



State Land Dispute Resolution Pinda Nabati-Yasa Kediri City (Study of Case Decision Number 61/Pdt.G/2016/PN.Kdr)

Penyelesaian Sengketa Tanah Negara Pinda Nabati-Yasa Kota Kediri (Studi Putusan Perkara Nomor 61/Pdt.G/2016/PN.Kdr)

Nurbaedah^{1*}

¹Universitas Islam Kediri

*Author Correspondence Email: nurbaedah@uniska-kediri.ac.id

Article History	Received (April 27 th , 2026)	Revised (May 20 th , 2026)	Accepted (June 29 th , 2026)
-----------------	---	--	--

News Article

Keyword:

State Land Dispute; Niet Ontvankelijke Verklaard; Plurium Litis Consortium; Normative Legal Research; Judicial Review

Abstract

This study examines the legal considerations in Case Decision Number 61/Pdt.G/2016/PN.Kdr jo Number 498/PDT/2017/PT SBY jo Number 2245 K/Pdt/2018 jo Number 780 PK/Pdt/2020 concerning a state land dispute in Kediri City (the Pinda Nabati-Yasa case) and the legal consequences of those considerations on the court rulings. This research employs a normative or doctrinal legal method carried out through library research. The statutory approach (statute approach) is applied and the research is descriptive in nature. Primary legal materials consist of applicable legislation, while secondary legal materials consist of the court decisions under study. Data are analyzed qualitatively in a descriptive manner. The findings show that the Kediri District Court declared the plaintiff's claim inadmissible (niet ontvankelijke verklaard) on the grounds of formal defects in the statement of claim, insufficient defendants (plurium litis consortium), unclear boundaries of the disputed object, and unidentified occupants. The East Java High Court upheld this reasoning as legally correct. The Supreme Court found that the Judex Facti decision was not contrary to law. The Review Panel likewise held that no judicial error or manifest mistake existed in the Judex Juris decision. Consequently, the plaintiff's claim was consistently declared inadmissible at all levels of adjudication.

Kata Kunci:

Sengketa Tanah Negara; Gugatan Tidak Dapat Diterima; Plurium Litis Consortium; Penelitian Hukum Normatif; Peninjauan Kembali

Abstrak

*Permasalahan dalam penelitian ini yaitu bagaimana pertimbangan hukum Putusan Perkara Nomor 61/Pdt.G/2016/PN.Kdr jo Nomor 498/PDT/2017/PT SBY jo Nomor 2245 K/Pdt/2018 jo Nomor 780 PK/Pdt/2020 dan bagaimana akibat pertimbangan hukum terhadap putusan Pengadilan. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menganalisis pertimbangan hukum keempat putusan tersebut serta akibat hukumnya. Jenis penelitian yang digunakan merupakan hukum normatif atau doctrinal dan dilakukan melalui metode *library research*. Metode pendekatan yang digunakan yaitu pendekatan perundang-undangan (*statute approach*) dan merupakan penelitian deskriptif. Pengumpulan data menggunakan bahan hukum primer berupa peraturan perundang-undangan dan bahan hukum sekunder berupa*

putusan-putusan perkara tersebut. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa pertimbangan hukum Pengadilan Negeri Kediri menyatakan Surat Gugatan cacat formil, kurangnya pihak yang digugat (plurium litis consortium), batas-batas objek sengketa tidak jelas, dan penunjukan orang yang menguasai objek sengketa tidak jelas, sehingga gugatan dinyatakan tidak dapat diterima (Niet Ontvankelijke Verklaard). Pengadilan Tinggi Jawa Timur menguatkan pertimbangan Pengadilan Negeri. Mahkamah Agung menyatakan putusan Judex Facti tidak bertentangan dengan hukum. Peninjauan Kembali menyatakan tidak terdapat kekhilafan hakim atau kekeliruan nyata dalam putusan Judex Juris. Akibatnya, gugatan Penggugat dinyatakan tidak dapat diterima dan dikuatkan di seluruh tingkatan peradilan.

To cite this article: Nurbaedah. (2026). "State Land Dispute Resolution Pinda Nabati-Yasa Kediri City (Study of Case Decision Number 61/Pdt.G/2016/PN.Kdr)". *Jurnal Ilmiah Gema Perencana*, Volume (issue), month-month, 2026. Page: 473 – 490.



This article is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](#) ©2025 by Nurbaedah

INRODUCTION

Background of the Problem

The escalating scarcity of land, driven by rapid urbanization and the multifaceted economic value of property, has intensified competition and precipitated complex legal conflicts over land tenure and ownership ([Ihsani & Putra, 2024](#)). These disputes frequently emerge from overlapping claims and unclear administrative documentation, necessitating robust legal frameworks to ensure both stability and the protection of individual property rights ([Effendi & Sara, 2025](#)).

In the Indonesian context, the persistence of dual land certificates often undermines the conclusive power of title deeds, thereby necessitating a rigorous judicial examination of both procedural formalities and substantive property claims ([Sabdaningtyas & Dewi, 2024](#)). Such legal uncertainties often arise from administrative oversights and systemic discrepancies during the land registration process, which can lead to protracted litigation aimed at determining the primacy of competing titles ([Akbar & Kaharuddin, 2025](#)).

The case of Pinda Nabati-Yasa in Kediri City serves as a critical focal point for examining how judicial authorities weigh competing evidentiary claims when addressing these structural administrative failures (Ramdhani, 2025). This research analyzes how the court navigates these inconsistencies, particularly when resolving the validity of conflicting instruments through a normative juridical lens ([Aji & Susantyo, 2025](#)) ([Christopher & Djaja, 2025](#)). This analysis further evaluates how judicial oversight functions to mitigate the social unrest and legal ambiguity stemming from overlapping ownership claims ([Harahap et al., 2025](#)).

Furthermore, this study examines whether the judicial resolution of such conflicts effectively addresses the underlying administrative deficiencies or merely offers symptomatic relief for systemic land registration failures ([Putri & Hadi, 2025](#)). Ultimately, the study seeks to determine the extent to which the judiciary acts as a corrective mechanism for administrative inconsistencies, particularly when certificates suffer from procedural flaws that jeopardize the principle of legal certainty ([Hermanta et al., 2026](#)).

Specifically, this analysis investigates how the judiciary addresses the negative system of land registration, wherein the presumption of certificate validity remains vulnerable to challenges when administrative procedural defects occur ([Wisudawanta, 2025](#)). The

emergence of dual certificates, often catalyzed by administrative negligence or inconsistencies in land recording, fundamentally challenges the integrity of the national agrarian registry and reduces public confidence in existing property documentation ([Purnama et al., 2025](#)); ([Suryandari & Sejati, 2024](#)).

