

Protecting Homebuyers: Legal Solutions for Real Estate Disputes

Andreas Marfel Silaban¹, Beby Sendy^{2*}

Fakultas Ilmu Sosial, Universitas Pembangunan Panca Budi

Corresponding Author: Beby Sendy bebysendy@dosen.pancabudi.ac.id

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords : Consumer Protection, Real Estate Disputes, Arbitration, Online Dispute Resolution, Contract Law

Received : 01 February 2025

Revised : 21 February 2025

Accepted: 25 March 2025

©2025 Silaban, Sendy: This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).



ABSTRACT

Consumer protection in real estate disputes remains a critical issue across jurisdictions due to variations in legal frameworks, enforcement mechanisms, and dispute resolution procedures. This study adopts a qualitative legal research methodology, employing doctrinal and comparative legal analyses to examine statutory protections, contractual obligations, and judicial precedents related to consumer rights in property transactions. A key focus is placed on the effectiveness of litigation, arbitration, and alternative dispute resolution (ADR) mechanisms, including the emerging role of Online Dispute Resolution (ODR). The findings highlight that while legal instruments such as the EU ADR Directive and the New York Convention provide structured approaches to dispute resolution, inconsistencies in implementation, judicial inefficiencies, and power imbalances continue to hinder consumer access to justice. The study underscores the need for harmonized legal standards, greater transparency in arbitration clauses, and the establishment of specialized real estate dispute resolution tribunals to enhance consumer protection. The research contributes to ongoing discussions on legal reforms aimed at improving access to justice and ensuring equitable dispute resolution in the real estate sector.

INTRODUCTION

The cancellation of property development projects frequently results in legal disputes, particularly concerning consumer rights, contractual obligations, and the responsibilities of developers. Consumers who invest in pre-sold properties or enter agreements with developers often face financial losses when projects are abandoned, delayed, or fail to comply with contractual terms. Such disputes necessitate well-defined legal frameworks to protect consumer interests while balancing the rights of developers ([Xu & Yuan, 2009](#)).

In many jurisdictions, consumer protection laws, contract law, and property regulations govern the legal landscape of real estate transactions. However, enforcement mechanisms vary significantly, creating challenges in dispute resolution. Some legal systems emphasize judicial litigation as the primary means of resolving property-related disputes, while others promote alternative dispute resolution (ADR) mechanisms such as arbitration and mediation ([Cortés, 2015](#)). The effectiveness of these mechanisms depends on regulatory oversight, judicial efficiency, and consumer access to legal remedies ([Williams et al., 2020](#)).

One major concern in real estate dispute resolution is the power imbalance between consumers and developers. In many cases, developers insert arbitration clauses in contracts, limiting consumer access to traditional courts ([Wilson, 2015](#)). While arbitration offers efficiency and enforceability, critics argue that it may disadvantage consumers who lack legal knowledge and bargaining power ([Gill et al., 2016](#)). Mediation, in contrast, provides a more balanced forum, but its voluntary nature and lack of enforceability can hinder its effectiveness ([Gešková, 2022](#)).

The rise of digital platforms has also introduced Online Dispute Resolution (ODR) as an emerging trend in consumer disputes. In the European Union, the ODR Regulation facilitates cross-border dispute resolution through online mechanisms ([Loutocký, 2016](#)). However, the success of ODR depends on consumer awareness, regulatory oversight, and technological accessibility ([Jeretina, 2016](#)). Some jurisdictions, such as Slovakia, have implemented procedural protections to ensure that ODR platforms align with substantive consumer rights ([Gešková, 2022](#)).

This study aims to analyze the legal frameworks governing consumer protection in real estate disputes, assess the effectiveness of litigation, arbitration, and ADR, and identify the challenges faced by consumers in seeking legal remedies. Additionally, it explores international best practices for harmonizing dispute resolution mechanisms in real estate transactions ([Bogdan, 2015](#)). By providing a comparative analysis, this research contributes to ongoing discussions on legal reforms aimed at enhancing consumer access to justice in property disputes ([Hodges, 2014](#)).

LITERATURE REVIEW

Legal Frameworks Governing Consumer Protection in Real Estate Disputes

The legal frameworks governing consumer protection in real estate transactions differ significantly across jurisdictions. Some legal systems

emphasize statutory protections, while others rely on contractual obligations and judicial precedents to regulate consumer rights in property transactions.

- **Statutory Protections in Consumer Real Estate Law**

Statutory protections in consumer real estate law play a critical role in safeguarding buyers from unfair practices and ensuring compliance with contractual obligations. Various jurisdictions have developed specific legislative frameworks to regulate real estate transactions and provide legal remedies for consumers who experience disputes with developers. These protections typically focus on contract transparency, dispute resolution mechanisms, and enforcement of consumer rights.

In the European Union (EU), the Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) Directive and Rome I Regulation serve as key legal instruments that mandate consumer protection measures in real estate transactions. The ADR Directive promotes arbitration and mediation as primary methods of resolving disputes, thereby reducing the burden on courts ([Cortés, 2015](#)). Additionally, the Rome I Regulation ensures that consumers benefit from the most protective national laws, regardless of the jurisdiction in which they sign contracts ([Schmitz, 2022](#)).

In France, consumer protection laws have evolved significantly over the past decade. The Consumer Code, alongside various provisions from the Civil and Commercial Codes, establishes stringent regulations that govern contractual obligations in real estate sales. These laws emphasize the requirement for developers to disclose complete and accurate information about properties before finalizing transactions ([Minor, 1984](#)). Similarly, Germany's Consumer Protection Act enforces mandatory rights for homebuyers, ensuring that contracts cannot contain unfair terms that limit legal recourse ([Rühl, 2011](#)).

