

Overlapping Electronic Certificates Due to Administrative Errors as an Unlawful Act

Pemas Dwi Saputra Adiko

Faculty of Law, Gorontalo State University, Gorontalo, Indonesia

**E-mail:pemasadiko23@gmail.com*

ABSTRACT

Overlapping electronic certificates due to land administration errors raises legal issues regarding the possibility of civil liability for actions or omissions in the implementation of land registration. This article aims to analyze the qualifications of overlapping electronic certificates as an Unlawful Act based on Article 1365 of the Civil Code. This study uses a normative legal research method with a statutory and conceptual approach, through an analysis of relevant legal materials. The results of the analysis indicate that overlapping electronic certificates is a land administration issue that cannot automatically be qualified as an Unlawful Act. This qualification depends on the fulfillment of the elements of an unlawful act, error, loss, and causal relationship, which must be assessed based on legal obligations and demonstrable circumstances. Thus, Article 1365 of the Civil Code can be the basis for assessing civil liability if the error or negligence in land administration is proven to fulfill all the elements of an Unlawful Act.

Keywords: Electronic Certificates, Overlapping Certificates, Land Administration Errors, Unlawful Acts.

INTRODUCTION

Land registration is a legal instrument to provide legal certainty regarding land rights. Article 19 of Law Number 5 of 1960 concerning Basic Agrarian Regulations emphasizes the importance of land registration to ensure legal certainty.¹ These regulations are further elaborated in Government Regulation Number 24 of 1997 concerning Land Registration as amended by Government Regulation Number 18 of 2021.² Over time, land registration has undergone a transformation through the use of electronic systems. This change does not eliminate the obligation to ensure the consistency of the physical and legal data that form the basis for land registration. Therefore, the issuance of Electronic Certificates must still be

¹ Muh Ibnu Sumarna, "Implementation of Land Registration as an Effort to Ensure Legal Certainty of Land Rights in Indonesia," *LEGALITAS: Scientific Journal of Legal Science* 10, no. 2 (2025): 153–58, <https://doi.org/10.31293/lg.v10i2.9116>.

² Mien Soputan et al., "Legal Power of Village Head's Position in Issuing Land Certificates Reviewed by Government Regulation Number 18 of 2021 Concerning Land Registration," *Nuansa Akademik: Jurnal Pembangunan Masyarakat* 9, no. 2 (2024): 291–304, <https://doi.org/10.47200/jnajpm.v9i2.2428>.

analyzed within the framework of land registration legal norms and the principle of legal certainty.³

Normatively, overlapping certificates relate to the issue of the conformity of physical and legal data on land parcels recorded in land administration. This issue needs to be placed within the framework of legal obligations governing the land registration process, including data verification, measurement, mapping, recording, and data maintenance.⁴If there are discrepancies in the administrative process, the assessment cannot be made solely by looking at the existence of overlapping certificates. A legal analysis must first determine the applicable obligations, the form of deviation from those obligations, and the legal consequences that may arise under the laws and regulations.⁵

The issue becomes more complex when overlapping e-certificates are linked to alleged errors or negligence by the Land Office. From a civil law perspective, Article 1365 of the Civil Code (KUHPerdara) stipulates the obligation to compensate for losses arising from an unlawful act.⁶The application of these provisions to actions or omissions in land administration requires testing of the elements of an Unlawful Act, namely the existence of the act or omission, the unlawful nature, error, loss, and causal relationship.⁷Thus, the relationship between administrative errors and Unlawful Acts cannot be established solely on the basis of overlapping certificates, but must be analyzed through the fulfillment of the elements specified in civil law.

This test also requires an explanation of the relationship between legal obligations in land administration and the concept of unlawfulness. Provisions regarding land registration can be used to identify obligations that must be met in the implementation of land administration, while the concept of Unlawful Acts is used to assess the civil consequences of actions or

³ Syarifatul Hidayah et al., "Challenges and Opportunities of Electronic Certificates in Land Registration Reform in the Digital Era. | JURNAL ILMIAH NUSANTARA," 2024, <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.61722/jinu.v1i6.2793>.

