

Legal Analysis of Dismissal of Land Deed Officials Based on Health Conditions in the Perspective of Legal Certainty

Okky Wildhan Pratama¹⁾, Hanif Nur Widhiyanti²⁾, Diah Aju Wisnuwardhani³⁾

¹⁾Program Master Of Notary, Faculty Of Law, Brawijaya University, Indonesia

^{2,3)}Faculty Of Law, Brawijaya University, Indonesia

*Corresponding Author

Email: okkywildhanp@student.ub.ac.id

Abstract

This study aims to analyze the criteria for the dismissal of Land Deed Officials (PPAT) based on health conditions from a justice perspective. The method used is normative legal research with a statutory and conceptual approach, analyzed using a perspective analysis through grammatical and systematic interpretation methods. The results of the study show that the rules for dismissing PPATs due to health reasons refer to Article 10 paragraph (2) letter b of Government Regulation Number 24 of 2016. This regulation does not provide a health recovery period for PPATs, unlike the provisions in the Notary Position Law which grants a three-year recovery period. In conclusion, this regulation creates the potential for injustice for PPATs due to the absence of an opportunity to recover before being dismissed. Regulatory changes are needed to create a balance between public interest and the protection of individual rights.

Keywords: *Dismissal of Land Deed Officials, Physical and Mental Health, Justice, Legal Certainty*

INTRODUCTION

The rule of law serves to guarantee protection, certainty, and legal order in order to achieve justice. These three aspects require concrete evidence in the lives of the community as legal subjects to establish their rights and obligations (Anshori, 2009). Indonesia is a state based on law (rechtstaat), thus the government should ensure that the functions of the law are effectively implemented. The government gives serious attention to legal development, particularly in basic services, to meet the needs of the community and as a tangible manifestation of the state's presence (Karsayuda et al., 2023). The government creates legal professions to assist individuals with limited understanding of the legal procedures that need to be followed in resolving issues. The aim is to enhance legal awareness among citizens and relevant parties. One of the legal professions established in this context is the Land Deed Official (PPAT), who plays a crucial role as a public official in providing legal certainty regarding land transactions.

The Land Deed Official (PPAT) in performing their duties is subject to and compliant with Government Regulation Number 24 of 2016 concerning Amendments to Government Regulation Number 37 of 1998 regarding the Regulations of the Land Deed Official, hereinafter referred to as Government Regulation on PPAT (Immanuella & Hoesin, 2022). Referring to Article 1 Paragraph (1) of the Government Regulation regarding the Land Deed Official (PPAT), the authority possessed by a PPAT is to create authentic deeds related to land or land rights in Indonesia, particularly concerning Land Rights or Ownership Rights over Strata Title Units. This authority indicates that PPAT has the responsibility to provide public services by creating authentic deeds, which serve as valid and irrefutable evidence in legal actions related to land matters, as long as the deed is not contested in court.

The position of the Land Deed Official (PPAT) established by legislation has a specific duration. Under the Government Regulation on PPAT, there are provisions for Dismissal with Honor and Dismissal without Honor. This study specifically focuses on analyzing the dismissal

of PPAT with Honor as stipulated in Article 10 Paragraph (2) letter b, which states: “unable to carry out their duties due to health conditions of the body or mental health after being declared by a competent health examination team at the request of the Minister/Head or appointed official.” This provision is also governed by Law Number 30 of 2004 concerning the Notary Position (UUJN), which states that a notary may be honorably dismissed due to an inability, whether mentally and/or physically, to perform notarial duties continuously for more than three years.

Thus, there are similarities and differences between these regulations. The similarity is that both regulations clearly require the dismissal of a public official, namely a notary or PPAT, due to incapacity resulting from health issues affecting the body/physical condition and/or mental condition. The difference lies in the fact that the Government Regulation on PPAT does not include a “time frame” as stipulated in the UUJN. This time frame allows notaries the opportunity to recover their health condition or even to access new technologies or treatments that may assist in their recovery, enabling them to resume their duties continuously in the future.