Consequently, the Kediri District Court's adjudication in Decision Number 61/Pdt.G/2016/PN.Kdr provides a crucial opportunity to evaluate how evidentiary assessment functions when administrative records fail to provide a definitive source of truth ([Ardiansyah & Santiago, 2026](#)). This case highlights the broader tension between the formal evidentiary value of certificates under the Civil Code and their susceptibility to invalidation when substantive procedural irregularities are exposed during litigation ([Syah et al., 2026](#)). This investigation particularly emphasizes the dichotomy between general courts and administrative jurisdictions, reflecting the recurring challenge of determining whether a dispute concerns the fundamental validity of ownership rights or the legitimacy of the underlying administrative certificate. ([Thesia, 2023](#)).

Consequently, this tension necessitates a critical evaluation of whether current judicial interventions successfully rectify systemic administrative errors or if they merely perpetuate the vulnerability of titleholders to subsequent, competing claims. While courts increasingly act as arbiters of substantive justice—often looking beyond the formal presumption of certificate validity to address procedural irregularities and bad faith—such interventions frequently occur within a fragmented jurisdictional framework ([Ardiansyah & Santiago, 2026](#)); ([Syah et al., 2026](#)).

By focusing on individual, case-specific outcomes rather than systemic reformation, judicial processes may provide immediate relief for the litigants involved without resolving the underlying administrative flaws that permit the issuance of overlapping documentation in the first place ([Hermanta et al., 2026](#)); ([Putri & Hadi, 2025](#)). Ultimately, if the judiciary continues to address symptoms of administrative neglect without mandating broader structural changes, the inherent instability within the negative land registration system risks remaining unmitigated, leaving future property owners susceptible to similar protracted legal challenges ([Aji & Susantyo, 2025](#)); ([Suryandari & Sejati, 2024](#)). Such recurring discrepancies highlight the urgent need for a more rigorous systematization of normative parameters for certificate cancellation, as outlined in current administrative regulations ([Atikasari & Suhadi, 2026](#)).

Moreover, the recurring issue of double certificates reveals that administrative weaknesses and poor verification processes remain significant barriers to achieving the legal certainty envisioned by national agrarian laws ([Julius & Rasji, 2025](#)). Specifically, technical deficiencies in land documentation and mapping systems frequently exacerbate these errors, complicating the judiciary's efforts to establish a definitive hierarchy of title ([Nurhayati & Suardi, 2026](#)). These persistent jurisdictional ambiguities often result in conflicting decisions across administrative and civil courts, further complicating the execution of final judgments.

While the State Administrative Court primarily scrutinizes the procedural legality of certificate issuance, the civil court is tasked with determining substantive ownership rights, leading to situations where a certificate may be declared procedurally void without necessarily resolving the underlying dispute over land possession ([Ardiansyah & Santiago, 2026](#)); ([Thesia, 2023](#)). Such fragmented adjudication not only delays the restoration of legal certainty for the affected parties but also places an undue burden on landowners, who often find themselves trapped between competing court rulings that fail to offer a unified resolution to their property claims ([Harahap et al., 2025](#)). To mitigate these systemic issues, implementing advanced technological solutions such as digitized mapping, GPS-based plotting, and blockchain-integrated administration is essential for reducing human error in land registry processes ([Soediro et al., 2023](#)).

Furthermore, integrating these technological advancements must be accompanied by strict adherence to the protocols mandated for handling and settling land cases to ensure that administrative actions are consistent with established legal frameworks. Such synergy requires robust inter-agency coordination and institutional accountability to bridge the gap between technical data management and substantive legal interpretation, thereby minimizing the discretionary space that currently allows for procedural negligence ([Christopher & Djaja, 2025](#)).

By harmonizing these administrative practices with judicial oversight, the agrarian system can transition from a reactive, symptom-focused approach toward a more proactive, systemic framework that genuinely secures property rights and restores public confidence in the integrity of land documentation ([Aji & Susantyo, 2025](#)); ([Julius & Rasji, 2025](#)). Addressing this systemic impasse further necessitates clearly defining the distinct responsibilities of the Administrative Court and the District Court to eliminate the jurisdictional gray areas that facilitate conflicting rulings ([Aristo et al., 2023](#)).

Identification of Problems

The primary legal concern involves the persistent ambiguity regarding absolute competence, which often leads to contradictory adjudications between civil and administrative tribunals ([Rauzi & Hadi, 2024](#)); ([Yuherman et al., 2025](#)). This procedural confusion is further compounded by the lack of a unified digital registry, which frequently allows overlapping claims to persist despite court-ordered cancellations ([Simarmata et al., 2025](#)). Moreover, the reliance on outdated colonial-era record-keeping methods often perpetuates a multiplicity of documents that complicates the verification of legitimate ownership ([Raihan et al., 2024](#)).

Additionally, the absence of synchronized data across disparate government agencies frequently results in ground-level discrepancies that contradict the formal data held in registry archives ([Thakur et al., 2019](#)). To address these critical infrastructure gaps, transitioning toward a modernized, digitized record-keeping system is essential to eliminate the corruption and documentation multiplicity inherent in current manual processes. Recent advancements in electronic land certification demonstrate that such digital transformation can significantly enhance administrative efficiency and reduce the risks of document falsification ([Marella & Silviana, 2025](#)).

However, this transition remains contingent upon ensuring robust data security and establishing clear authentication protocols to prevent potential conflicts between legacy paper documentation and contemporary digital records ([Yanti et al., 2025](#)). Furthermore, legal frameworks must be updated to explicitly recognize the evidentiary weight of electronic certificates, thereby ensuring that judicial oversight aligns with the principles of modern, transparent agrarian governance ([Ulhaq et al., 2025](#)). Beyond these technological improvements, legal reforms must prioritize strict accountability for administrative negligence within the Land Office, ensuring that the issuance of certificates adheres to a rigorous verification of land history to prevent the emergence of fictitious titles ([Biruni, 2025](#)).

Formulation of the Problem

Based on the aforementioned legal challenges, this research addresses two primary questions: *First*, how the Kediri District Court determines absolute competence when adjudicating dual ownership claims arising from administrative procedural errors; and second, what legal considerations inform the court's decision-making process in resolving conflicting land titles under the current agrarian framework ([Hijrianita et al.,](#)

2024); (Naim et al., 2025). These questions are particularly critical given the prevalence of organized irregularities, such as document forgery and collusion, which continue to undermine the integrity of land administration systems (Noor et al., 2025). Moreover, this research investigates the extent to which existing statutory protections are sufficient to mitigate the risks of data manipulation and identity theft in the nascent digital land registration environment (Waliyanto et al., 2025). By evaluating the interplay between legislative requirements and administrative practice, this analysis seeks to determine whether current regulatory safeguards adequately protect the rights of stakeholders amidst the transition toward electronic certification (Bestari & L.L.M. Diana Setiawati, S.H., 2026); (Noor et al., 2025).