⁴ Dewi Padusi Daeng Muri et al., "Electronic Certificates as a Guarantee of Land Rights Protection in the Implementation of Land Registration," *USM LAW REVIEW JOURNAL* 8, no. 2 (2025): 1126–47, <https://doi.org/10.26623/julr.v8i2.12136>.

⁵ Raden Ayu Rani Mutiara Dewi and Catherine Susantio, "Use of Electronic Certificates to Improve Land Registration Efficiency in Land Mafia Prevention Efforts," *Jurnal Syntax Admiration* 5, no. 9 (2024): 3382, <https://doi.org/10.46799/jsa.v5i9.1441>.

⁶ M. Ilham Dwi Putranto and Amin Mansyur, "The Urgency of Implementing Electronic Land Certificates," *Repertorium: Scientific Journal of Notary Law* 12, no. 1 (2023): 15–26, <https://doi.org/10.28946/rpt.v12i1.2645>.

⁷ Siti Nurhayati and Suardi Suardi, "Land Dispute Analysis Due to Multiple Certificates From a Civil Law Perspective," *POSTULAT* 4, no. 1 (2026): 80–92, <https://doi.org/10.37010/postulat.v4i1.2211>.

omissions that meet its elements.⁸The general principles of good governance, particularly the principles of legal certainty and due diligence, can serve as analytical material for assessing the implementation of administrative authority. However, violations of administrative principles or procedures do not in themselves prove that all elements of Article 1365 of the Civil Code have been met. Therefore, a normative analysis is necessary to distinguish administrative violations from acts that could give rise to civil liability.

Previous research has addressed the issue of overlapping certificates from several perspectives. The research by Mohamad Arista Hafid and colleagues on the conversion of physical certificates to e-certificates places the issue of overlapping certificates in the context of digitalization and land dispute resolution.⁹Sa'adah and colleagues' research addresses legal protection for owners of overlapping land certificates in the Complete Systematic Land Registration program.¹⁰Meanwhile, Ni Made Rian Ayu Sumardani's study discusses the legal responsibility of the National Land Agency regarding discrepancies in the results of electronic certificate checks.¹¹These studies are relevant as a basis for understanding the digitalization of land administration, the protection of rights holders, and the responsibilities of land institutions. However, this research focuses its analysis on the legal construction that links errors or negligence in land administration to the fulfillment of the elements of an Unlawful Act under Article 1365 of the Civil Code.

This study aims to analyze the relationship between legal norms of land registration, obligations of the Land Office, and elements of Unlawful Acts to determine the legal requirements that must be met so that overlapping e-Certificates can be qualified as Unlawful Acts. The novelty of the analysis lies in the normative examination of the relationship between land administration errors in the electronic system and elements of civil liability, by emphasizing that overlapping certificates does not automatically meet the qualifications of Unlawful Acts.

⁸ 12124067 ESTHER YULIANAWATI SETIAWAN, "Claim for Compensation for Dual Ownership Certificates" (masters, Narotama University, 2025), <http://repository.narotama.ac.id/2418/>.

⁹ Mohamad Arista Hafid et al., "Problems of Converting Old Physical Certificates to Electronic Certificates in Land Dispute Settlement: A Case Study of Overlapping Certificates in Pagar Alam, South Sumatra," *Jurnal Hukum Sasana* 12, no. 1 (2026): 202–22, <https://doi.org/10.31599/sasana.v12i1.4833>.

¹⁰ Kholissatus Sa'adah et al., "Legal Protection for Owners of Overlapping Land Certificates in the Complete Systematic Land Registration Program (PTSL)," *Jurnal Hukum Sasana* 11, no. 1 (2025): 149–69, <https://doi.org/10.31599/sasana.v11i1.3807>.

