

Administrative Irregularities in the Land Registration Process as a Cause of the Issuance of Duplicate Certificates

Septian Gamal Al Fattah^{1*}, Isharyanto Isharyanto², Andina Elok Puri Maharani³

¹⁻³Master Program in Notarial Studies, Faculty of Law, Universitas Sebelas Maret, Surakarta, Indonesia

Email: ¹⁾ officialgamal@gmail.com

Received:
June 04, 2026

Revised:
July 15, 2026

Accepted:
July 16, 2026

Online:
July 17, 2026

Abstract

Land registration is a fundamental instrument in the national agrarian legal system, intended to provide legal certainty and protection for land rights holders through the systematic collection, organisation, and maintenance of land data. This study examines legal issues in the administration of land affairs, particularly regarding the occurrence of duplicate certificates, which creates legal uncertainty for land rights holders. These issues relate to legal certainty, the responsibilities of the Land Office, and efforts to provide legal protection for aggrieved parties. This study employs an empirical legal method using a statutory approach and a case-based approach to examine the alignment between legal norms and on-the-ground practices. The findings indicate that the occurrence of duplicate certificates stems from weaknesses in the land administration process, such as suboptimal verification of physical and legal data, as well as overlapping ownership data. In practice, legal protection for rights holders has not yet fully provided certainty, so dispute resolution often depends on court rulings. Therefore, improvements to the quality of the land administration system and the strengthening of the Land Office's responsibilities are required to prevent similar conflicts from arising in the future.

Keywords: Double Certificates, Land Administration, Legal Certainty, Legal Protection, National Land Agency (BPN).

1. Introduction

Land constitutes one of the most fundamental assets for both individual welfare and national development, and its administration therefore requires a legal framework capable of ensuring order, certainty, and protection for rights holders. Boedi Harsono states that land registration is a series of activities carried out by the State or the government on an ongoing and systematic basis, involving the collection of specific information or data regarding particular plots of land located in specific areas, as well as the organisation, storage and presentation of such information for the benefit of the public, with a view to providing legal certainty in the land sector, including the issuance of proof of ownership and the maintenance of such records (Apriani & Bur, 2021). The purpose of this land registration process is to ensure legal certainty and secure land rights. This measure is taken in the interests of land rights holders, so that they can easily demonstrate their entitlement to a particular plot of land through the issuance of a Land Rights Certificate (Sahnan et al., 2019).

Within this framework, the legal status of the certificate as an instrument of proof is set out clearly in national legislation. The issue of land certificates remains a crucial matter in the administration of national land law. Under Law No. 5 of 1960 on the Basic Agrarian Principles (UUPA) and Government Regulation No. 24 of 1997 on Land Registration, a certificate is regarded as a document evidencing rights with strong probative force, but not as an absolute means of proof. This provision is explicitly set out in Article 19(2)(c) of Law No. 5 of 1960 on the Basic Provisions of Agrarian Law (UUPA), which states



that land registration includes the issuance of a document evidencing rights that serves as strong evidence. This provision is further reinforced in Article 32(1) of Government Regulation No. 24 of 1997 on Land Registration, which states that a certificate is a document evidencing rights that serves as strong evidence regarding the physical and legal data contained therein, provided that such physical and legal data correspond to the data contained in the survey document and the relevant land rights register.

The consequence of this provision is that the accuracy of the physical and legal data contained in the certificate may still be disproved if another party can prove the existence of a more valid basis of title. Thus, the certificate is not absolute, but is subject to the principles of evidence in land law. Within this framework, duplicate certificates must be understood as a situation where more than one title certificate is issued for the same parcel of land, each of which is administratively recognised as evidence of title. This situation cannot be viewed as a conflict between individuals, but rather as an indication of systemic failure in the state's administration of land registration, particularly in ensuring administrative order and legal certainty regarding land rights (Putra et al., 2023).

A duplicate certificate refers to a situation where more than one certificate has been issued for the same plot of land, thereby giving rise to a conflict of ownership rights between the holders of the certificates over that plot of land. A duplicate certificate does not involve a conflict between different plots of land, but rather a conflict of rights over the same plot of land. The occurrence of duplicate certificates is distinguished based on the source of the error; normatively, duplicate certificates may arise as a result of administrative errors in land administration by the state, or as a result of legal acts by the applicant or the public (Koswara et al., 2024). Administrative errors in land administration by the state may take the form of mistakes in the collection and verification of physical and legal data, negligence in the maintenance of land registration data, and weak oversight mechanisms in the issuance of certificates. Meanwhile, duplicate certificates arising from legal acts by applicants or the public may be caused, amongst other things, by the provision of false information, document forgery, or unlawful acts during the land rights application process (Herman et al., 2022).