In fact, the process of becoming a Land Deed Official (PPAT) is not simple, as it is a distinctive profession that has specific criteria for its appointment. Its distinctiveness also lies in its authority, which is to create the foundation of legal certainty regarding land ownership (Muchsin et al., 2020). The responsibilities of the Land Deed Official (PPAT) include the creation, registration, and management of legal documentation related to land and building certificates (Wibawa, 2019). Therefore, based on these considerations, it is necessary to comprehensively analyze the provisions mentioned to provide justice for Land Deed Officials (PPAT). Thus, the purpose of this study is to establish clear criteria regarding the "Dismissal of Land Deed Officials Based on Health Conditions from a Justice Perspective." The concept of justice utilized in this research is derived from John Rawls, who emphasizes two main principles of justice: 1) Liberty Principle: Every person has the same rights to the widest basic liberties, provided that such liberties do not interfere with the liberties of others. 2) Difference Principle: Social and economic inequalities must be arranged to benefit the least advantaged (the most vulnerable) in society. Furthermore, positions or roles in society must be open to everyone under conditions of equal opportunity (Safa'at, 2011).

These principles of justice are based on: 1) Liberty Principle: Every individual has the right to the same basic freedoms, including the right to practice their profession as long as they are able. The dismissal of a Land Deed Official (PPAT) must consider this individual's right to have the opportunity to improve their health condition before losing their position. 2) Difference Principle: Inequalities are only acceptable if they benefit the least advantaged. In this context, if a PPAT is no longer able to perform their duties due to health reasons, there is a necessity to ensure that the dismissal process does not disadvantage their social and economic position, and that support for recovery is provided.

Therefore, the dismissal of Land Deed Officials (PPAT) becomes an important issue within the context of law and public service, especially when related to physical or mental health conditions. The relevance of previous studies to the issue under investigation remains limited, particularly concerning the dismissal of Land Deed Officials (PPAT) on the grounds of physical or mental health. This is evident in the research conducted by (Astuti, 2017), which examines the dismissal of PPATs declared bankrupt under Government Regulation Number 24 of 2016. His study focuses on the following questions: What are the responsibilities and liabilities of a PPAT declared bankrupt under Government Regulation Number 24 of 2016? Can a PPAT be reinstated after rehabilitation? However, the issue of dismissal of Land Deed Officials based on physical or mental health is not addressed at all in his research. Therefore, this study is crucial to provide legal certainty for PPATs.

The Government Regulation on PPAT contains provisions that regulate the criteria for dismissing PPATs who are no longer able to perform their duties. This provision aims to ensure that officials who carry out vital functions in the management of land deeds remain in a condition that allows them to provide optimal service. However, the interpretation of the criterion “no longer able” often raises questions regarding justice and the protection of individual rights. Thus, it is essential to analyze and understand these criteria from a justice perspective, as well as to review the processes undertaken by the health examination team to avoid potential abuses and ensure that the decisions made are genuinely objective and fair.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study employs normative legal research, which analyzes the procedures for identifying a set of legal rules, legal principles, and relevant doctrines used to address the issues at hand (Marzuki, 2019). Particularly in determining justice for Land Deed Officials (PPAT) regarding dismissal due to health factors, this study adopts a Statutory Approach as the framework that underpins the analysis of the issues at focus, alongside a Conceptual Approach aimed at identifying ideas that generate an understanding of relevant legal concepts and principles. The legal materials in this research consist of Primary Legal Materials, which include Law Number 2 of 2014 concerning Amendments to Law Number 30 of 2004 regarding the Notary Position, and Government Regulation Number 24 of 2016 concerning Amendments to Government Regulation Number 37 of 1998 regarding the Regulations of the Land Deed Official. Secondary legal materials consist of various literature related to the issues under examination, such as scientific articles, legal textbooks, websites containing legal information, opinions and analyses from legal experts, and research journals specifically directed to support the primary legal materials. These legal materials will be analyzed using a perspective analysis with the methods of Grammatical Interpretation and Systematic Interpretation.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Concept of Criteria for the Dismissal of Land Deed Officials Based on Health Conditions