¹¹ Ni Made Rian Ayu Sumardani and I Nyoman Bagiastara, "Legal Responsibility of the National Land Agency Regarding Discrepancies in Electronic Certificate Check Results - Neliti," 2021, <https://www.neliti.com/publications/361793/tanggung-jawab-hukum-badan-pertanahan-nasional-terkait-ketidaksesuaian-hasil-pen>.

METHODS

This research is a normative legal research that focuses on the analysis of the legal qualifications of overlapping Electronic Certificates (e-Certificates) due to errors or negligence of the Land Office as an Unlawful Act based on Article 1365 of the Civil Code (KUHPperdata). The research was conducted by examining the legal norms governing land registration and the issuance of e-Certificates, and linking them with the provisions and doctrines regarding Unlawful Acts in civil law.¹²

The approaches used include the statute approach and the conceptual approach.¹³ A statutory approach is used to examine provisions regarding land registration, electronic land administration, the authority and obligations of the Land Office, and the basis for civil liability under Article 1365 of the Civil Code. Meanwhile, a conceptual approach is used to analyze the concepts of error, negligence, unlawfulness, loss, causal relationships, and the principles of good governance relevant to land administration.

The legal materials used consist of primary and secondary legal materials. Primary legal materials include laws and regulations relating to land registration, e-certificates, government administration, and unlawful acts. Secondary legal materials include law books, scientific journal articles, and expert opinions relevant to land law, civil law, and government administration law.¹⁴ Legal materials are collected through literature studies and analyzed qualitatively using prescriptive reasoning, namely assessing the suitability between applicable legal norms and the concept of civil liability to formulate legal arguments regarding the issues being studied.¹⁵

The analysis is conducted by linking legal obligations in the implementation of land administration with the elements of Unlawful Acts based on Article 1365 of the Civil Code, which include acts or omissions, unlawful nature, errors, losses, and causal relationships. This analysis is directed at formulating the legal requirements that must be met so that overlapping e-Certificates due to administrative errors or negligence can be qualified as Unlawful Acts. Thus, the study does not assume that every overlapping certificate is an Unlawful Act, but rather tests the qualification based on relevant legal norms and concepts.

¹² Irwansyah, *Legal Research (Choice of Methods & Article Writing Practice)*, Revised 4th Edition (Mirra Buana Media, 2021), 93–99.

¹³ Peter Mahmud Marzuki, *Legal Research Revised Edition* (Kencana, Prenadamedia Group, 2025), 133–37.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 181.

¹⁵ Mukti Fajar and Yulianto Achmad, *Dualism in legal research*, 5th ed. (Pustaka Pelajar, 2019), 43.

RESULTS

The results of the normative analysis indicate that the overlapping of Electronic Certificates (e-Certificates) needs to be placed within the legal framework of land registration and civil liability. The transformation of land administration into an electronic system does not eliminate the need to ensure the conformity of physical and legal data on land parcels. Provisions regarding land registration remain the basis for assessing the accuracy of the data used in the certificate issuance and maintenance process. Therefore, the overlapping of e-Certificates is normatively related to the issue of land data consistency and the implementation of administrative obligations in the implementation of land registration.

The results of the review of the concept of Unlawful Acts indicate that the existence of overlapping certificates does not in itself meet the qualifications of Article 1365 of the Civil Code (KUHPPerdata). This qualification depends on the fulfillment of the elements of an act or omission, unlawful nature, error, loss, and a cumulative causal relationship. Therefore, land data discrepancies require further analysis to determine whether there are actions or omissions that are contrary to legal obligations, can be accounted for as errors, and give rise to losses that have a causal relationship with the action or omission.