Mistakes in measurement and field surveys form part of the land administration process, which culminates in the issuance of certificates as administrative decisions. Land surveying is a fundamental stage in the creation of physical data that serves as the basis for land officials to determine and issue evidence of land rights. Consequently, any error in the surveying process has legal implications for the validity of the certificates issued (Herman et al., 2022). When land surveying is considered within the realm of administrative law, surveying errors must be regarded as procedural defects in the process of forming administrative decisions, rather than merely technical errors in the field. Consequently, certificates issued following an inaccurate surveying process have the potential to give rise to conflicts over rights to the same parcel of land and to result in the issuance of duplicate certificates (Kaplan & Haenlein, 2010).

Prior research on duplicate certificates has predominantly examined the issue from the standpoint of legal consequences and dispute resolution once a conflict has already materialised (Marino & Arnanda, 2021; Putra et al., 2023). The issue of duplicate certificates cannot be understood merely as the issuance of two documents evidencing rights to a single parcel of land; rather, it must be analysed as a structural problem within the land registration system. The focus of legal analysis does not stop at the mere fact of the existence of duplicate certificates, but shifts to the fundamental question of how the state, through its apparatus, can issue more than one document evidencing rights to the same parcel of land. It is at this point that the real legal issue lies, because the issuance of certificates is an act of state administration that should be underpinned by systems, procedures and oversight mechanisms (Marino & Arnanda, 2021). This is where the research gap lies, existing studies have largely

treated duplicate certificates as an outcome to be resolved after the fact, rather than tracing the issue back to the administrative process of land registration itself. This study addresses that gap by shifting the focus upstream, from the resolution of duplicate-certificate disputes to the administrative defects in the registration process that give rise to them in the first place, thereby assessing the effectiveness of the principle of legal certainty within the land registration system itself rather than merely its downstream consequences.

The existence of duplicate certificates indicates that the land registration mechanism, which is supposed to function as the primary instrument for providing legal certainty, actually results in legal uncertainty, because the state, through its land administration apparatus, is unable to ensure the object of rights and the consistency of land data. Consequently, certificates intended to protect rights holders, in practice, have the potential to become a source of disputes and undermine confidence in the land law system (Mahadewi & Adinda, 2024).

The issue of duplicate land certificates in Sukoharjo Regency serves as a pilot study site to assess the effectiveness of the land registration system in ensuring legal certainty regarding land rights. The cases of duplicate certificates occurring in Sukoharjo Regency are used as a starting point to examine whether the land registration mechanism, as stipulated in legislation, has been implemented consistently and is capable of preventing the issuance of more than one proof of title for the same plot of land.

Based on these issues, this study aims to analyse the forms of administrative defects in the land registration process that give rise to duplicate certificates, as well as their impact on the legal certainty of land rights. Furthermore, this study also aims to assess the forms of administrative defects in the land registration process that result in duplicate certificates, as well as their impact on the legal certainty of land rights. Consequently, this study is expected to contribute to the strengthening of the land administration system and the development of land law studies, particularly regarding the resolution of disputes over duplicate certificates.

2. Literature Review

2.1. The Concept of Legal Certainty in Land Registration

Legal certainty is one of the primary objectives of the national agrarian legal system, which is achieved through the implementation of land registration. In Indonesia's land system, the state has an active responsibility to guarantee legal certainty and protection for land rights holders through the land registration mechanism as stipulated in Law No. 5 of 1960 on the Basic Provisions of Agrarian Law. Land registration serves not only as an administrative instrument but also as a means of establishing legal order and protecting land rights (Apriani & Bur, 2021). From the perspective of Gustav Radbruch's theory of legal certainty, the law must be capable of creating order, predictability and safeguards for the rights of the public. Therefore, legal certainty in land matters relates not only to the existence of a certificate as a formal instrument of proof, but also to the quality of the administration that produces such legal instruments (Nasihuddin, 2024). In the context of disputes over duplicate certificates, legal protection for certificate holders is crucial because such conflicts do not merely concern the revocation of rights, but also involve the restoration of rights for those who have suffered losses as a result of administrative errors on the part of the state (Alfons et al., 2024; Nasir, 2024).

2.2. The Theory of the Validity of Public Administration and the Status of Land Titles

From the perspective of administrative law, a land certificate is regarded as an administrative act of the state, arising from governmental action and possessing the characteristics of an Administrative Decision (KTUN), as it is issued by a public official, is specific, individual and final, and gives rise to legal consequences for specific parties (Remaja, 2021). Therefore, the validity of a certificate is determined not only by civil law considerations, but also by the legality of the administrative acts underpinning its issuance. The theory of administrative validity holds that an administrative decision must satisfy the elements of authority, procedure and substance in order to be deemed legally valid (Riza, 2018). In the context of the exercise of governmental authority, administrative powers must be exercised in accordance with attributions, delegations or mandates as provided for by law, as any deviation from the proper exercise of such powers may give rise to administrative defects and affect the validity of the legal instruments issued (Gandara, 2020). It is therefore important to recognise that the issuance of duplicate certificates should be understood not only as a conflict of rights, but also as an indicator of problems in the exercise of administrative powers relating to land.