The dismissal of Land Deed Officials (PPAT) based on health conditions is an important aspect in maintaining the integrity and effectiveness of the PPAT's functions within the land law system in Indonesia. The criteria for dismissal are regulated in Government Regulation Number 24 of 2016 concerning PPAT, specifically in Article 10 Paragraph (2) letter b, which states that a PPAT may be honorably dismissed if they are “no longer able to perform their duties due to physical or mental health conditions, as determined by a competent health examination team at the request of the Minister/Head or designated official.” Based on this Article, further clarification is provided regarding the elements present in the Article as follows:

1) Definition of “no longer able to perform duties”

From an etymological perspective, these terms will be interpreted separately to provide a clear and precise definition related to the Article that will be interpreted, as follows:

- a. The word “No” in the Indonesian Dictionary (KBBI) is defined as a term used to express negation, rejection, denial, and similar meanings.

- b. The word “longer/more” in the KBBI is defined as a return to the original action or original state.
- c. The word “Able To” in the Indonesian Dictionary (KBBI) is defined as a term used to indicate the power or ability to do something.
- d. The word “perform” in the KBBI is defined as a term meaning to perform, to make something work, to execute, to comply with, or to practice something.
- e. The word “Duties” according to the KBBI is defined as something that must be done or is designated to be done, an order to perform a task, or a function (position).

The word-for-word translation from the Indonesian Dictionary (KBBI) of the phrase “no longer able to perform duties” can be interpreted as follows: “No” (indicating negation) “Longer/more” (returning to the original state) “Able To” (the power to be able) “Perform” (to perform or execute) “Duties” (something that must be done or a function of a position). Therefore, the overall translation can be understood as “no longer able to perform the functions or obligations that should be fulfilled.”

Based on the understanding of the term “functions or obligations that should be fulfilled,” it is inherently related to authority. The term “authority” in Indonesian is often equated with “authority” in English. However, according to Black's Law Dictionary, authority is defined as legal power or legitimate authority, the right to govern or act, and the rights or powers possessed by public officials to comply with and enforce the law in the performance of their public duties (Winarno, 2008). Referring to the authority of Land Deed Officials (PPAT) as established in Government Regulation 24 of 1997 concerning Land Registration and Government Regulation on PPAT, it is clearly stated that PPAT has the authority to create authentic deeds related to land or land rights in Indonesia, specifically regarding Land Rights or Ownership Rights over Strata Title Units. This authority is inherently linked to the responsibilities of PPAT to ensure that all processes comply with the law and provide legal certainty to the public regarding land ownership status. The quality and accuracy of the deeds produced by PPAT are crucial, as this will impact the rights and obligations of landowners in the future (Rizal, 2022).

Therefore, the phrase “no longer able” in this provision tends to refer to a condition that is permanent in nature. This is due to the fact that the phrase is linked to the inability to perform duties due to physical or mental health conditions, which have been officially declared by a competent health examination team. This aligns with the perspective of notarial law, where an individual's inability to fulfill their duties, once legitimized by the appropriate authority, is considered a condition that cannot be remedied in the short term, thus deemed permanent (Yuliandari & Oppusunggu, 2021). Thus, the meaning of “no longer able to perform duties” can be interpreted as a state of denial, rejection, and similar concepts that are considered permanent regarding something that should be capable of being performed concerning a duty or authority granted by legislation.

2) **Physical and Mental Health Through Assessment by the Health Examination Team**

The assessment of physical and mental health is carried out by a health examination team consisting of professionals in the field of health, such as doctors or psychologists, who possess the necessary competence to evaluate both physical and mental conditions. Therefore, the health assessment process for Land Deed Officials (PPAT) is conducted by a team of examiners, including doctors and psychologists. The existence of this team is crucial to ensure that the evaluation is conducted objectively and according to professional standards. The members of the team have the required competence to assess both physical and mental conditions, thus making the evaluation results reliable as a basis for decision-making.