Normative analysis also shows that legal provisions regarding land registration and the concept of Unlawful Acts have different, but interrelated, analytical functions. Land registration norms are used to identify obligations that must be fulfilled in the implementation of land administration, while Article 1365 of the Civil Code serves as the basis for assessing the possibility of civil liability if an act or omission fulfills all the elements of the Unlawful Act. Within this framework, the principles of legal certainty and the principle of accuracy in the implementation of government administration can be used as material for assessing the implementation of administrative obligations. However, indications of violations of obligations or administrative principles are not sufficient to conclude that the Unlawful Act exists if the elements of error, loss, and causality have not been met.

Thus, the research results place the overlapping of e-Certificates due to alleged errors or negligence of the Land Office as a legal issue that lies at the relationship between land administration and civil law. Qualification as an Unlawful Act requires normative testing of relevant legal obligations and fulfillment of all elements of Article 1365 of the Civil Code. The conclusion confirms that overlapping certificates is not evidence that automatically gives rise

to civil liability, but rather a situation that must be assessed based on the legal basis, the form of deviation, error, loss, and causal relationship that can be accounted for.

DISCUSSION

Overlapping Electronic Certificates as a Land Administration Problem

The issuance of Electronic Certificates (e-Certificates) is part of the development of land registration that utilizes electronic systems. Although data storage and presentation media have changed, the basic principles of land registration remain oriented towards providing legal certainty regarding the subject, object, and status of land rights. Article 19 of Law Number 5 of 1960 concerning Basic Agrarian Regulations positions land registration as an instrument to ensure legal certainty, while its implementation is further regulated in Government Regulation Number 24 of 1997 concerning Land Registration as amended by Government Regulation Number 18 of 2021. This legal framework demonstrates that digitalization does not eliminate the obligation to maintain the conformity of physical and legal data in the implementation of land registration.

Within this framework, overlapping certificates can be understood as a legal issue related to data discrepancies regarding registered land objects. Overlaps can be related to inconsistencies in boundaries or coordinates of plots, inconsistent data recording, or issues with the history of registration and data maintenance. However, normatively, the existence of two certificates covering the same or overlapping plots of land is not sufficient to determine the cause of the overlap. The assessment must take into account the history of rights, physical and legal data, and the administrative processes that underlie the issuance of each certificate. Therefore, it is necessary to distinguish between inconsistencies in land data and administrative errors that can be legally accounted for.

This distinction is important because land registration is a series of administrative activities, not simply the act of issuing certificates. The collection and processing of physical data, legal data research, title recording, certificate issuance, and data maintenance are all interrelated parts of the process. The accuracy of administrative results depends on the suitability of the information used in each stage. In the implementation of electronic systems, the need for data consistency remains, even when data from physical documents is transferred or processed in electronic systems. Regulations regarding electronic documents in land registration activities must also be read in conjunction with the overall legal framework for land registration, not as a substitute for the basic principles of land registration.

From an administrative law perspective, the Land Office's authority must be exercised in accordance with statutory provisions and the principles of good governance. Law Number 30 of 2014 concerning State Administration provides a framework for assessing the use of government authority, including through the principles of legal certainty and accuracy. In land administration, the principle of legal certainty relates to the clarity of land rights and information, while the principle of accuracy relates to the thoroughness of examining and processing information that forms the basis for administrative actions. Both principles are relevant to assessing whether administrative processes have been carried out in accordance with applicable legal obligations.

However, data discrepancies or administrative errors do not necessarily indicate that the Land Office has committed an unlawful act. Such discrepancies must first be assessed based on their cause, relevant legal obligations, and the associated administrative stages. Errors can stem from a variety of circumstances, so attribution of errors to the Land Office cannot be based solely on the final result of conflicting certificates. A normative analysis must determine the actions or omissions in question, the obligations that should have been fulfilled, and the relationship between these deviations and the data discrepancies.

Therefore, overlapping e-certificates should be positioned as a land administration issue that can open up the possibility of civil law assessment, but does not automatically give rise to civil liability. Determining the legal consequences requires further examination based on norms governing land administration obligations and provisions concerning Unlawful Acts. This distinction serves as a starting point for assessing whether an administrative error or negligence meets the elements of Article 1365 of the Civil Code (KUHPerdata).