The United Kingdom (UK) has implemented robust statutory protections through the Housing Grants, Construction and Regeneration Act 1996, which provides adjudication rights for consumers in property disputes. This law ensures that unfair contract terms can be challenged, preventing developers from imposing excessive penalties on buyers ([Hellwege, 2004](#)). Additionally, the Property Ombudsman (UK) functions as an independent body that facilitates dispute resolution outside the court system, offering a more accessible alternative for consumers ([Cartwright, 1996](#)).

In the United States, statutory protections vary by state but are generally guided by the Uniform Commercial Code (UCC) and state-specific consumer protection statutes. Courts have upheld the enforceability of consumer protection laws to counter fraudulent real estate practices, ensuring that buyers receive transparent information and the right to cancel contracts in cases of misrepresentation ([Barkhausen, 2010](#)). The Federal Trade Commission (FTC) also plays a significant role in regulating interstate property sales, imposing penalties on developers who engage in misleading advertising or predatory practices ([Cain, 1993](#)).

In India, the Real Estate (Regulation and Development) Act, 2016 (RERA) mandates that all real estate developers register their projects with a designated regulatory authority to prevent fraudulent activities. RERA also ensures

consumer access to dispute resolution forums, enabling legal action against developers who fail to meet contractual obligations ([Gill et al., 2016](#)). Furthermore, judicial precedents have reinforced consumer rights by ruling against unfair trade practices in the property sector ([Shandy, 2021](#)).

While these statutory protections provide significant safeguards, challenges remain in ensuring effective enforcement. The success of these regulations depends largely on consumer awareness, judicial efficiency, and regulatory oversight. Policymakers continue to refine legal frameworks to balance the interests of both developers and buyers, ensuring that statutory protections remain relevant in an evolving real estate market ([Svantesson, 2017](#)). In the United Kingdom (UK), the Housing Grants, Construction and Regeneration Act 1996 provides adjudication rights to consumers in property disputes, ensuring that they can challenge unfair contract terms. Additionally, the Property Ombudsman (UK) functions as an independent entity that facilitates dispute resolution outside the court system ([Hodges, 2014](#)).

- **Contractual Obligations and Judicial Precedents**

Contractual obligations and judicial precedents play a crucial role in consumer protection in real estate transactions, particularly in cases where statutory protections are either inadequate or absent. The enforceability of contractual terms and the evolution of legal precedents impact how real estate disputes are resolved in various jurisdictions.

Contract law forms the foundation of consumer real estate transactions, determining the rights and responsibilities of buyers and developers. Many jurisdictions uphold freedom of contract, allowing parties to negotiate terms freely. However, judicial intervention is often required when contractual terms disproportionately favor one party, particularly in cases involving asymmetrical bargaining power ([Lewison, 2022](#)).

For instance, in Turkish law, contract law reform has introduced judicial oversight to ensure fair contract terms, particularly in unforeseen circumstances ([Büyüksagis, 2016](#)). Similar trends are observed in Brazil, where quantitative analyses of judicial decisions highlight that a small number of legal precedents dominate corporate and real estate contract enforcement ([Nunes & Hartmann, 2021](#)).

Judicial precedents significantly influence consumer protection in real estate transactions by setting standards for contract interpretation, enforceability, and consumer rights. Courts often intervene to strike down unfair clauses, particularly those that limit consumer access to legal remedies ([Morse, 1992](#)).

One key example is the evolution of privity of estate doctrine, which determines whether contractual obligations transfer to subsequent buyers in real estate transactions ([Clark, 1922](#)). In some cases, courts have invalidated contractual clauses that place excessive burdens on consumers, as seen in recent decisions that require greater transparency in real estate contracts ([Jaffey, 1996](#)).

Legal doctrines such as frustration of contract play a vital role in determining whether contractual obligations remain binding in cases where unforeseen circumstances prevent performance. Courts have developed legal

standards to determine whether government interventions, such as compulsory land acquisition, render contracts void ([Hwang, 2004](#)). In Singapore, legal precedents have evolved to clarify the extent to which government policies can alter contractual obligations in real estate sales.

Internationally, contractual obligations in real estate are influenced by choice of law rules and cross-border consumer protections. In the European Union (EU), the Rome Convention on Contractual Obligations establishes rules to protect consumers against unfair contractual terms, particularly in international property transactions ([Tang, 2007](#)).

Additionally, the development of consumer protection restatements in the United States has been shaped by empirical analyses of case law, ensuring that judicial decisions align with emerging market trends ([Bar-Gill et al., 2017](#)). Contractual obligations and judicial precedents continue to evolve in response to changing market dynamics and consumer protection needs. Courts play a pivotal role in interpreting contractual obligations, ensuring that real estate contracts remain fair and enforceable. Moving forward, legal reforms should focus on harmonizing international consumer protection standards while addressing emerging challenges in cross-border real estate transactions ([Mallet, 2024](#)).

Litigation, Arbitration, and Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) Mechanisms

- **Litigation as a Traditional Approach**

Litigation remains the conventional method for resolving real estate disputes. It involves formal judicial proceedings where legal claims are adjudicated based on statutory and contractual obligations. However, litigation in real estate disputes has been widely criticized for its high costs, procedural complexity, and prolonged timelines ([Jespersen, 2018](#)).