- a. **Physical Examination:** This includes an examination specifically focused on physical aspects that may affect the ability to perform duties (Melani et al., 2024). Thus, the physical examination includes an evaluation of the general health of the Land Deed Official (PPAT), including the detection of any diseases or physical conditions that may hinder their ability to perform duties. This is important, considering that the PPAT must be capable of executing their responsibilities effectively to maintain legal certainty in the creation of authentic deeds. If there are physical health issues, this may potentially affect the performance of the PPAT and, consequently, impact the community that relies on the services provided.
- b. **Mental Examination:** This refers to a psychological assessment for the determination of mental health (Kamalah et al., 2023). Therefore, the mental examination involves a psychological evaluation aimed at assessing the mental health of the Land Deed Official (PPAT). This aspect includes the cognitive and emotional abilities necessary for performing duties, such as making sound decisions and managing stress. Good mental health is essential, especially in professions that require accuracy and quick thinking, such as the creation of valid deeds.

However, it is important to emphasize that physical and mental health are inseparable and mutually influence each other (Pangastuti, 2022). For instance, poor physical condition can lead to mental health issues such as stress and anxiety, which in turn can affect the ability of the PPAT to perform their duties. Therefore, a comprehensive assessment of both aspects is crucial to ensure that the PPAT has the full capacity to fulfill their responsibilities (Thamrin & Khoidin, 2021).

When examining the position of Notaries under the provisions of the Notary Law (UUJN), it is evident that both PPAT and Notaries are regulated within a legal framework that mandates termination if the official can no longer perform their duties due to health reasons. However, the most striking difference between the provisions for PPAT and those in the UUJN is the presence of a "time limit" in the UUJN, which is absent in the PP for PPAT. Under the UUJN, a notary can be honorably dismissed if they are unable, either mentally or physically, to perform their duties continuously for more than three years (Marpaung, 2019). This time limit provides an opportunity for the notary to recover from their health condition or to find effective medical treatment that enables them to resume their duties. Meanwhile, the PP for PPAT does not specify a certain time frame. This lack of a clear time limit can lead to uncertainty for PPAT officials facing health issues. In the absence of a defined timeframe, PPAT may not be afforded the same opportunity to recover before a termination decision is made. This could potentially result in the loss of rights and position for individuals who may still have the chance to resume their duties.

Inequity may arise from this difference, where PPAT officials do not receive the same opportunity as notaries to improve their conditions. In the context of justice, it is essential to ensure that the termination process takes individual factors into account and provides the necessary support for recovery. The legal system should establish a fair and transparent mechanism for assessing the capabilities of PPAT officials, including carefully considering their health conditions and allowing them space for rehabilitation.

Based on both explanations, this is related to Gustav Radbruch's Theory of Legal Certainty, which states that the theory of legal certainty encompasses four fundamental aspects closely linked to the meaning of legal certainty itself, as follows (Fadli & Hadi, 2023):

1. Law is a positive matter, meaning that positive law refers to legislation. Therefore, the regulations governing the dismissal of Land Deed Officials (PPAT), as stipulated in Government Regulation Number 24 of 2016, constitute positive law that must be adhered to. This underscores the importance of having clear legislation to underpin legal actions.

- In this context, the existence of regulations governing the dismissal of PPAT based on health conditions must be emphasized to prevent abuse of authority.
2. Law is based on facts, meaning that laws are created based on reality. In this case, the dismissal of a Land Deed Official (PPAT) must be based on objective facts, specifically the results of a health assessment conducted by a professional team. This means that the decision to dismiss a PPAT cannot be arbitrary; it must be grounded in measurable and actual health conditions. This is essential to ensure that the decisions made reflect the true circumstances.
 3. Facts that are contained or stated in the law must be formulated clearly to avoid confusion in interpretation and to ensure they can be easily implemented. The provisions regarding the dismissal of a Land Deed Official (PPAT) should be clearly articulated to prevent misunderstandings. Currently, the regulations concerning PPAT do not specify a clear timeframe for recovery before dismissal, which can lead to uncertainty and potential abuse of authority. Clear and precise wording is essential to ensure that all parties understand the procedures and requirements that must be met.
 4. Positive law should not be easily changed. This principle underscores the importance of stability in the law. Regulations concerning the dismissal of Land Deed Officials (PPAT) should not be subject to frequent changes, as this can create uncertainty for PPAT facing health issues. Consistency in the application of the law will provide clarity for PPAT and the public, enabling them to understand their rights and obligations clearly.