Qualification of Overlapping Electronic Certificates as an Unlawful Act Based on Article 1365 of the Civil Code

Article 1365 of the Civil Code provides the basis for civil liability for unlawful acts that cause harm to others. The application of this provision to overlapping e-Certificates requires an assessment of the elements of PMH, namely the existence of the act, the unlawful nature, the fault, the loss, and the causal relationship between the act and the loss. These five elements must be analyzed cumulatively. Therefore, the existence of overlapping certificates does not in itself prove that the Land Office has carried out PMH. Overlapping is a condition that needs to be legally explained, while liability under Article 1365 of the Civil Code depends on the fulfillment of the required elements.

Article 1365 of the Civil Code stipulates that any unlawful act that causes harm to another person requires the party whose fault it is that caused the loss to compensate for the loss. This provision serves as the basis for assessing liability for actions or omissions that harm another party, including when such loss is related to the implementation of land administration. However, the application of Article 1365 of the Civil Code cannot be done simply by showing that two certificates cover the same or overlapping plots of land. This situation is a fact whose cause must be investigated, while qualification as an unlawful act must be determined through proof of the elements required by the provision.

The first element that needs to be assessed is the existence of an act, whether an act or omission. In the context of land administration, an act can include issuing documents or recording land data that does not align with the legal and physical conditions of the land object. Meanwhile, negligence can relate to the failure to adequately examine land registration data, title histories, measurement letters, plot maps, or other relevant documents before data is determined or updated. The assessment of this element must take into account the authority and legal obligations inherent in the official or institution carrying out the administrative process. Therefore, not every data discrepancy can be directly viewed as an act that can be accounted for under Article 1365 of the Civil Code; rather, the type of act or omission that caused it must first be determined.

The existence of such actions or omissions must then be linked to an unlawful element. In the case of overlapping electronic certificates, unlawful nature can be assessed if the actions or omissions in the land administration process contradict applicable legal obligations, violate the rights of other parties, or fail to meet the standards of prudence that should be implemented in the implementation of administration. Law Number 30 of 2014 concerning Government Administration provides a normative framework regarding the implementation of government authority and the obligation to comply with the General Principles of Good Governance (AUPB). The principles of legal certainty and the principle of accuracy, for example, are relevant to assessing whether the administrative process has been carried out in accordance with legal provisions and has adequately examined the necessary information and documents.

However, violations of the principles of government administration do not automatically resolve the assessment of the fulfillment of all elements of an unlawful act under Article 1365 of the Civil Code. The AUPB can be used as a framework for assessing compliance with the implementation of administrative authority, while civil liability still requires an examination of the elements of error, loss, and causality. This distinction is important so that every error in the

issuance of an electronic certificate is not automatically equated with an unlawful act that gives rise to an obligation to compensate for losses. Conversely, if an administrative error is proven to violate legal obligations and also causes losses that can be causally linked to the action or omission, the basis for assessing the existence of an unlawful act becomes stronger.

The element of error also plays a crucial role in determining liability under Article 1365 of the Civil Code. Errors in this context can be intentional or negligent, depending on the circumstances and the demonstrable basis for liability. In the issuance of electronic certificates, negligence can be considered if the data checking, matching, or updating process is not carried out as required by applicable provisions. However, the existence of overlapping certificates does not in itself prove that the authorized official or institution has committed negligence. The assessment of error must be based on applicable obligations, the proper administrative process, and the demonstrable form of deviation. Furthermore, a distinction must be made between individual official error and institutional responsibility, taking into account the relevant authority, actions, and legal basis. This distinction is necessary so that the determination of responsibility is not based solely on the party's position within the land administration structure.