The legal framework for real estate litigation varies across jurisdictions but typically relies on contract law, consumer protection statutes, and property regulations. Courts play a crucial role in enforcing contractual obligations, ensuring that developers fulfill their commitments to buyers. In the United Kingdom (UK), the Property Misdescriptions Act 1991 holds developers accountable for misleading information provided to buyers ([Samuel, 2002](#)). Similarly, in the United States (US), state-level real estate disclosure laws require sellers to provide accurate information about property conditions, failing which litigation may be initiated ([Fong, 2021](#)).

Despite its necessity in upholding legal rights, litigation is often perceived as an adversarial process that exacerbates disputes rather than resolving them efficiently. In response, some jurisdictions have implemented court-annexed mediation programs to encourage out-of-court settlements ([Gill et al., 2015](#)).

Litigation in real estate disputes presents multiple challenges, including financial burdens, procedural delays, and limited access to justice. Research indicates that legal costs in real estate litigation are a significant deterrent for consumers, often leading them to accept unfavorable settlements rather than pursue lengthy legal battles ([Connerty, 1996](#)).

In China, judicial inefficiencies further complicate real estate litigation. Courts often face a backlog of cases, resulting in prolonged dispute resolution periods. Recent studies highlight that mediation remains the preferred approach for resolving consumer real estate disputes due to these inefficiencies ([Xu & Yuan, 2009](#)).

The effectiveness of litigation varies depending on jurisdictional legal structures and procedural efficiency. Studies comparing litigation versus alternative dispute resolution (ADR) reveal that while litigation provides enforceability and judicial oversight, it is often less effective in preserving business relationships between consumers and developers ([Wang, 2000](#)).

A survey conducted in Australia examining real estate disputes found that ADR methods such as arbitration and mediation were preferred by consumers due to lower costs and faster resolution times compared to litigation ([Coulson, 1983](#)). Nevertheless, litigation remains the primary enforcement mechanism for disputes involving contractual breaches and fraudulent misrepresentations ([Holtzworth-Munroe et al., 2021](#)).

Recent legal developments suggest a shift towards integrated dispute resolution models, incorporating both judicial oversight and ADR mechanisms. Scholars propose that hybrid models, such as litigation-assisted mediation, could provide a more balanced approach to resolving real estate disputes ([Ballard & Easteal, 2016](#)).

Furthermore, the rise of Online Dispute Resolution (ODR) has begun influencing litigation practices, particularly in cross-border real estate transactions. The European Union's ODR Regulation facilitates online dispute resolution to enhance access to justice and reduce litigation costs ([Abedi et al., 2019](#)). While litigation remains indispensable for complex legal disputes, its future role is likely to be integrated with technological innovations and alternative dispute resolution methods to improve efficiency and accessibility ([McLean, 2009](#)).

- **Arbitration in International Real Estate Disputes**

Arbitration is increasingly recognized as an effective mechanism for resolving international real estate disputes, particularly in cases involving cross-border property transactions and multinational investors. Unlike litigation, arbitration offers a neutral forum, confidentiality, and enforceability under treaties such as the New York Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards ([Gotanda, 2002](#)).

Arbitration offers significant advantages in resolving international real estate disputes. One of its key benefits is the ability to appoint expert arbitrators familiar with real estate law, reducing reliance on generalist judges ([Biti & Rrugia, 2014](#)). Additionally, arbitration agreements often provide for faster resolutions compared to traditional litigation, which can be prolonged by jurisdictional complexities ([Maktouf, 1988](#)).

A critical factor in real estate arbitration is jurisdictional certainty. By allowing parties to specify the legal framework governing the dispute, arbitration reduces forum shopping and unpredictable judicial interpretations

[\(Rosenne, 1993\)](#). The Permanent Court of Arbitration (PCA) also plays a role in facilitating arbitration in cases where one party is a state, ensuring that public entities comply with contractual obligations [\(American Journal of International Law, 1963\)](#).

The legal foundation of international arbitration in real estate is established through multiple treaties and institutional rules. The New York Convention (1958) provides for the recognition and enforcement of arbitral awards across 168 countries, making arbitration an attractive option for international investors [\(Baron, 2000\)](#). Additionally, investment treaties often include arbitration clauses to protect foreign investors in real estate projects [\(Urueña, 2016\)](#).

Real estate arbitration also benefits from institutional support, such as the International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes (ICSID), which handles investor-state disputes related to real estate expropriation and development projects [\(Nwakoby & Aduaka, 2015\)](#). The International Chamber of Commerce (ICC) Arbitration Rules provide another legal framework frequently used in high-value real estate transactions [\(Simões, 2017\)](#).

Despite its benefits, arbitration in real estate disputes is not without challenges. Costs remain a concern, particularly in high-value disputes requiring multiple arbitrators and extensive legal representation [\(Wilson, 1990\)](#). Some critics argue that arbitration lacks the procedural safeguards of litigation, such as the right to appeal or precedential rulings [\(Rosenne, 1993\)](#).

A comparative study between French and Jordanian laws reveals inconsistencies in national recognition of arbitral awards. While French courts generally uphold arbitration agreements, Jordanian courts impose additional procedural barriers, limiting enforceability [\(Ismail, 2022\)](#). This discrepancy highlights the importance of drafting arbitration agreements that comply with local legal requirements.

The future of arbitration in real estate disputes is expected to be shaped by digital innovations and global harmonization efforts. The increasing adoption of Online Dispute Resolution (ODR) platforms aims to improve accessibility, particularly for cross-border real estate transactions [\(Lee, Ahn, & de Werra, 2014\)](#).