Through the analysis of this theory of legal certainty, it becomes evident that the application of legal certainty principles is highly relevant in the context of the dismissal of Land Deed Officials (PPAT) based on health conditions. The existence of clear, fact-based, and stable regulations will strengthen justice and transparency in the legal process. Therefore, it is important to consider revising the existing provisions to make them fairer and to provide opportunities for PPATs who may still have the potential to recover and resume their duties

Termination of Land Deed Officials Based on Health in the Perspective of Justice

1) Justice in the Termination Process Based on Health

From the perspective of justice, the termination of a Land Deed Official (PPAT) based on health reasons requires fair consideration, as explained in John Rawls' Theory of Justice. Rawls emphasizes the importance of the principle of justice as fairness, which prioritizes the distribution of rights and equal opportunities for all individuals, including those hindered by health conditions. The principle of Equal Liberty states that every individual should have the same rights to basic freedoms, including the freedom to perform their job responsibilities (Maulana, Fadli, Herlinda, et al., 2024). In the context of PPAT, the right to perform their duties is part of professional freedom. If an individual loses this right due to health reasons, the termination process must ensure that these fundamental rights are respected. Meanwhile, regarding the Difference Principle, inequalities are only justifiable if they benefit those who are most vulnerable (Maulana, Fadli, Herlindah, et al., 2024). In this case, PPATs suffering from health issues constitute a vulnerable group that requires special protection. This principle demands that the legal system provide compensation or protection for individuals who can no longer work optimally due to physical or mental conditions. Therefore, the termination process based on health must incorporate mechanisms that allow PPATs to receive a fair opportunity, including time for recovery and legal protections for their rights during the recovery period (Khafifa Bazar & Silviana, 2021).

In this context, Rawls would critique the uncertainty faced by PPATs experiencing health issues. PPATs who are not given the opportunity to recover before being terminated reflect injustice, as their rights are not protected fairly. This theory demands that the

termination process take individual conditions into account and provide opportunities for recovery, in line with the principle that equality of rights must be considered, especially for individuals facing health challenges.

2) **Protection of Land Deed Official Rights**

The provision in Article 10 paragraph (2) of Government Regulation Number 24 of 2016 states that a PPAT may be dismissed if they are declared unable to perform their duties due to physical or mental health issues by the authorized health team (Oktaviyano, 2022). However, this provision differs from that in the Notary Office Law (UUJN). The UUJN allows notaries a recovery period of three years before dismissal, providing more leeway for notaries to improve their health condition (Triwahyuningsih, 2020). This has the potential to create uncertainty for PPATs experiencing health issues. This uncertainty, from a Rawlsian perspective, constitutes a form of structural injustice because:

- (1) **Lack of Opportunity for Recovery:** Unlike notaries, who are granted a three-year period to recover under the Notary Position Law (UUJN), PPATs do not have a clear time protection before being dismissed. This means that PPATs who may be able to recover within a certain timeframe are forced to lose their positions without adequate opportunity for recovery. According to Rawls' theory, this constitutes a violation of the principle of fairness, wherein PPATs should be afforded an equal opportunity to retain their rights to their positions, particularly in contexts involving health conditions.
- (2) **Insufficient Protection for Vulnerable Parties:** In the absence of a clear recovery period, there is a risk that PPATs who still have the potential to regain their health may be permanently dismissed. This violates Rawls' difference principle, which prioritizes protection for the most vulnerable individuals. Legal provisions that do not provide space for PPATs to recover or fail to offer adequate compensation represent a form of structural injustice, as they do not take into account the specific needs of those impeded by health issues.

The provisions in the Notary Position Law (UUJN) that grant a three-year period for notaries to recover before being dismissed can be seen as a form of more equitable protection, especially when compared to the provisions for the dismissal of Land Deed Officials (PPAT) that lack a clear recovery timeframe. With this time frame, notaries have the opportunity to improve their health conditions and return to their duties, thereby ensuring that their rights to employment are respected. From the perspective of John Rawls' theory of justice, this reflects the principle of fairness, where the distribution of rights and opportunities should be equitable, including for those experiencing health challenges. A process that allows for a recovery period prior to dismissal creates a balance between public interest and the protection of individual rights, particularly for those in vulnerable positions.