Furthermore, the element of loss must be concretely proven and cannot simply be assumed from the existence of overlapping certificates. Losses can be material losses, such as the costs of document inspection, re-measurement, or dispute resolution arising as a direct result of administrative errors. Other losses may be related to the obstruction of the use or transfer of land rights, as long as these consequences can be proven and have a relevant relationship to the act in question. Immaterial losses, however, require a separate basis for assessment in accordance with the circumstances and applicable legal provisions. Therefore, claims for losses must be supported by adequate evidence, both regarding the existence of the loss and its connection to actions or omissions in the land administration process.

A causal relationship is the element that connects administrative errors with losses suffered by the injured party. In cases of overlapping electronic certificates, it is necessary to assess whether the losses actually arose from actions or omissions in the issuance, recording, or maintenance of land data, or were caused by other, independent factors. This assessment may require an examination of the rights history, physical and legal data, land plot maps, measurement letters, documents underlying the certificate issuance, and the administrative stages that have been carried out. Examination of this series of documents and processes serves to test the relationship between the actions in question and the claimed losses. Without a justifiable causal relationship, the simultaneous existence of administrative errors and losses is

not sufficient to ensure that the losses must be compensated under Article 1365 of the Civil Code.

Based on the above description, overlapping electronic certificates due to errors or negligence in land administration can be classified as an unlawful act if the actions or negligence that occurred are proven to cumulatively fulfill the elements of Article 1365 of the Civil Code. Overlapping certificates essentially indicate a problem that requires examination and resolution within the legal framework of land registration, but does not automatically give rise to civil liability. Qualification of an unlawful act requires an unlawful act or negligence, a responsible error, proven losses, and a causal relationship between the act and the loss. Therefore, legal assessment must be carried out by distinguishing between issues of administrative irregularity, defects in data issuance or recording, and the fulfillment of the basis for civil liability. This distinction is important to maintain legal certainty for land rights holders and ensure that liability for administrative errors is based on proven legal elements, not solely on the occurrence of overlapping certificates.

CONCLUSION

Overlapping electronic certificates caused by errors or negligence in land administration can be classified as an Unlawful Act based on Article 1365 of the Civil Code if it meets all the required elements, namely the existence of an act or negligence, the unlawful nature, the error, the loss, and the causal relationship between the act and the loss. The existence of overlapping certificates does not automatically prove the occurrence of an Unlawful Act because the inconsistency of land data still requires an investigation into the administrative process, applicable legal obligations, and the cause of the loss. In this case, land registration provisions and the principles of government administration are the basis for assessing compliance with the process of issuing and maintaining land data, while Article 1365 of the Civil Code is used to assess the fulfillment of the basis for civil liability. Thus, the determination of an Unlawful Act must be carried out through a comprehensive legal assessment of each element, so that liability for land administration errors is not solely based on the occurrence of overlapping certificates, but on the existence of an act that can be accounted for and proven to cause loss.

LIMITATION

This research is limited by its normative nature, focusing on the analysis of laws and regulations and the concept of Unlawful Acts in the context of overlapping electronic

certificates due to errors or negligence in land administration. Therefore, this article does not conduct an empirical examination of the certificate issuance process, land documents, or dispute handling practices at a specific Land Office. The analysis presented is also not intended to determine legal responsibility in a concrete dispute, because determining the fulfillment of the elements of error, loss, and causality requires an assessment of relevant facts and evidence. Furthermore, the discussion is limited to the qualification of overlapping electronic certificates as an Unlawful Act under Article 1365 of the Civil Code and does not elaborate in depth on the administrative mechanisms for correcting or canceling problematic certificates or the form of rights recovery for injured parties. This limitation opens up space for further research to examine the relationship between civil liability, administrative resolution, and legal protection for land rights holders within the framework of applicable land regulations.

REFERENCES

ESTHER YULIANAWATI SETIAWAN, 12124067. "Claim for Compensation for Dual Ownership Certificates." Masters, Narotama University, 2025. <http://repository.narotama.ac.id/2418/>.