Additionally, legal scholars advocate for reforms to arbitral procedural rules to enhance fairness and cost-effectiveness [\(Naldi, 1990\)](#). As international real estate markets continue to grow, arbitration will likely play an even greater role in resolving disputes efficiently and ensuring legal certainty for investors. Overall, while arbitration presents clear advantages for international real estate disputes, its success depends on continued legal developments, cost management strategies, and global cooperation to standardize procedures [\(Threlkeld, 2023\)](#).

- **Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) Mechanisms**

Mediation and arbitration are the two most commonly used ADR mechanisms in real estate disputes. Mediation is a voluntary, non-binding process where a neutral third party assists the disputing parties in reaching a mutually acceptable resolution. In contrast, arbitration involves a neutral

arbitrator who hears evidence and makes a binding decision ([Walker & Daniels, 1995](#)). In the United States, mediation is increasingly encouraged in real estate transactions, particularly in contract disputes and landlord-tenant conflicts. The Uniform Mediation Act (UMA) provides a legal framework for mediating disputes, ensuring confidentiality and enforceability of mediated agreements ([Gnaedinger, 1987](#)). Meanwhile, arbitration is frequently used in international real estate transactions. The New York Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards ensures that arbitration decisions are recognized and enforced across multiple jurisdictions, making it a preferred choice for cross-border property disputes ([Ojo, 2023](#)).

Several studies have shown that ADR mechanisms significantly reduce the time and cost of dispute resolution compared to traditional litigation. In Nigeria, ADR has been successfully integrated into the property market, demonstrating its effectiveness in settling disputes without resorting to lengthy court proceedings ([Ojo, 2023](#)). Similarly, in India, ADR is widely used under the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, which facilitates dispute resolution in property transactions ([Kumar, 2023](#)). Despite its advantages, ADR is not always effective in resolving high-stakes disputes involving fraud or breach of contract. Critics argue that ADR, particularly mediation, may lack the binding enforcement mechanisms found in litigation, leading to non-compliance with agreements.

Several barriers hinder the widespread adoption of ADR in real estate disputes:

- Lack of awareness among consumers regarding the availability and benefits of ADR mechanisms.
- Reluctance of developers and landlords to engage in mediation due to the perception that it may weaken their legal position.
- Absence of regulatory mandates in some jurisdictions, making ADR participation voluntary rather than compulsory ([Connerty, 1996](#)).

As legal systems evolve, many jurisdictions are integrating Online Dispute Resolution (ODR) into ADR frameworks. The European Union's ODR Regulation aims to provide a structured platform for resolving real estate disputes online, increasing accessibility and efficiency ([Balzer & Schneider, 2021](#)). Additionally, scholars advocate for making ADR a mandatory requirement in real estate contracts, reducing litigation costs and promoting faster dispute resolution ([Cohen, 2006](#)). ADR mechanisms provide a cost-effective, time-efficient, and flexible means of resolving real estate disputes. While challenges remain, ongoing legal and technological advancements are expected to enhance ADR's role in ensuring fair and accessible dispute resolution for property transactions worldwide ([Ezulike & Hoare, 1998](#)).

Challenges in Consumer Dispute Resolution

- High Costs and Procedural Complexities

One of the primary barriers to effective consumer dispute resolution in real estate transactions is the high cost of legal proceedings and the procedural

complexities involved. The financial burden associated with litigation often deters consumers from pursuing legal action against developers or sellers, even in cases of contractual breaches or fraudulent misrepresentations. Additionally, real estate contracts frequently contain mandatory arbitration clauses, which restrict consumers from accessing traditional courts and force them into arbitration, which may also be prohibitively expensive ([Budnitz, 2004](#)).

Research indicates that the cost of pursuing legal remedies in consumer real estate disputes often outweighs the potential financial benefits. A study on consumer arbitration agreements found that many arbitration clauses impose excessive filing fees, administrative costs, and arbitrator fees, making it financially impractical for consumers to pursue claims ([Budnitz, 2004](#)).

The procedural complexity of arbitration also plays a role in discouraging consumers from pursuing their rights. While arbitration is often promoted as a faster and more cost-effective alternative to litigation, studies show that arbitration proceedings can be just as expensive, if not more so, due to high arbitrator fees and administrative costs ([Collins, 2008](#)). In many cases, consumers are required to travel to distant arbitration locations, increasing logistical expenses.

Another major challenge in consumer real estate dispute resolution is the procedural complexity of the legal system. Studies indicate that real estate litigation involves multiple procedural stages, including pre-trial motions, discovery, and expert testimony, all of which require legal expertise and significant financial resources ([Gešková, 2022](#)).

In jurisdictions such as Austria and Slovakia, consumer protection laws attempt to simplify procedural requirements, yet consumers continue to face difficulties in accessing justice due to the lengthy nature of litigation and the reluctance of courts to expedite consumer cases ([Frössel, 2022](#)).

Judicial inefficiencies and limited access to legal representation further exacerbate procedural difficulties for consumers. Research on procedural justice in consumer dispute resolution suggests that consumers often feel disempowered due to their lack of legal knowledge and inability to navigate complex court processes ([Creutzfeldt, 2014](#)).