If the same provisions were applied in the context of Land Deed Officials (PPAT), the dismissal process would be fairer and align with Rawls' principles of justice, particularly the difference principle, which states that existing inequalities should benefit the most vulnerable parties, in this case, PPAT facing health issues. By providing a recovery period, this system would protect PPAT from premature dismissal and give them the space to recuperate. This would create an equitable distribution of opportunities and ensure that PPAT who can still contribute after recovery do not unjustly lose their rights.

CONCLUSION

The importance of maintaining the integrity and effectiveness of Land Deed Officials (PPAT) in Indonesia is particularly relevant concerning their dismissal based on health condition criteria. PPAT plays a crucial role in providing legal certainty in land transactions, and the regulations regarding the dismissal of PPAT are governed by Government Regulation No. 24 of 2016. According to this regulation, PPAT may be dismissed if they are deemed unable to perform their duties due to physical or mental health conditions, with decisions made by a health examination team. However, this regulation raises questions about justice, especially when compared to the provisions for notaries, who are granted the opportunity to recover within three years before dismissal. The lack of a clear recovery timeframe for PPAT is viewed as an injustice, as they may lose their positions without having the same opportunity to recuperate.

Revisions to Government Regulation No. 24 of 2016 are necessary to incorporate a recovery timeframe for Land Deed Officials (PPAT), similar to the provisions for notaries, which would allow PPAT to have a fair opportunity to improve their health conditions before dismissal. The protection of PPAT's rights in the dismissal process must ensure the safeguarding of their fundamental rights, including social and economic protections, and provide a reasonable opportunity for recovery. Furthermore, the health assessment regarding the condition of PPAT by the examination team should be conducted transparently and objectively to ensure that the dismissal decision is based on valid and fair medical conditions.

REFERENCES

- Anshori, A. G. (2009). *Lembaga Kenotariatan Indonesia: Perspektif Hukum Dan Etika* (Pertama). UIIPress.
- Astuti, R. K. (2017). Pemberhentian PPAT Yang Dinyatakan Pailit Berdasarkan Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 24 Tahun 2016. *JATISWARA*, 32(3). <https://doi.org/10.29303/jtsw.v32i3.142>
- Fadli, M., & Hadi, S. (2023). *Kepastian Hukum Perspektif Teoritik*. Nuswantara Media Utama.
- Immanuella, C. N., & Hoesin, S. H. (2022). AKIBAT HUKUM TERHADAP NOTARIS/PPAT TERKAIT PERBUATAN MELAWAN HUKUM OLEH PEGAWAI NOTARIS/PPAT (Studi Kasus Putusan Pengadilan Negeri Blitar Nomor 10/Pdt.G/2020/PN Blt). *PALAR / PAKUAN LAW REVIEW*, 8(1), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.33751/palar.v8i1.4584>
- Kamalah, A. D., Novianasari, & Nafiah, H. (2023). Gejala Mental Emosional dan Upaya dalam Meningkatkan Kesehatan Jiwa Remaja. *Jurnal Keperawatan Berbudaya Sehat*, 1(2), 68–72. <https://doi.org/10.35473/jkbs.v1i2.2419>
- Karsayuda, M. R., Fadli, M., Khusaini, M., & Kusumaningrum, A. (2023). Legal Construction of Infrastructure Financing Based on Public Private Partnership to Realize National Resilience. *International Journal Of Humanities Education and Social Sciences (IJHESS)*, 3(1). <https://doi.org/10.55227/ijhess.v3i1.563>
- Khafifa Bazar, B. N., & Silviana, A. (2021). Perlindungan Hukum Terhadap Hak dan Kewajiban Pejabat Pembuat Akta Tanah. *Notarius*, 14(1), 29–38. <https://doi.org/10.14710/nts.v14i1.37599>