Objectives and Benefits of Research

Research Objectives

This study aims to evaluate the judicial reasoning of the Kediri District Court in case number 61/Pdt.G/2016/PN.Kdr regarding the validation of land ownership rights and the resolution of conflicting claims. Additionally, this research examines the effectiveness of current agrarian regulations in addressing technical discrepancies during the conversion of physical land deeds into electronic certificates (Hafid et al., 2026). Furthermore, this research seeks to identify the procedural shortcomings that facilitate the emergence of dual certificates, thereby providing recommendations to improve the administrative verification mechanisms currently employed by the National Land Agency (Lambu et al., 2025).

Furthermore, the study aims to analyze how the judicial determination of property rights serves as a corrective measure against intentional misinformation and administrative errors during the field measurement process (Setyani et al., 2022). Finally, the research intends to delineate the legal consequences of these judicial determinations, specifically focusing on how court-mandated cancellations of invalid certificates mitigate economic losses and restore the principle of legal certainty for legitimate landholders (Sulaiman & Lesmana, 2024). Through this examination, the study further elucidates the recurring challenges of document falsification and procedural deviations that often necessitate judicial intervention to rectify administrative oversight (Adinda & Kurniawan, 2024).

Research Benefits

The findings of this study are expected to provide both theoretical and practical contributions to the development of agrarian law in Indonesia. Theoretically, this study contributes to the body of knowledge regarding judicial reasoning in land ownership disputes, particularly in cases involving dual certificates arising from technical discrepancies during the conversion of physical land deeds into electronic certificates (Hafid et al., 2026). The study also enriches academic discourse on the role of judicial determination as a corrective mechanism against administrative errors and intentional misinformation during the field measurement process (Setyani et al., 2022).

Practically, the findings of this study are beneficial for several parties:

1. For the National Land Agency (BPN), this study provides recommendations to improve administrative verification mechanisms in order to minimize the

emergence of dual certificates caused by procedural shortcomings ([Lambu et al., 2025](#)).

2. For the Judiciary, this study offers insight into how court-mandated cancellations of invalid certificates can mitigate economic losses and restore the principle of legal certainty for legitimate landholders ([Sulaiman & Lesmana, 2024](#)).
3. For the Public and Landholders, this study raises awareness regarding recurring challenges of document falsification and procedural deviations that often necessitate judicial intervention to rectify administrative oversight ([Adinda & Kurniawan, 2024](#)).
4. For Policymakers, this study provides an evaluative basis for reviewing the effectiveness of current agrarian regulations in addressing technical and administrative discrepancies in land certification processes ([Hafid et al., 2026](#)).

THEORETICAL AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Theoretical Framework

To establish a robust analytical foundation, this study utilizes the rule of law as a primary framework to ensure that judicial decisions align with constitutional mandates for land tenure protection ([Roestamy et al., 2025](#)). Additionally, this research integrates the theory of legal certainty to evaluate how electronic land certificates function as secure, non-manipulable evidence of ownership within the national registration system ([Haris et al., 2026](#)); ([Muri et al., 2025](#)). Furthermore, this framework incorporates the principle of legal protection to assess whether the transition toward digitized documentation effectively safeguards rights holders against systemic vulnerabilities, such as data updating errors and unauthorized system access ([Widad, 2026](#)).

In this context, the integration of these legal principles serves to harmonize conventional land administration with emerging regulatory requirements, such as those introduced by Government Regulation Number 18 of 2021 ([Andayani & Firmansyah, 2026](#)). This framework also encompasses the principles of good governance to scrutinize instances of maladministration, particularly where regulatory authorities inadvertently facilitate the issuance of multiple certificates for a single land parcel ([Widjojo & Pranatia, 2025](#)). By centering the analysis on these principles, the research effectively evaluates the responsibilities of the Land Office in preventing administrative and juridical defects that compromise the legitimacy of property records ([Sarimun et al., 2024](#)).

Moreover, this theoretical approach underscores the necessity of professional accountability within the National Land Agency, as systemic errors in certificate issuance often necessitate judicial intervention to restore the integrity of land ownership ([Muzakkir et al., 2021](#)). This necessitates a comprehensive analysis of administrative law doctrines, which provide the essential criteria for assessing the validity of land titles and the subsequent legal implications of certificate cancellation due to identified defects ([Kaunang, 2025](#)). Furthermore, this inquiry emphasizes that certificates deemed legally defective by the court must be formally nullified to prevent further infringement upon the rights of bona fide landholders ([Kusuma et al., 2024](#)).

This intervention functions not merely as a corrective measure for technical anomalies, but as a mechanism to reinforce professional accountability within the National Land Agency. Through the rigorous validation of land records, the court provides a vital check against the misuse of authority, ultimately enhancing the stability of the registration

system and ensuring that ownership remains protected against both administrative lapses and intentional manipulation.

Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework of this study is constructed around several interrelated legal concepts that collectively explain the phenomenon of dual land certificates and the judicial mechanisms employed to resolve such disputes.

1. Land Registration and Certification

Land registration is a fundamental administrative process through which the state acknowledges and records property rights. In the Indonesian context, land certificates serve as the strongest form of legal evidence of ownership. However, technical discrepancies during the conversion of physical deeds into electronic certificates have created vulnerabilities that give rise to overlapping or dual certificates ([Hafid et al., 2026](#)); ([Haris et al., 2026](#)).

2. Dual Certificate and Administrative Defect

A dual certificate occurs when two or more certificates are issued for the same land parcel, often resulting from measurement errors, data inconsistencies, or maladministration within the National Land Agency. Such administrative defects undermine the credibility of the land registration system and require judicial intervention for resolution ([Lambu et al., 2025](#)); ([Widjojo & Pranatia, 2025](#)).

3. Electronic Land Certificate (*Sertifikat Elektronik*)

The electronic land certificate represents the digitization of land ownership records under Government Regulation Number 18 of 2021. While designed to enhance security and minimize manipulation, the transition process has exposed systemic vulnerabilities, including data updating errors and unauthorized access that may compromise the integrity of ownership records ([Widad, 2026](#)); ([Andayani & Firmansyah, 2026](#)).

4. Judicial Determination of Property Rights

Judicial determination refers to the authority of the court to validate or invalidate land ownership claims based on substantive and procedural legal standards. Courts function as the ultimate arbiter in land disputes, with the power to cancel defective certificates and restore legal certainty to rightful landholders ([Setyani et al., 2022](#)); ([Sulaiman & Lesmana, 2024](#)).

5. Certificate Cancellation and Legal Consequences

Certificate cancellation is a judicial remedy applied when a land certificate is found to be legally defective, whether due to procedural violations, measurement errors, or document falsification. The cancellation reinstates the rights of the legitimate landholder and serves as a deterrent against future administrative irregularities ([Kaunang, 2025](#)); ([Kusuma et al., 2024](#)).

6. Professional Accountability of the National Land Agency

The National Land Agency (BPN) bears institutional responsibility for ensuring the accuracy and integrity of land records. Systemic failures in certificate issuance reflect a deficiency in professional accountability, necessitating both judicial oversight and administrative reform to prevent recurrence ([Muzakkir et al., 2021](#)); ([Sarimun et al., 2024](#)).