One solution proposed by legal scholars is the implementation of specialized consumer courts and small claims procedures to address real estate disputes more efficiently ([Benöhr, 2013](#)). The EU's legal framework has emphasized the need for alternative mechanisms such as Consumer Ombudsman Schemes and Online Dispute Resolution (ODR) to mitigate high costs and procedural delays ([Jeretina, 2016](#)).

Lack of Consumer Awareness

A significant barrier to effective consumer dispute resolution in real estate transactions is the lack of awareness among consumers regarding their legal rights and available dispute resolution mechanisms. Many consumers enter real estate contracts without fully understanding their legal protections, making them vulnerable to unfair contract terms and fraudulent practices ([Xu & Yuan, 2009](#)).

Studies indicate that many consumers lack basic knowledge of their legal rights in real estate transactions. In Indonesia, for example, research has shown that the lack of public trust in consumer dispute resolution mechanisms stems from poor legal awareness and ineffective consumer protection policies ([Syamsudin, 2020](#)). In many jurisdictions, consumer education programs on real estate rights are either non-existent or insufficiently publicized, leaving consumers unprepared to challenge deceptive business practices ([Gill et al., 2016](#)). This lack of awareness contributes to consumers failing to pursue legal remedies when they encounter unfair practices in real estate transactions ([Fong, 2021](#)).

The complexity of dispute resolution systems also contributes to the problem. Many consumers are unaware of alternative dispute resolution (ADR) mechanisms, such as mediation and arbitration, which could provide faster and more cost-effective solutions to their disputes ([Jeretina, 2016](#)). A study on consumer protection policies in the EU found that while ADR mechanisms are widely available, consumers often do not understand how to access them, leading to underutilization of these legal options ([Hodges, 2014](#)). Similarly, in the United States, many real estate buyers are unaware of their right to challenge misleading advertisements or contract misrepresentations in legal forums ([Samuel, 2002](#)).

METHODOLOGY

This study adopts a qualitative legal research methodology to analyze the legal frameworks governing consumer protection in real estate disputes. The research is doctrinal in nature, focusing on statutory regulations, judicial precedents, and contractual obligations that shape consumer rights in property transactions. To strengthen the analysis, comparative legal research is employed to examine best practices in different jurisdictions.

A comparative legal analysis will be conducted, evaluating legal frameworks and dispute resolution mechanisms across multiple jurisdictions, including the European Union, the United States, the United Kingdom, and select Asian legal systems. The research design follows a normative legal study, supported by a systematic literature review of scholarly sources indexed in Scopus database.

The study utilizes secondary data from statutory legal instruments, judicial decisions, Scopus-indexed literature, and international treaties and directives such as the Rome I Regulation, EU ADR Directive, and the New York Convention on arbitration. Data collection is performed through legal databases, government repositories, and Scopus-indexed journals to ensure academic rigor and validity.

A doctrinal legal analysis is applied to assess the statutory provisions and their effectiveness in protecting consumer rights. The analysis follows a thematic approach, categorizing legal issues under key themes such as contractual obligations and unfair contract terms, judicial efficiency in real estate litigation, arbitration and mediation in consumer disputes, and online dispute resolution (ODR) mechanisms. Additionally, a comparative legal method is applied to contrast different legal systems, highlighting best practices and potential areas for harmonization.

In order to ensure the validity and reliability of the research findings, the study relies on peer-reviewed legal sources indexed in Scopus, cross-referencing statutory provisions and judicial precedents. A triangulation method is employed by comparing legislation, case law, and academic literature to validate interpretations and conclusions. This study adheres to academic integrity principles by properly citing all sources and ensuring that interpretations remain objective and unbiased. Since the study relies on publicly available legal documents and scholarly articles, no ethical approval is required.

This research aims to provide a comprehensive legal analysis of consumer protection mechanisms in real estate disputes, offering policy recommendations for enhancing access to justice through litigation, ADR, and ODR. The findings will contribute to legal scholarship by identifying gaps in existing legal frameworks and proposing solutions for more effective dispute resolution in property transactions.

RESEARCH RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Consumer protection in real estate disputes remains a critical issue across jurisdictions, with significant legal and procedural disparities influencing the effectiveness of enforcement mechanisms. The European Union's ADR Directive, for example, has successfully promoted mediation and arbitration as viable alternatives to litigation. However, its implementation varies widely across member states, leading to inconsistencies in consumer access to legal remedies. In contrast, the United States follows a more fragmented approach, relying on state-specific regulations that often favor developers over consumers. This variation highlights the need for harmonized legal standards that ensure a more equitable balance of rights in real estate transactions.

Judicial efficiency is a key determinant in the success of real estate dispute resolution. Jurisdictions with overburdened court systems face prolonged litigation timelines, reducing consumer access to timely legal recourse. Arbitration, while offering a faster alternative, is often structured in a way that disproportionately benefits developers. Many real estate contracts include mandatory arbitration clauses, limiting consumers' ability to pursue litigation. While arbitration can be cost-effective, its enforceability across jurisdictions remains a challenge, particularly in international disputes where legal recognition of arbitral awards varies.

The growing role of Online Dispute Resolution (ODR) presents both opportunities and challenges for consumer protection. The European Union's ODR Regulation provides a model that other jurisdictions may follow, yet its success depends on consumer trust, digital accessibility, and regulatory oversight. ODR offers an efficient mechanism to resolve disputes without the costs associated with traditional litigation, yet questions remain regarding its legal enforceability and transparency. Without appropriate safeguards, ODR may further entrench disparities between developers and consumers, especially in jurisdictions where digital infrastructure is inadequate.