Fajar, Mukti, and Yulianto Achmad. Dualism in legal research. 5th edition. Pustaka Pelajar, 2019.

Irwansyah. Legal Research (Choice of Methods & Article Writing Practice). Revised 4th Edition. Mirra Buana Media, 2021.

Marzuki, Peter Mahmud. Legal Research Revised Edition. Kencana, Prenadamedia Group, 2025.

Mohamad Arista Hafid, Muhammad Irgi Fahrezi, Dustin Altoffiestin, and Muhammad Chairul Ridha. "Problems of Converting Old Physical Certificates to Electronic Certificates in Land Dispute Settlement: A Case Study of Overlapping Certificates in Pagar Alam, South Sumatra." *Sasana Law Journal* 12, no. 1 (2026): 202–22. <https://doi.org/10.31599/sasana.v12i1.4833>.

Muri, Dewi Padusi Daeng, Erna Sri Wibawanti, and Manda Ika Safitri. "Electronic Certificates as a Guarantee of Land Rights Protection in the Implementation of Land

Registration.” *USM LAW REVIEW JOURNAL* 8, no. 2 (2025): 1126–47.
<https://doi.org/10.26623/julr.v8i2.12136>.

Ni Made Rian Ayu Sumardani and I Nyoman Bagiastra. “Legal Responsibility of the National Land Agency Regarding Discrepancies in Electronic Certificate Check Results - Neliti.” 2021. <https://www.neliti.com/publications/361793/tanggung-jawab-hukum-badan-pertanahan-nasional-terkait-ketidaksesuaian-hasil-pen>.

Nurhayati, Siti, and Suardi Suardi. “Land Dispute Analysis Due to Multiple Certificates From a Civil Law Perspective.” *POSTULAT* 4, no. 1 (2026): 80–92.
<https://doi.org/10.37010/postulat.v4i1.2211>.

Putranto, M. Ilham Dwi, and Amin Mansyur. “The Urgency of Implementing Electronic Land Certificates.” *Repertorium: Scientific Journal of Notary Law* 12, no. 1 (2023): 15–26.
<https://doi.org/10.28946/rpt.v12i1.2645>.

Rani Mutiara Dewi, Raden Ayu, and Catherine Susantio. “The Use of Electronic Certificates to Improve Land Registration Efficiency in Land Mafia Prevention Efforts.” *Jurnal Syntax Admiration* 5, no. 9 (2024): 3382. <https://doi.org/10.46799/jsa.v5i9.1441>.

Sa'adah, Kholissatus, Rahmat Saputra, and Diana Fitriana. “Legal Protection for Owners of Overlapping Land Certificates in the Complete Systematic Land Registration Program (PTSL).” *Sasana Law Journal* 11, no. 1 (2025): 149–69.
<https://doi.org/10.31599/sasana.v11i1.3807>.

Soputan, Mien, Vonny Anneke Wongkar, and Tommy Ferdy Sumakul. “The Legal Power of the Village Head's Position in Issuing Land Certificates Reviewed by Government Regulation Number 18 of 2021 Concerning Land Registration.” *Academic Nuances: Journal of Community Development* 9, no. 2 (2024): 291–304.
<https://doi.org/10.47200/jnajpm.v9i2.2428>.

Sumarna, Muh Ibnu. “Implementation of Land Registration as an Effort to Ensure Legal Certainty of Land Rights in Indonesia.” *LEGALITAS: Scientific Journal of Legal Science* 10, no. 2 (2025): 153–58. <https://doi.org/10.31293/lg.v10i2.9116>.

Syarifaatul Hidayah, Evi Hariyani, Lilis Mukarromah, Aprila Niravita, and M. Adymas Hikmal Fikri. "Challenges and Opportunities of Electronic Certificates in Land Registration Reform in the Digital Era. | JURNAL ILMIAH NUSANTARA." 2024.
<https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.61722/jinu.v1i6.2793>.