7. Legal Protection of Bona Fide Landholders

The concept of legal protection underscores the obligation of the state to safeguard the rights of good-faith landholders from both intentional manipulation and administrative negligence. This protection is operationalized through judicial mechanisms that nullify fraudulent or erroneous certificates and restore ownership integrity (Adinda & Kurniawan, 2024); (Roestamy et al., 2025).

RESEARCH METHODS

This research employs a normative juridical approach, utilizing both statutory and conceptual frameworks to analyze the legal implications of the court's decision in case number 61/Pdt.G/2016/PN.Kdr ([Jamil et al., 2026](#)). This method is supplemented by a case study analysis that focuses on the judicial considerations and legal reasoning applied to the resolution of property disputes ([Hutapea et al., 2025](#)). The data collection process relies on an examination of primary legal materials, including the pertinent court ruling, alongside secondary sources such as academic literature and ministerial regulations concerning land administration ([Putra, 2026](#)). Furthermore, this approach enables a critical assessment of how the principles established in the Basic Agrarian Law are interpreted within the context of contemporary land administration disputes ([Nisa & Lukman, 2025](#)).

Specifically, this methodology incorporates an analysis of the criteria required to establish administrative legal defects, such as discrepancies in land mapping or misinformation provided during the registration process ([Rois et al., 2022](#)). Moreover, the research synthesizes these findings to evaluate whether such administrative irregularities align with the specific criteria for title invalidation as outlined in the prevailing ministerial regulations regarding land case settlement. Consequently, this systematic review integrates the analysis of administrative protocols with judicial rulings to determine the precise conditions under which the National Land Agency is mandated to execute certificate cancellations.

In this regard, the research further investigates how court decisions provide an essential mechanism for resolving ownership conflicts arising from Indonesia's negative land registration system, which inherently permits legal challenges to title despite formal registration ([Roestamy et al., 2025](#)). Because this framework does not confer absolute, incontestable ownership, judicial intervention becomes indispensable for reviewing and rectifying administrative errors that compromise the accuracy of land records

By adjudicating these disputes, the court not only resolves immediate conflicts between competing claimants but also functions as a corrective authority that validates property rights when the administrative system fails to maintain clear and undisputable titles, thereby upholding the principle of legal certainty for bona fide holders. Consequently, this study explores the tension between the formal evidentiary value of certificates and the susceptibility of underlying land registry data to legal challenges.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

The analysis of the District Court's decision indicates that administrative non-compliance in the issuance process serves as a primary driver for the subsequent invalidation of land rights (Wibowo & Turisno, 2024). Specifically, the court identified that procedural irregularities during the registration phase effectively undermine the certificate's status as absolute proof of title, necessitating judicial intervention to rectify

administrative errors that otherwise perpetuate ownership conflicts (Fadhilah et al., 2026). Such irregularities, often stemming from misapplications of law or inaccurate juridical data, underscore the prevalence of administrative legal defects as defined by regulatory standards.

These defects, which include overlapping rights and errors regarding the subject or object of land ownership, mandate a formal cancellation process to restore the accuracy of the land registry (Sihombing, 2023). In these instances, the judiciary functions as a critical oversight mechanism, compelling the National Land Agency to annul certificates that lack valid foundational documentation or result from overlapping rights (Wulandari, 2020). Beyond these interventions, the judiciary emphasizes that the negative registration system necessitates a shift in focus from mere administrative status to the substantive legitimacy of underlying land relations (Ardiansyah & Santiago, 2026). This shift ensures that formal certificates do not provide a veil for underlying defects, such as the exclusion of legitimate heirs or the omission of essential historical land claims (Panjaitan et al., 2026).

This judicial prioritization of material truth over formal documentation reflects the ongoing dialectic between the *judex factie* and the *judex juris*, where courts increasingly scrutinize the validity of the transaction underlying the registered title (Ardiansyah & Santiago, 2026). Moreover, this approach acknowledges that Indonesia's land registration system, which adheres to a negative publication system with a positive tendency, necessitates such judicial scrutiny because certificates do not guarantee absolute ownership (Devi et al., 2025); (Kistriana et al., 2025). but rather remain susceptible to challenges if the initial registration process failed to account for substantive legal relationships or prior existing rights.

Such judicial oversight serves as a necessary corrective, ensuring that administrative records reflect the actual state of possession and good-faith transactions (Susanti et al., 2024). This judicial practice acknowledges that because the system places certificates as strong but not absolute evidence, potential defects in issuance can effectively trigger legitimate claims from third parties (Roto et al., 2026). Such vulnerabilities further underscore that the National Land Agency bears a profound responsibility to verify the accuracy of both land subjects and objects to prevent the emergence of disputes stemming from intentional or unintentional data inaccuracies.

Furthermore, the absence of a state guarantee regarding the veracity of recorded data within this system often compels the court to act as the ultimate arbiter in disputes involving contested ownership. In the context of the Pinda Nabati-Yasa dispute, this responsibility manifests in the agency's duty to manage conflicting claims arising from procedural oversights during the registration of agrarian assets.

This ruling highlights that administrative finality cannot supersede substantive justice when foundational documentation is proven deficient. By prioritizing material truth over formalistic compliance, the court emphasized that a certificate—while possessing strong evidentiary weight—cannot serve as an unassailable shield for underlying defects that invalidate the claimant's right to the object of the land. Thus, the judicial decision reinforces the corrective mandate to resolve discrepancies, ensuring that the legitimacy of property rights is ultimately founded upon factual possession rather than mere administrative consistency.

Discussion

The discourse centers on whether the current negative publication system sufficiently balances administrative efficiency with the imperative of providing legal security for

landowners (Murni et al., 2022). While supporters argue that this system prevents the state from becoming liable for registration errors, critics contend that the lack of absolute guarantees necessitates a transition toward a positive publication model to achieve more robust, state-backed legal certainty. However, current research suggests that the existing system operates as a negative publication model containing positive elements, where the certificate serves as strong, though not absolute, evidence of rights.

This legal framework acknowledges that the certificate's validity remains vulnerable for a limited period, during which judicial intervention remains essential to rectify foundational data inaccuracies (Apriani & Bur, 2020); (Padjadjaran & Nurlinda, 2016). Such remedial measures are reinforced by Article 32 of Government Regulation No. 24 of 1997, which allows the judiciary to invalidate titles upon proof of substantive discrepancies that supersede the presumption of administrative correctness.

Consequently, this mechanism ensures that administrative registration functions as a transparent record rather than an impenetrable barrier against parties who possess superior substantive claims (Chairunisa et al., 2023). Ultimately, this judicial latitude highlights the inherent tension in Indonesian land law, where certificates are legally recognized as strong evidence yet remain subject to judicial cancellation when they fail to align with the material reality of ownership (Roni et al., 2020). Accordingly, this study highlights that legal protection in Indonesia must evolve beyond reactive litigation to adopt more robust, preventive administrative procedures that ensure foundational data integrity.