A significant challenge in consumer protection is the power imbalance between consumers and developers. Developers often include terms in contracts that limit liability and restrict consumer access to litigation, reinforcing legal

asymmetries. In jurisdictions where consumer protection laws are weak or poorly enforced, buyers are left with limited legal recourse. Comparative legal studies indicate that countries with robust consumer protection laws—such as Germany and France—provide stronger safeguards against unfair contract terms. The presence of independent regulatory bodies further enhances consumer rights by monitoring industry practices and ensuring compliance with fair contract standards.

Another pressing issue is the lack of consumer awareness regarding dispute resolution options. Despite widespread promotion of ADR mechanisms, many consumers remain unaware of their rights or are deterred by complex legal procedures. Research suggests that consumer education programs, integrated within real estate transactions, can significantly improve dispute resolution outcomes. Moreover, making ADR participation mandatory before litigation could help reduce court congestion and enhance the efficiency of dispute resolution.

The legal framework governing real estate transactions must also address enforcement gaps. Even in jurisdictions with strong statutory protections, enforcement mechanisms often fall short. Courts may be reluctant to intervene in contractual disputes, particularly when arbitration clauses are present. Additionally, the absence of standardized international consumer protection regulations complicates cross-border real estate transactions, exposing buyers to varying levels of risk.

A crucial policy recommendation is the establishment of specialized real estate dispute resolution tribunals. These tribunals would function as hybrid models integrating ADR, judicial oversight, and regulatory enforcement. By adopting best practices from multiple jurisdictions, they could ensure swift and equitable resolution of consumer disputes. Additionally, regulatory agencies should mandate transparency in real estate contracts, prohibiting unfair arbitration clauses that limit consumer rights.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

This study highlights the complexities and disparities in consumer protection frameworks for real estate disputes across different jurisdictions. While the European Union, the United States, and various Asian countries have developed regulatory structures to address these disputes, inconsistencies in enforcement and procedural accessibility continue to pose challenges. Judicial efficiency, arbitration fairness, and the rise of ODR mechanisms significantly impact consumer rights, with notable gaps in legal harmonization.

The findings indicate that consumer access to justice in real estate transactions is often hindered by power imbalances favoring developers, limited public awareness of dispute resolution mechanisms, and inconsistent legal protections. To mitigate these challenges, legal reforms should focus on strengthening consumer protections through standardized contract regulations, enhancing transparency in dispute resolution processes, and increasing the accessibility of ADR and ODR mechanisms. The implementation of specialized real estate dispute resolution tribunals could further improve the efficiency and fairness of legal remedies available to consumers.

While various legal frameworks attempt to safeguard consumer rights in real estate transactions, substantial gaps remain in enforcement and accessibility. Future research should explore the practical effectiveness of ADR and ODR models in real estate disputes, as well as the feasibility of international legal harmonization efforts to create a more balanced and equitable dispute resolution system.

ADVANCED RESEARCH

In writing this article the researcher realizes that there are still many shortcomings in terms of language, writing, and form of presentation considering the limited knowledge and abilities of the researchers themselves. Therefore, for the perfection of the article, the researcher expects constructive criticism and suggestions from various parties.

REFERENCES

- Abedi, F., Zeleznikow, J., & Brien, C. (2019). Developing regulatory standards for the concept of security in online dispute resolution systems. *Comput. Law Secur. Rev.*, 35, 105328. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.CLSR.2019.05.003>.
- Ballard, A., & Easteal, P. (2016). (Alternative) Dispute Resolution and Workplace Bullying. *Alternative Law Journal*, 41, 105 - 109. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1037969x1604100208>.
- Balzer, B., & Schneider, J. (2021). Managing a conflict: optimal alternative dispute resolution. *The RAND Journal of Economics*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1756-2171.12374>.
- Bar-Gill, O., Ben-Shahar, O., & Marotta-Wurgler, F. (2017). Searching for the Common Law: The Quantitative Approach of the Restatement of Consumer Contracts. *University of Chicago Law Review*, 84, 2.
- Barkhausen, H. (2010). Regulating in the Shadow of the U.C.C.: How Courts Should Interpret State Consumer Protection Laws. *Yale Law Journal*, 119, 5.
- Baron, A. (2000). The Australian International Arbitration Act, the Fiction of Severability and Claims for Restitution. *Arbitration International*, 16, 159-188. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1008920818760>.
- Benöhr, I. (2013). Consumer Dispute Resolution after The Lisbon Treaty: Collective Actions and Alternative Procedures. *Journal of Consumer Policy*, 36, 87-110. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S10603-012-9202-0>.
- Biti, B., & Rrugia, B. (2014). International Commercial Arbitration as an Alternative Method to Solve International Commercial Disputes. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, 3, 351. <https://doi.org/10.5901/AJIS.2014.V3N3P351>.
- Bogdan, M. (2015). The new EU regulation on online resolution for consumer disputes. *European Review of Private Law*, 23(2), 287-307.