- Marpaung, M. M. (2019). Perlindungan Hukum Terhadap Notaris Yang Telah Diberhentikan Berdasarkan Pasal 13 Undang Undang Jabatan Notaris. *SAPIENTIA ET VIRTUS*, 4(2), 103–120. <https://doi.org/10.37477/sev.v4i2.190>
- Marzuki, P. M. (2019). *Penelitian Hukum: Edisi revisi* (Cetakan ke-14). Kencana.
- Maulana, I., Fadli, M., Herlinda, H., & Nur, A. I. (2024). Justice for Indigenous People: Management Right Term to Third Parties. *Indonesia Law Reform Journal*, 4(1), 59–74. <https://doi.org/10.22219/ilrej.v4i1.33058>
- Maulana, I., Fadli, M., Herlinda, H., & Permadi, I. (2024). Pengaturan Jangka Waktu Yang Berkeadilan Atas Perjanjian Kerjasama Kepada Pihak Ketiga Hak Pengelolaan Diatas Tanah Ulayat. *Tunas Agraria*, 7(3), 285–302. <https://doi.org/10.31292/jta.v7i3.352>
- Melani, M., Prastita, N. P. G., Putri, R. T. D., & Adnani, Q. E. S. (2024). *Promosi Kesehatan Remaja dengan Pendekatan KIPK*. Sarana Ilmu Indonesia (Salnesia). <https://doi.org/10.36590/penerbit.salnesia.2>
- Muchsin, T., Saliro, S. S., Manullang, S. O., & Miharja, M. (2020). PEJABAT PEMBUAT AKTA TANAH DALAM HAL PENDAFTARAN TANAH: SEBUAH TINJAUAN KEWENANGAN DAN AKIBAT HUKUM. *Madani: Legal Review*, 4(1), 63–80. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.31850/malrev.v4i1.566>
- Oktaviyano, R. S. (2022). PERLINDUNGAN HUKUM PPAT TERHADAP PENDAFTARAN HAK ATAS TANAH KARENA TERKENDALA PANDEMI COVID-19. *Media Keadilan: Jurnal Lmu Hukum*, 13(1), 108–124. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.31764/jmk.v13i1.8003>
- Pangastuti, N. I. (2022). Optimalisasi Prestasi Atlet Melalui Konsep Manusia Seutuhnya (Sebuah Kajian Filosofis). *Jorpres (Jurnal Olahraga Prestasi)*, 18(2), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.21831/jorpres.v18i2.49005>
- Rizal, E. A. (2022). *Tanggung Jawab PPAT Atas Pembatalan Akta Yang Dibuat D Hadapannya* [Tesis]. Universitas Islam Indonesia.
- Safa'at, ali, M. (2011, December). *Pemikiran Keadilan (Plato, Aristoteles, Dan John Rawls)*. <Http://Www.Safaat.Lecture.Ub.Ac.Id/Files/2011/12/Keadilan.Pdf>.
- Thamrin, H., & Khoidin, M. (2021). *Hukum Notariat Dan Pertanahan (Kewenangan Notaris dan PPAT Membuat Akta Pertanahan* (I. Soerodjo, Ed.; cetakan 1). Laksbang Justicia.
- Triwahyuningsih, S. (2020). PERAN NOTARIS DALAM PENEGAKAN HAK ASASI MANUSIA. *Jurnal Hukum Dan Kenotariatan*, 4(1), 41. <https://doi.org/10.33474/hukeno.v4i1.6447>
- Wibawa, K. C. S. (2019). MENAKAR KEWENANGAN DAN TANGGUNG JAWAB PEJABAT PEMBUAT AKTA TANAH (PPAT) DALAM PERSPEKTIF BESTUURS BEVOEGDHEID. *CREPIDO*, 1(1), 40–51. <https://doi.org/10.14710/crepido.1.1.40-51>
- Winarno, N. B. (2008). *Penyalahgunaan Wewenang dan Tindak Pidana Korupsi*. Laksbang Mediatama.
- Yuliandari, N. M., & Oppusunggu, Y. U. (2021). UPAYA HUKUM NOTARIS YANG DIBERHENTIKAN DENGAN TIDAK HORMAT DITINJAU DARI PERADILAN TATA USAHA NEGARA. *JURNAL USM LAW REVIEW*, 4(2), 844. <https://doi.org/10.26623/julr.v4i2.4363>