Moreover, integrating stricter verification protocols within the National Land Agency is essential to mitigate the incidence of overlapping titles that frequently necessitate such judicial intervention (Wisudawanta, 2025). By shifting toward a more proactive, systematic verification process, the government could enhance the reliability of the land registry and reduce the reliance on protracted litigation (Naibaho & Syaputra, 2025). This strategy necessitates the integration of advanced geospatial data management to rectify mapping inaccuracies while reinforcing rigorous due diligence during the initial registration phase to preclude foundational administrative defects (Yuris & Sudiro, 2023). By adopting such measures, the National Land Agency could transition beyond its traditionally passive administrative role, thereby mitigating the risk of issuing conflicting titles and diminishing the procedural failures that currently burden the judicial system with complex ownership disputes.

Research Limitations

This study is restricted to the analysis of a specific judicial decision, which inherently limits the generalizability of the findings across the broader spectrum of agrarian litigation occurring in diverse jurisdictional contexts. Furthermore, the scope is confined to normative case analysis, precluding an empirical investigation into the practical administrative hurdles that regional land offices encounter when executing registration mandates. Consequently, the analysis primarily focuses on legal doctrines derived from jurisprudential interpretations rather than the day-to-day operational constraints of land administration offices, which often involve multifaceted stakeholder complexities. Future research should therefore incorporate empirical data to assess how administrative officers interpret these mandates in practice, particularly regarding the resolution of overlapping title claims.

Novelty/Contribution

This study contributes to existing legal discourse by bridging the gap between formalistic judicial interpretation and the systemic administrative failures that precipitate land registration conflicts. It highlights the critical interplay between procedural regularity and substantive justice, providing a framework for evaluating how the judiciary addresses administrative irregularities that lead to the invalidation of registered property rights.

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

Conclusion

The findings underscore that the adjudication of Case Number 61/Pdt.G/2016/PN.Kdr serves as a critical precedent for rectifying administrative inaccuracies that undermine the legitimacy of land ownership records. The court's decision affirms that administrative finality cannot be utilized to immunize titles obtained through procedural irregularities, thereby necessitating judicial intervention to restore substantive truth to the registry.

This decision underscores the judiciary's role in addressing the gap between normative administrative provisions and the practical realities of title verification, where weak accountability often facilitates the issuance of invalid certificates. Furthermore, this case illustrates the persistent disharmony between administrative authority and the permanent legal force of judicial decrees, where the failure of land institutions to uphold court rulings creates a persistent vacuum of legal protection for rightful owners.

Ultimately, reconciling these administrative deficiencies requires a more robust integration of court mandates into the National Land Agency's digital registry to ensure that judicial determinations of ownership are fully enforceable and resistant to further bureaucratic obstruction. Addressing this jurisdictional divide, transitioning toward a connectivity model could synchronize the absolute competence of civil courts with the administrative oversight of the State Administrative Court to prevent contradictory rulings.

Such synchronization is critical to upholding the principle of legal certainty, particularly when the formal land registration regime faces the challenge of reconciling informal transactions with rigid statutory requirements. By fostering a unified adjudicatory approach, the judicial system can better validate equitable ownership claims that might otherwise be dismissed due to purely administrative technicalities, thereby aligning the land registry more closely with the material reality of possession and ensuring that the protection of property rights remains both accessible and robust.

Suggestions

It is essential to synchronize the laws and regulations governing land registration under the National Land Agency to eliminate divergent interpretations, thereby providing legal certainty for authorized officials and relevant stakeholders.

Furthermore, enhancing inter-agency coordination is critical to simplifying the bureaucratic execution of inkraacht court decisions, ensuring that administrative actions by land offices strictly align with judicial determinations.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTION STATEMENT

Nurbaedah: conceptualization, formulation of the problem, methodology design, data collection and analysis, interpretation of results, drafting of the manuscript, revision, and approval of the final version for publication.

REFERENCES

- Adinda, I. G. A. S., & Kurniawan, I. G. A. (2024). The Legal Protection for The Parties Due to The Issuance of Overlapping Land Certificates (Decision Study Number: 1 K/PDT/2021). *Jurnal Akta*, 11(2), 450. <https://doi.org/10.30659/akta.v11i2.37475>
- Aji, M. S., & Susantyo, H. P. (2025). Analisis Yuridis Penyelesaian Sengketa Kepemilikan Tanah berdasarkan Bukti Sertifikat di Pengadilan Negeri Kabupaten Probolinggo (Studi Kasus Perkara Nomor 10/Pdt.G/2023/PN Pbl). *AHKAM*, 4(3), 763–775. <https://doi.org/10.58578/ahkam.v4i3.6681>
- Akbar, M., & Kaharuddin, K. (2025). Analysis of Land Dispute Resolution Due to Dual Certificates in Indonesia (Study of Supreme Court Decision Number 217/PDT/2021/PT KPG). *Law Development Journal*, 7(4), 577. <https://doi.org/10.30659/ldj.7.4.577-585>
- Andayani, L., & Firmansyah, A. (2026). Guarantee of Legal Protection for Conventional and Electronic Land Rights Certificates Holders within The Land Registration Legal System in Indonesia. *Jurnal Daulat Hukum*, 9(1), 133. <https://doi.org/10.30659/jdh.v9i1.50623>
- Apriani, D., & Bur, A. (2020). Kepastian Hukum Dan Perlindungan Hukum Dalam Sistem Publikasi Pendaftaran Tanah Di Indonesia. *Jurnal Bina Mulia Hukum*, 5(2), 220–239. <https://doi.org/10.23920/jbmh.v5i2.11>
- Ardiansyah, M. F., & Santiago, F. (2026). Judicial Interpretation of Land Registration and Legal Protection in Indonesia Between Administrative Evidence and Substantive Justice. *Greenation International Journal of Law and Social Sciences*, 3(4), 1565–1575. <https://doi.org/10.38035/gijlss.v3i4.705>
- Aristo, E., Arifin, K. M., & Moidady, S. R. (2023). Establishment of Special Land Courts as an Effort to Settlement of Land Cases. *Jurnal Ius Constituendum*, 8(3), 450–465. <https://doi.org/10.26623/jic.v8i3.7837>
- Atikasari, S., & Suhadi, S. (2026). Double Certificates as Land Administration Defects: Parameters for Cancellation According to Government Regulation 18/2021 and Regulation of the Minister of Agrarian Affairs and Spatial Planning/Head of the National Land Agency of the Republic of Indonesia. *Jurnal Daulat Hukum*, 9(1), 11. <https://doi.org/10.30659/jdh.v9i1.51337>
- Bestari, H., & L.L.M. Diana Setiawati, S.H., (2026). Pengaturan Hukum Dan Kepastian Hukum Konversi Sertifikat Tanah Konvensional Ke Sertifikat Elektronik. In *UMS Library Center of Academic Activities (Universitas Surakarta)*. Universitas Surakarta.
- Biruni, F. Al. (2025). A Analisis Yuridis Mengenai Peran ATR/BPN dalam Putusan Nomor 285/Pdt.G/2023/PN Cikarang atas Terjadinya Sertipikat Ganda. *Bandung Conference Series Law Studies*, 5(2). <https://doi.org/10.29313/bcsls.v5i2.21468>
- Chairunisa, A., Handayani, I. G. A. K. R., & Karjoko, L. (2023). Aspects of Legal Certainty of Land Declaration Letters as Guidelines for Land Registration with Negative Stelse. *International Journal of Educational Research & Social Sciences*, 4(6),