- Budnitz, M. (2004). The High Cost of Mandatory Consumer Arbitration. *Law and contemporary problems*, 67, 133-166.
- Büyüksagis, E. (2016). Turkish Contract Law Reform: Standard Terms, Unforeseen Circumstances, and Judicial Intervention. *European Business Organization Law Review*, 17, 423-449. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S40804-016-0045-Z>.
- Cain, R. (1993). Don't reach out and touch us any more: Expanding telephone consumer protection. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 7, 60 - 74. <https://doi.org/10.1002/DIR.4000070109>.
- Cartwright, P. (1996). Defendants in Consumer Protection Statutes: A Search for Consistency. *Modern Law Review*, 59, 225-240. <https://doi.org/10.1111/J.1468-2230.1996.TB02076.X>.
- Clark, C. (1922). The Doctrine Of Privity Of Estate In Connection With Real Covenants. *Yale Law Journal*, 32, 3. <https://doi.org/10.2307/788995>.
- Collins, D. (2008). Compulsory Arbitration Agreements in Domestic and International Consumer Contracts. *King's Law Journal*, 19, 335 - 355. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09615768.2008.11423672>.
- Connerty, A. (1996). The Role of ADR in the Resolution of International Disputes. *Arbitration International*, 12, 47-56. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ARBITRATION/12.1.47>.
- Cortés, P. (2015). A new regulatory framework for extra-judicial consumer redress: where we are and how to move forward. *Legal Studies*, 35, 114 - 141. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lest.12048>.
- Coulson, R. (1983). Dispute Management Under Modern Construction Systems. *Law and contemporary problems*, 46, 127-135. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1191583>.
- Creutzfeldt, N. (2014). How Important is Procedural Justice for Consumer Dispute Resolution? A Case Study of an Ombudsman Model for European Consumers. *Journal of Consumer Policy*, 37, 527-546. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S10603-014-9269-X>.
- Ezulike, E., & Hoare, D. (1998). The need for education in alternative dispute resolution (ADR) in the construction industry. *Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management*, 5, 144-149. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EB021069>.
- Fong, V. (2021). The limited role of local courts in resolving consumer disputes is explored in chap-. *The China Quarterly*, 246, 623 - 625. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305741021000369>.
- Frössel, A. (2022). Consumer Dispute Resolution in Austria. *International and Comparative Law Review*, 22, 120 - 133. <https://doi.org/10.2478/iclr-2022-0008>.

- Gešková, K. (2022). Procedural Specifics of Consumer Dispute Resolutions in Slovakia. *International and Comparative Law Review*, 22, 43 - 72. <https://doi.org/10.2478/iclr-2022-0003>.
- Gill, A., Gray, J., Skitmore, M., & Callaghan, S. (2015). Comparison of the effects of litigation and ADR in South-East Queensland. *International Journal of Construction Management*, 15, 254 - 263. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15623599.2015.1066568>.
- Gill, C., Williams, J., Brennan, C., & Hirst, C. (2016). Designing consumer redress: a dispute system design (DSD) model for consumer-to-business disputes. *Legal Studies*, 36, 438 - 463. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lest.12116>.
- Gnaedinger, J. (1987). Mediation/Arbitration: Alternative Dispute Resolution Process. *Journal of Performance of Constructed Facilities*, 1, 150-160. [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)0887-3828\(1987\)1:3\(150\)](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)0887-3828(1987)1:3(150)).
- Hellwege, P. (2004). Consumer Protection In Britain In Need Of Reform. *The Cambridge Law Journal*, 63, 712 - 742. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0008197304006737>.
- Hodges, C. (2014). Consumer ombudsmen: better regulation and dispute resolution. *ERA Forum*, 15, 593-608. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S12027-014-0366-8>.
- Holtzworth-Munroe, A., Applegate, A., Beck, C., Rossi, F., Adams, J., Jiang, L., Tomlinson, C., & Hale, D. (2021). Intimate partner violence and family dispute resolution: 1-year follow-up findings from a randomized controlled trial comparing shuttle mediation, videoconferencing mediation, and litigation.. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*. <https://doi.org/10.1037/law0000309>.
- Hwang, M. (2004). Does Compulsory Acquisition Frustrate A Contract for the Sale of Immovable Property? Lim Kim Som Revisited. *Singapore journal of legal studies*, 379.
- Ismail, M. (2022). The National Recognition of The International Arbitration in The International Trade Disputes: A Comparative Study Between The French And Jordanian Laws. *Journal of Southwest Jiaotong University*. <https://doi.org/10.35741/issn.0258-2724.57.5.1>.
- Jaffey, P. (1996). Contractual obligations of the company in general meeting. *Legal Studies*, 16, 27 - 50. <https://doi.org/10.1111/J.1748-121X.1996.TB00398.X>.
- Jeretina, U. (2016). Administrative Aspects of Alternative Consumer Dispute Resolution in the European Union (EU), Slovenia and Croatia. *NISPAce Journal of Public Administration and Policy*, 9, 191 - 222. <https://doi.org/10.1515/nispa-2016-0009>.
- Jespersen, A. (2018). Reducing Demand for Litigation in Consumer Disputes—a Randomized Field Experiment with Social Information. *Journal of Consumer Policy*, 41, 21-32. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S10603-018-9370-7>.
- Kumar, V. (2023). Supply Chain Dispute Resolution through Alternative Dispute Resolution (Adr) Mechanism (Viz, Arbitration, Mediation, Conciliation, And

