sterile equipment, the hospital can be sued for medical malpractice. Furthermore, if the failure to comply with SPs is rooted in institutional deficiencies such as chronic understaffing, failure to provide adequate PPE, or lack of mandatory training the hospital may be directly liable for corporate negligence. The findings from the Palembang hospital, which indicate systemic shortages of PPE and uneven training distribution, represent precisely the types of institutional failures that plaintiff attorneys utilize to establish a breach of the standard of care. Healthcare workers who contract infectious diseases due to inadequate institutional protection also have legal recourse. While workers' compensation systems typically cover occupational injuries, cases of gross negligence or willful violation of safety standards (such as intentional withholding of PPE) can sometimes pierce the corporate veil, allowing for direct civil lawsuits against the employer (Siracusa et al., 2019). Under Indonesia's Health Omnibus Law and Law No. 1 of 1970 on Occupational Safety (Government of the Republic of Indonesia, 1970), hospitals have a non-delegable duty to provide a safe working environment. The moral distress reported by nurses in the study stemming from an inability to protect themselves due to resource constraints highlights a significant legal vulnerability for the hospital (Jameton, 1984). Failure to address these known hazards constitutes a breach of statutory duty, potentially leading to administrative sanctions, fines, or civil litigation.

The failure to adhere to standard precautions is not merely an administrative oversight; it carries severe implications under tort law and medical malpractice frameworks. The legal liability associated with inadequate infection control extends to both individual healthcare providers and the institutions that employ them. In cases where a patient acquires a healthcare-associated infection (HAI) due to lapses in standard precautions, the hospital may be held liable under the legal doctrine of *respondeat superior* (vicarious liability) or direct corporate negligence (Zieliński et al., 2022). If a patient can demonstrate that their infection was proximately caused by a healthcare worker's failure to perform hand hygiene or use sterile equipment, the hospital can be sued for medical malpractice. Furthermore, if the failure to comply with SPs is rooted in institutional deficiencies such as chronic understaffing, failure to provide adequate PPE, or lack of mandatory training the hospital may be directly liable for corporate negligence. The findings from the Palembang hospital, which indicate systemic

shortages of PPE and uneven training distribution, represent precisely the types of institutional failures that plaintiff attorneys utilize to establish a breach of the standard of care. Healthcare workers who contract infectious diseases due to inadequate institutional protection also have legal recourse. While workers' compensation systems typically cover occupational injuries, cases of gross negligence or willful violation of safety standards (such as intentional withholding of PPE) can sometimes pierce the corporate veil, allowing for direct civil lawsuits against the employer (Siracusa et al., 2019). Under Indonesia's Health Omnibus Law and Law No. 1 of 1970 on Occupational Safety (Government of the Republic of Indonesia, 1970), hospitals have a non-delegable duty to provide a safe working environment. The moral distress reported by nurses in the study stemming from an inability to protect themselves due to resource constraints highlights a significant legal vulnerability for the hospital (Jameton, 1984). Failure to address these known hazards constitutes a breach of statutory duty, potentially leading to administrative sanctions, fines, or civil litigation.

Conclusions

This comprehensive analysis demonstrates that while over half of the nurses at a large tertiary hospital in Indonesia achieved good compliance with standard precautions, significant disparities exist between clinical units. These disparities, driven by unequal access to personal protective equipment, inconsistent training, and systemic workload pressures, have profound legal and ethical implications. They undermine the bioethical principles of justice, autonomy, beneficence, and non-maleficence, and represent a failure to fulfill the legal obligations mandated by Indonesia's Health Omnibus Law and international occupational safety standards. The failure to implement standard precautions equitably and consistently exposes healthcare institutions to significant legal liability, including claims of medical malpractice for patient infections and statutory violations of occupational health rights. Addressing these inequities requires more than technical interventions; it demands an explicit legal and ethical commitment from healthcare institutions to ensure equitable protection for all healthcare workers, regardless of their department. By embedding ethical reasoning and legal awareness into infection prevention training, implementing fair resource allocation policies, and fostering a supportive safety culture, healthcare systems can fulfill both their clinical objectives and their legal mandates, ultimately safeguarding the health, rights, and legal standing of all stakeholders.

Author Contributions

Author NTR conceived and designed the research framework; Author NTR analyzed the legal and ethical implications; Author NTR wrote the paper. Authorship is limited to those who have contributed substantially to the work reported.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest. There are no personal circumstances or interests that may be perceived as inappropriately influencing the representation or interpretation of reported research results.

Acknowledgment

The authors would like to acknowledge the nursing staff and administration at the Palembang tertiary hospital for their participation and support in providing the empirical data that formed the foundation for this legal analysis.

References

- Allegranzi, B., Nejad, S. B., Combescure, C., Graafmans, W., Attar, H., Donaldson, L., & Pittet, D. (2011). Burden of endemic health-care-associated infection in developing countries: systematic review and meta-analysis. *The Lancet*, 377(9761), 228-241. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(10\)61458-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(10)61458-4)
- Beauchamp, T. L., & Childress, J. F. (2019). *Principles of biomedical ethics* (8th ed.). Oxford University Press.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2024). *Standard Precautions for All Patient Care*. Retrieved from <https://www.cdc.gov/infection-control/hcp/basics/standard-precautions.html>
- Ginting, M. L. B. (2023). Human Rights-Based Legal Protection for Health Workers. *Journal of Human Rights Law*, 4(2).
- Government of the Republic of Indonesia. (1970). *Law Number 1 of 1970 concerning Occupational Safety*. Jakarta.
- Government of the Republic of Indonesia. (2023). *Law Number 17 of 2023 concerning Health*. State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia Year 2023 Number 105. Jakarta.
- Jameton, A. (1984). *Nursing practice: The ethical issues*. Prentice-Hall.
- Miller, J. M. (2004). Liability relating to contracting infectious diseases in hospitals. *The Journal of Legal Medicine*, 25(2), 211-226. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01947640490457497>
- Siracusa, M., Scuri, S., & Grappasonni, I. (2019). Healthcare acquired infections: Malpractice and litigation issues. *Annali di Igiene*, 31(5), 441-452. <https://doi.org/10.7416/ai.2019.2306>
- Storr, J., Twyman, A., Zingg, W., Damani, N., Kilpatrick, C., Reilly, J., ... & Allegranzi, B. (2017). Core components for effective infection prevention and control programmes: new WHO evidence-based recommendations. *Antimicrobial Resistance & Infection Control*, 6(1), 6. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13756-016-0149-9>
- Tarantola, A., Abiteboul, D., & Rachline, A. (2006). Infection control in settings with limited resources. *Journal of Hospital Infection*, 64(2), 107-115. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhin.2006.05.013>
- World Health Organization. (2022). *Standard precautions for the prevention and control of infections: aide-memoire*. World Health Organization. <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/WHO-UHL-IHS-IPC-2022.1>
- Yallew, W. W., Kumie, A., & Yehuala, F. M. (2017). Assessment of compliance with standard precautions among healthcare workers in Gondar University Comprehensive Specialized Hospital, Northwest Ethiopia. *BMC Public Health*, 16(1), 671. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-017-4681-6>
- Zieliński, G., Kanecki, K., & Lewtak, K. (2022). Legal liability for healthcare-associated infections. *Family Medicine & Primary Care Review*, 21(1), 85-89. <https://doi.org/10.5114/fmPCR.2022.113016>