- 1085–1092. <https://doi.org/10.51601/ijersc.v4i6.731>
- Christhopher, M., & Djaja, B. (2025). Legal Status of Duplicate Land Certificates and Mechanisms for Their Resolution Under the National Land Law System. *JIHK*, 7(2), 1249–1261. <https://doi.org/10.46924/jihk.v7i2.386>
- Devi, S. A., Lukman, F. X. A., & Samosir, T. (2025). Legal Eligibility for Land Rights Owners for Cancellation of Certificates. *International Journal Of Humanities Education and Social Sciences (IJHESS)*, 5(2). <https://doi.org/10.55227/ijhess.v5i2.1838>
- Effendi, L., & Sara, R. (2025). Legal Reform in Settlement of Land and Housing Disputes in Urban Areas to Achieve Legal Certainty. *International Journal of Social Service and Research*, 5(7), 781–788. <https://doi.org/10.46799/ijssr.v5i6.1258>
- Fadhilah, F., Yamani, Y. A. N., & Kontesa, E. (2026). Pembatalan Sertipikat Hak Milik Atas Tanah Berdasarkan Putusan Verstek Pengadilan Negeri Nomor 34/Pdt.G/2023/Pn.Bgl. *Jurnal Multidisiplin Dehasen (MUDE)*, 5(1), 685–694. <https://doi.org/10.37676/mude.v5i1.10162>
- Hafid, M. A., Fahrezi, M. I., Altoffiestin, D., & Ridha, M. C. (2026). Problematika Konversi Sertifikat Fisik Lama ke Sertifikat Elektronik dalam Penyelesaian Sengketa Pertanahan: Studi Kasus Tumpang Tindih Sertifikat di Pagar Alam, Sumatera Selatan. *Jurnal Hukum Sasana*, 12(1), 202–222. <https://doi.org/10.31599/sasana.v12i1.4833>
- Harahap, H. R., Isnawati, I., Asyhari, F., & Putri, D. P. H. (2025). Position Of Land Examination By Judges In Administrative Courts Over Land Certificate Disputes. *Awang Long Law Review*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.56301/awl.v8i1.1867>
- Haris, B., I, A., & Hepni, A. (2026). Perlindungan Hukum Terhadap Pemegang Sertifikat Tanah Elektronik. *Jurnal Alwatzikhoebillah Kajian Islam Pendidikan Ekonomi Humaniora*, 12(1), 445–456. <https://doi.org/10.37567/alwatzikhoebillah.v12i1.4942>
- Hermanta, I. G., Suwitra, I. M., & Puspadma, I. N. A. (2026). Cancellation of Overlapping Land Rights Certificates Without Judicial Mechanism. *Jurnal Indonesia Sosial Sains*, 7(3), 812–819. <https://doi.org/10.59141/jiss.v7i3.2253>
- Hijrianita, A., Runggu, Y., Sianturi, T. C., & Madika, M. A. (2024). Dinamika Hukum Agraria Di Indonesia Tantangan Dan Solusi Dalam Penyelesaian Konflik Pertanahan Yang Bersertifikat. *Jurnal Dunia Ilmu Hukum (JURDIKUM)*, 2(2), 37–42. <https://doi.org/10.59435/jurdikum.v1i2.376>
- Hutapea, J. G. C., Rasji, R., & Siregar, R. A. (2025). Pembatalan Sertifikat Hak Milik Akibat Sertifikat Ganda dalam Sengketa Tata Usaha Negara: Studi Kasus Putusan No. 273/B/2021/PT.TUN.MDN. *JLEB Journal of Law Education and Business*, 3(1), 737–743. <https://doi.org/10.57235/jleb.v3i1.5969>
- Ihsani, F. A. N., & Putra, G. P. (2024). Praktik Mediasi Sebagai Alternatif Penyelesaian Sengketa Batas di Kantor Pertanahan Kota Kediri. *Birokrasi JURNAL ILMU HUKUM DAN TATA NEGARA*, 2(4), 252–262. <https://doi.org/10.55606/birokrasi.v2i4.1651>
- Jamil, Borahima, A., & Lahae, K. (2026). State Responsibility And Legal Accountability In The Issuance Of Electronic Land Certificates: Bridging The Gap Between Technological Advances And The Principle Of Legality. *Veredas Do Direito Direito Ambiental e Desenvolvimento Sustentável*, 23(4). <https://doi.org/10.18623/rvd.v23.n4.4748>