- Negotiation) in India.. *Russian Law Journal*.
<https://doi.org/10.52783/rlj.v11i5s.951>.
- Lee, G., Ahn, K., & Werra, J. (2014). Euro-Korean Perspectives on the Use of Arbitration and ADR Mechanisms for Solving Intellectual Property Disputes. *Arbitration International*, 30, 91-124. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ARBITRATION/30.1.91>.
- Lewison, K. (2022). Contract Law in Practice. By Neil Andrews. [Oxford University Press, 2021. lxiii + 764 pp. Hardback £250.00. ISBN 978-0-192-89794-7.]. *The Cambridge Law Journal*, 81, 195 - 197.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0008197322000125>.
- Loutocký, P. (2016). Online Dispute Resolution to resolve consumer disputes from the perspective of European Union Law. *Masaryk University Journal of Law and Technology*, 10, 113-127.
- Maktouf, L. (1988). Resolving International Tax Disputes through Arbitration. *Arbitration International*, 4, 32-51.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/ARBITRATION/4.1.32>.
- Mallet, P. (2024). Consensual Terms Modifying Contractual Liability in The Light of UAE Law: A Comparative Study with French Law. *Access to Justice in Eastern Europe*.
<https://doi.org/10.33327/ajee-18-7.4-a000107>.
- McLean, D. (2009). Toward a New International Dispute Resolution Paradigm: Assessing the Congruent Evolution of Globalization and International Arbitration Anniversary Contributions - International Litigation & Arbitration. *University of Pennsylvania Journal of International Law*, 30, 1087.
- Minor, P. (1984). Consumer Protection in French Law: General Principles and Recent Developments. *International and Comparative Law Quarterly*, 33, 108 - 133.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/iclqaj/33.1.108>.
- Morse, C. (1992). Consumer Contracts, Employment Contracts and the Rome Convention. *International and Comparative Law Quarterly*, 41, 1 - 21.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/ICLQAJ/41.1.1>.
- Naldi, G. (1990). Reflections on International Arbitration and Litigation in the International Court of Justice by Professor Shabtai Rosenne. *Arbitration International*, 6, 366-367. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ARBITRATION/6.4.366>.
- Nunes, J., & Hartmann, I. (2021). A quantitative approach to ranking corporate law precedents in the Brazilian Superior Court of Justice. *Artificial Intelligence and Law*, 30, 117-145. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S10506-021-09290-8>.
- Ojo, S. (2023). Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR): A Suitable Broad Based Dispute Resolution Model in Nigeria; Challenges and Prospects.. *International Journal of Conflict Management*. <https://doi.org/10.47941/ijcm.1253>.
- Rosenne, S. (1993). Some Thoughts on International Arbitration Today. *Israel Law Review*, 27, 447 - 459. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0021223700011377>.

- Rosenne, S. (1993). The International Court of Justice and International Arbitration. *Leiden Journal of International Law*, 6, 297 - 322. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0922156500002703>.
- Rühl, G. (2011). Consumer Protection in Choice of Law. *Cornell International Law Journal*, 44, 569-602.
- Ryan, E. (2006). ADR, The Judiciary, and Justice: Coming to Terms with the Alternatives. *Harvard Law Review*, 113.
- Samuel, A. (2002). Consumer Financial Services in Britain: New Approaches to Dispute Resolution and Avoidance. *European Business Organization Law Review*, 3, 649-694. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1566752900001099>.
- Schmitz, B. (2022). Rethinking the Public Interest in Consumer Protection. *European Journal of Comparative Law and Governance*. <https://doi.org/10.1163/22134514-bja10034>.
- Shandy, K. (2021). Legal Protection of Flat Buyers Whose Land is Actually Being Secured with Hak Tanggungan. *Norma*, 18, 47-57. <https://doi.org/10.30742/NLJ.V18I1.1287>.
- Simões, F. (2017). The Language of International Arbitration. *Conflict Resolution Quarterly*, 35, 89-109. <https://doi.org/10.1002/CRQ.21191>.
- Svantesson, D. (2017). Enter the quagmire - the complicated relationship between data protection law and consumer protection law. *Comput. Law Secur. Rev.*, 34, 25-36. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.CLSR.2017.08.003>.
- Syamsudin, M. (2020). The Failure of the Court to Protect Consumers: A Review of Consumer Dispute Resolution in Indonesia. *Journal of Consumer Policy*, 44, 117-130. <https://doi.org/10.1007/S10603-020-09470-0>.
- Tang, Z. (2007). Parties' Choice of Law in E-Consumer Contracts. *Journal of Private International Law*, 3, 113 - 136. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17536235.2007.11424319>.
- Threlkeld, M. (2023). International Arbitration and the Roots of Women's Foreign Policy Activism. *The Journal of the Gilded Age and Progressive Era*, 22, 278 - 295. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S153778142300004X>.
- Urueña, R. (2016). Subsidiarity And The Public- Private Distinction In Investment Treaty Arbitration. *Law and contemporary problems*, 79, 99-121.
- Walker, G., & Daniels, S. (1995). Argument and alternative dispute resolution systems. *Argumentation*, 9, 693-704. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00744750>.
- Wang, M. (2000). Are Alternative Dispute Resolution Methods Superior to Litigation in Resolving Disputes in International Commerce. *Arbitration International*, 16, 189-212. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1008972802830>.

- Williams, J., Gill, C., Creutzfeldt, N., & Vivian, N. (2020). Participation as a framework for analyzing consumers' experiences of alternative dispute resolution (ADR). *Journal of Law and Society*.
- Wilson, K. (1990). Saving Costs in International Arbitration. *Arbitration International*, 6, 151-157. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ARBITRATION/6.2.151>.
- Wilson, T. (2015). Setting boundaries rather than imposing bans: Is it possible to regulate consumer arbitration clauses to achieve fairness for consumers? *Journal of Consumer Policy*, 39, 349-364.
- Xu, Z., & Yuan, Y. (2009). Principle-based dispute resolution for consumer protection. *Knowl. Based Syst.*, 22, 18-27. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.knosys.2008.04.009>.