- Julius, L., & Rasji, R. (2025). Implementation of Legal Protection for Land Rights Holders Regarding the Issuance of Duplicate Certificates: Case Study of Supreme Court Decision Number 316 K/TUN/2021. *Academia Open*, 10(2). <https://doi.org/10.21070/acopen.10.2025.12836>
- Kaunang, P. D. (2025). Juridical Review of The Cancellation of Electronic Land Title Certificates Based on The Regulation of The Minister of Agrarian Affairs and Spatial Planning/Head of The National Land Agency of The Republic of Indonesia Number 21 of 2020. *International Journal of Law and Society*, 2(2), 154–166. <https://doi.org/10.62951/ijls.v2i2.383>
- Kistriana, F. E., Purwadi, H., & Nagara, A. S. (2025). Legal Protection for Buyers in Good Faith as a Result of the Cancellation of Transfer of Rights Based on a Court Decision. *Journal of Legal and Cultural Analytics*, 4(4), 1287–1298. <https://doi.org/10.55927/jlca.v4i4.15623>
- Kusuma, D. T., Handayani, I. G. A. K. R., & Karjoko, L. (2024). Analysis Of Cancellation Of Land Rights Certificates In Certificate Overlapping Cases. *International Journal of Educational Research & Social Sciences*, 5(3), 513–521. <https://doi.org/10.51601/ijersc.v5i3.840>
- Lambu, A. M., Audrey, J. C., Meha, M. H. M., Sutanto, M. A., & Papatungan, P. E. A. (2025). Politik Hukum: Sertipikat Elektronik pada Sertipikat Ganda. *Jurnal MINUTA*, 7(1), 13–27. <https://doi.org/10.24123/minuta.v7i01.7053>
- Marella, C., & Silviana, A. (2025). Digital Revolution in Land Affairs: Transformation of Land Certificates Through Electronic Mortgage Service. *The Indonesian Journal of International Clinical Legal Education*, 6(4), 551–580. <https://doi.org/10.15294/iccle.v6i4.18929>
- Muri, D. P. D., Wibawanti, E. S., & Safitri, M. I. (2025). Sertipikat Elektronik Sebagai Jaminan Perlindungan Hak Atas Tanah Dalam Pelaksanaan Pendaftaran Tanah. *JURNAL USM LAW REVIEW*, 8(2), 1126–1147. <https://doi.org/10.26623/julr.v8i2.12136>
- Murni, C. S., Kelen, B. B., & Sulaiman, S. (2022). The Legal Certainty Of Land Ownership Right In Registration's Context. *International Journal of Law Reconstruction*, 6(1), 13. <https://doi.org/10.26532/ijlr.v6i1.16422>
- Muzakkir, N. F., Rinaldi, Y., & Adwani, A. (2021). Cancellation of Land Ownership Certificate by the State Administrative Court Reviewed from the State Administrative Justice Law. *International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding*, 8(4), 703. <https://doi.org/10.18415/ijmmu.v8i4.2624>
- Naibaho, P. G. A., & Syaputra, M. Y. A. (2025). Legal Certainty for Resolution of Land Disputes Regarding Overlapping Land Ownership Certificates (Case Study at the National Agency Office of Simalungun Regency). *International Journal of Research and Review*, 12(5), 483–488. <https://doi.org/10.52403/ijrr.20250549>
- Naim, S., Lahae, K., Haeranah, H., & Riza, M. (2025). Resolving Land Disputes in Papua: Court Competence, Legal Challenges, and Dual Ownership Issues. *Journal of Management World*, 2025(2), 186–192. <https://doi.org/10.53935/jomw.v2024i4.899>
- Nisa, Z., & Lukman, F. X. A. (2025). Legal Consequences Of Cancellation Of Certificate of Right to Building Because Of Administrative Defects. *International Journal Of Humanities Education and Social Sciences (IJHESS)*, 5(2). <https://doi.org/10.55227/ijhess.v5i2.1870>

- Noor, A., Rahmawati, S., Hidayati, T. D., Rosmiati, R., adenafio, M. R., Nurwanda, A. Y., & Satriawan, A. R. (2025). The Impact of Land Mafia on Agrarian Disputes and the Optimisation of Electronic Land Transfer Deeds in Indonesia. *International Journal of Management Entrepreneurship Social Sciences and Humanities*, 9(2). <https://doi.org/10.31098/ijmesh.v9i2.3693>
- Nurhayati, S., & Suardi, S. (2026). Land Dispute Analysis Due To Multiple Certificates From A Civil Law Perspective. *POSTULAT*, 4(1), 80–92. <https://doi.org/10.37010/postulat.v4i1.2211>
- Padjadjaran, F. H. U., & Nurlinda, I. (2016). Telaah Atas Materi Muatan Rancangan Undang-Undang Pertanahan Ida Nurlinda. *Jurnal Bina Mulia Hukum*, 1(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.23920/jbmh.v1n1.1>
- Panjaitan, S. M., Simamora, J., & Simamora, S. (2026). Analisis Hukum Pembatalan Sertipikat Hak Atas Tanah Karena Cacat Administrasi (Studi Putusan Nomor 81/G/2023/Ptun.Sby). *Jurnal Ilmu Hukum Humaniora Dan Politik*, 6(3), 1982–1993. <https://doi.org/10.38035/jihhp.v6i3.7990>
- Purnama, C. L., Supriyadi, S., Mulyani, T., & Sihotang, A. P. (2025). Analisis Yuridis Putusan Ptun Nomor 83/G/2023/Ptun. Smg Terkait Dengan Pembatalan Sertifikat Hak Atas Tanah Yang Overlapping. *Semarang Law Review (SLR)*, 6(2), 411–425. <https://doi.org/10.26623/slr.v6i2.12851>
- Putra, N. A. (2026). The Urgency Of Land Administration Accuracy By The National Land Agency To Minimize Land Disputes. *Awang Long Law Review*, 8(2). <https://doi.org/10.56301/awl.v8i2.1887>
- Putri, D. C. W., & Hadi, S. (2025). The National Land Agency's Efforts in Anticipation and Resolving Disputes Regarding Multiple Land Ownership Certificates. *Law Development Journal*, 7(3), 541. <https://doi.org/10.30659/ldj.7.3.541-550>
- Raihan, S., Bourguignon, F., Raihan, S., Raihan, S., Raihan, S., Raihan, S., Melo, J. de, Hassan, M. M., Beck, T., Ahmed, S., Heady, C., Raihan, S., King, E. M., Raihan, S., Mookherjee, D., Ferdousi, R., & Platteau, J.-P. (2024). Is the Bangladesh Paradox Sustainable? In *Cambridge University Press eBooks*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009284677>
- Ramdhani, N. . 21103040134 D. I. F. (2025). Analisis Hukum Dalam Sengketa Sertifikat Ganda Terhadap Hak Milik Atas Tanah (Studi Kasus Kabupaten Sumbawa). In *Digital Library UIN Sunan Kalijaga (Sunan Kalijaga State Islamic University)*. Sunan Kalijaga State Islamic University Yogyakarta.
- Rauzi, F., & Hadi, M. Z. P. (2024). The Parameters of Absolute Competence of General Courts and State Administrative Courts in Adjudicating Land Disputes. *SHS Web of Conferences*, 182, 4008. <https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/202418204008>
- Roestamy, M., Sitohang, S., & Rahayu, R. T. (2025). Legal Certainty In Indonesia Regarding The Migration Of Land Certificates From Analog To Electronic Systems. *Al-Mubin Islamic Scientific Journal*, 8(1), 129–136. <https://doi.org/10.51192/almubin.v8i1.1713>
- Rois, B. Z., Hasana, D., Suwondo, D., & Maerani, I. A. (2022). Roles & Responsibilities of National Land Agency in Efforts to Settle Land Ownership Disputes Due to Overlapping Certificates. *Sultan Agung Notary Law Review*, 4(1), 22. <https://doi.org/10.30659/sanlar.4.1.22-35>
- Roni, R., Daulay, Z., & Benni, B. (2020). Pembatalan Sertipikat Hak Milik Oleh Kantor Pertanahan Berdasarkan Putusan Pengadilan Yang Telah Berkekuatan Hukum

- Tetap Dalam Perkara NOMOR:17/PDT.G/2009.PN.LB.BS. *UNES Law Review*, 3(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.31933/unesrev.v3i1.137>
- Roto, O. P., Raharjo, P. S., & Najicha, F. U. (2026). Perlindungan Hukum Pemegang Hak Atas Tanah Akibat Tumpang Tindih Sertipikat Dalam Sistem Publikasi Negatif Berdasarkan Asas Keadilan. *RIGGS Journal of Artificial Intelligence and Digital Business*, 5(1), 1900–1908. <https://doi.org/10.31004/riggs.v5i1.6521>
- Sabdaningtyas, Y., & Dewi, P. M. (2024). Legal Certainty and Procedural Justice in Land Management in Indonesia: Ensuring Rights Protection and Effective Dispute Resolution. *Mimbar Keadilan*, 17(2), 210–222. <https://doi.org/10.30996/mk.v17i2.11475>
- Sarimun, M. H., Amiq, B., & Masnun, M. A. (2024). Legal Protection for Land Rights Certificate Holders in Cases of Multiple Certificate Issuance (Analysis of Decision Number: 502 K/TUN/2019). *Lex Journal Kajian Hukum Dan Keadilan*, 8(2), 164–174. <https://doi.org/10.25139/lex.v8i2.9392>
- Setyani, A. N., Hasana, D., & Adillah, S. U. (2022). The Issuance of Land Certificates from an Electronic System. *Sultan Agung Notary Law Review*, 4(3), 716. <https://doi.org/10.30659/sanlar.4.3.716-727>
- Sihombing, B. F. (2023). Critical Studies of the Land Mafia Practices: Evidence in Indonesia. *Beijing Law Review*, 14(1), 433–472. <https://doi.org/10.4236/blr.2023.141023>
- Simarmata, A. D., Samosir, T., & Anggriani, J. (2025). Legal Protection for Land Rights Owners on Cancellation of Certificates by the Court Due to Overlapping. *Al-Adalah Jurnal Hukum Dan Politik Islam*, 247–260. <https://doi.org/10.30863/ajmpi.v10i2.8064>
- Soediro, S., Kartini, I. A., Faridli, E. M., & Nuraeni, N. (2023). Double Certificates and Its Resolution in (Study of Supreme Court Decision Number 976 K/PDT/2015). *Proceedings Series on Social Sciences & Humanities*, 14, 17–22. <https://doi.org/10.30595/pssh.v14i.910>
- Sulaiman, S., & Lesmana, A. B. (2024). Juridical Analysis Of The Settlement Of Disputes Over Multiple Ownership Of Land Assets Of The Army In Indonesia. *Jurnal Hukum Volkgeist*, 9(1), 8–18. <https://doi.org/10.35326/volkgeist.v9i1.6869>
- Suryandari, W. D., & Sejati, H. (2024). Legal Uncertainty Regarding Dual Certifications in Agrarian Law in Indonesia. *International Journal of Law Social Sciences and Management*, 1(4). <https://doi.org/10.69726/ijlssm.v1i4.59>
- Susanti, N. W. A., RS, N., & Damanik, S. N. (2024). The Authority of the Ministry of Agrarian Affairs and Spatial Planning/National Land Agency in the Legal Protection of Land Rights Holders whose Transfer of Rights is Revoked. *Jurnal Syntax Transformation*, 5(7), 977–987. <https://doi.org/10.46799/jst.v5i7.985>
- Syah, A. N. A. D. P., Nawi, S., & Poernomo, S. L. (2026). The Evidentiary Strength of Land Title Certificates in Civil Cases: A Study of Decisions of the Makassar District Court. *SIGN Jurnal Hukum*, 7(2), 1131–1145. <https://doi.org/10.37276/sjh.v7i2.558>
- Thakur, V., Doja, M. N., Dwivedi, Y. K., Ahmad, T., & Khadanga, G. (2019). Land records on Blockchain for implementation of Land Titling in India. *International Journal of Information Management*, 52, 101940. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2019.04.013>
- Thesia, E. H. (2023). Double Certificate Cases in Indonesia: Absolute Jurisdiction of the

Administrative Court or General Court? *International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding*, 10(12), 197.
<https://doi.org/10.18415/ijmmu.v10i12.5229>

- Ulhaq, D. D., Heriyanto, B., & Suhermanto, S. (2025). Analisis Yuridis Putusan Pengadilan Tata Usaha Negara Nomor 171/G/2024/Ptun.Jkt. Mengenai Gugatan Pembatalan Pencatatan Peralihan Sertipikat Hak Milik. *Journal of Legal Political and Humanistic Inquiry*, 1(2), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.65310/dz4jxp82>
- Walianto, S., Abdullah, A. G., & Djajaputra, G. (2025). Legal Land Conflict In The Implementation Of Digital Land Certificates: Legal Certainty In The Era Of Online. *Lex Localis - Journal of Local Self-Government*, 23, 9197–9209. <https://doi.org/10.52152/8sk3fa27>
- Wibowo, R. A., & Turisno, B. E. (2024). Analysis of Land Rights Cancellation Process Due to Administrative Non-Compliance with Applicable Law in Indonesia. *Santhet (Jurnal Sejarah Pendidikan Dan Humaniora)*, 8(1), 368–372. <https://doi.org/10.36526/santhet.v8i1.3647>
- Widad, S. (2026). Pemeliharaan Hak Atas Tanah Dalam Era Sertifikat Elektronik: Analisis Kepastian Hukum Dan Perlindungan Hak Masyarakat. *SINERGI Jurnal Riset Ilmiah*, 3(1), 363–376. <https://doi.org/10.62335/sinergi.v3i1.2303>
- Widjojo, A. G. M., & Pranatia, M. (2025). Regulation of Maladministration of the National Land Agency as the Embodiment of Principles of Legal Certainty of Land Ownership. *Science of Law.*, 2025(2), 121–127. <https://doi.org/10.55284/wsg79040>
- Wisudawanta, D. P. (2025). Legal Protection of Double Certified Land Right Holders. *Jurnal Independent*, 13(1), 112–123. <https://doi.org/10.30736/ji.v13i1.377>
- Wulandari, S. (2020). Indicators Of Land Rights Certificate Cancellation Caused By Overlapping Rights As Administration Failure. *Administrative and Environmental Law Review*, 1(2), 113–124. <https://doi.org/10.25041/aclr.v1i2.2149>
- Yanti, D. V., Sari, M. T., Utami, W., & Samosir, T. (2025). Legal Certainty Dynamics of Land Rights in Electronic Transactions and the Implementation of Digital Land Certificates in Indonesia. *Riwayat Educational Journal of History and Humanities*, 8(2), 1471–1478. <https://doi.org/10.24815/jr.v8i2.45449>
- Yuherman, Y., Nugroho, W., Nuriyatman, E., & Aziz, H. A. (2025). Integration of Absolute Authority of District Courts and State Administrative Courts in Land Disputes through Koneksitas Courts. *Administrative and Environmental Law Review*, 6(1), 45–60. <https://doi.org/10.25041/aclr.v6i1.4223>
- Yuris, R. F., & Sudiro, A. (2023). Responsibility Of The Head Of The National Land Agency For The Issuance Of Land Ownership Certificates With Administrative Legal Defects. *Policy Law Notary And Regulatory Issues (POLRI)*, 2(4), 437–445. <https://doi.org/10.55047/polri.v2i4.911>