2.3. The Concept of Resolving Disputes Over Duplicate Certificates and Legal Protection

Land disputes can generally be resolved through either litigation or non-litigation mechanisms. The litigation route involves the judicial system to obtain a legally binding decision, whereas the administrative route places the land authority as the primary actor in rectifying administrative decisions that contain defects (Ashidiq & Silviana, 2024). In the context of duplicate certificates, dispute resolution cannot be understood merely as the resolution of conflicts between parties, but also as an effort to provide redress for administrative errors on the part of the state. Legal protection for certificate holders is essential because, in many cases, both parties have obtained their certificates through procedures that appear to be lawful; consequently, the state has a responsibility not only to resolve conflicts but also to ensure proportionate redress for the aggrieved party (Ayuningtyas et al., 2020; Nasir, 2024).

3. Methods

This study employs an empirical legal research method, using a case-based and statutory approach to analyse the application of land registration legal norms in resolving dual certificate disputes at the Sukoharjo Regency Land Office. The research location was selected because the Sukoharjo Regency Land Office is directly responsible for land administration and the handling of land disputes. The research data consists of primary empirical data obtained through interviews with officials at the Sukoharjo Regency Land Office, and primary legal materials comprising Law No. 5 of 1960 on Basic Agrarian Principles, Government Regulation No. 24 of 1997 on Land Registration, Government Regulation No. 18 of 2021 concerning Management Rights, Land Rights, Apartment Units, and Land Registration, and Regulation of the Minister of Agrarian Affairs and Spatial Planning/Head of the National Land Agency No. 21 of 2020 concerning the Handling and Resolution of Land Cases, as well as secondary legal materials in the form of literature and previous research.

Data collection and analysis followed the stages of data reduction, data presentation, and conclusion drawing. In the data reduction stage, interview results and primary legal materials were sorted and grouped according to the forms of administrative defect they reflected, namely defects of authority, procedural defects, and substantive defects. In the data presentation stage, this categorised data was arranged systematically to show how each form of administrative defect corresponds to specific stages of the land registration process, from physical and legal data collection through to

certificate issuance. In the conclusion drawing stage, the categorised empirical findings were examined against the applicable statutory provisions, namely Law No. 5 of 1960, Government Regulation No. 24 of 1997, Government Regulation No. 18 of 2021, and Ministerial Regulation No. 21 of 2020, to assess whether land administration practice at the Sukoharjo Regency Land Office aligns with these legal norms. This process of testing empirical findings against statutory norms was carried out using the theory of legal certainty, alongside the theory of administrative validity and state administrative responsibility, to assess the authority of the land administration, the nature of administrative defects underlying the issuance of duplicate certificates, and the effectiveness of dispute resolution mechanisms in securing legal certainty over land rights.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1. Forms of Administrative Irregularities in the Land Registration Process Leading to Duplicate Certificates

Land registration is a key instrument in the national agrarian legal system for establishing orderly land administration and ensuring legal certainty regarding land rights. Article 19 of Law No. 5 of 1960 on the Basic Provisions of Agrarian Law (UUPA) stipulates that the government shall conduct land registration to ensure legal certainty through surveying, record-keeping, and the issuance of certificates of title. This provision is reaffirmed in Article 3 of Government Regulation No. 24 of 1997, which states that the administration of land registration aims to provide legal certainty and legal protection to land rights holders. Consequently, any deviation in the land administration process must be regarded as a deviation from the normative objective of land registration itself (Apriani & Bur, 2021).

From the perspective of public administrative law, a land certificate is an administrative document created through government action and is classified as an Administrative Decision (KTUN) because it is issued by a public administrative official; it is specific, individual and final, and gives rise to legal consequences for specific parties (Remaja, 2021). Therefore, the validity of a certificate is determined not only by the formal existence of the document, but also by the legality of the administrative action underpinning its issuance. According to the theory of administrative validity, an administrative decision must fulfil the elements of authority, procedure and substance in order to be deemed legally valid. These three elements serve as parameters for identifying forms of administrative defects that have the potential to give rise to duplicate certificates.

The first form of administrative defect is a defect of authority. A defect of authority occurs when an administrative act is carried out outside the scope of the attribution, delegation, or mandate granted by legislation. In the administration of land registration, the exercise of administrative authority must be carried out appropriately because the entire land registration process constitutes a governmental act that produces legal consequences regarding the civil rights of the public. Deviations in the exercise of authority may cause the legal instrument issued to lose its administrative legitimacy and potentially have its validity challenged (Gandara, 2020). The inappropriate exercise of authority also highlights the weak implementation of the principles of legality and due diligence in public administration, thereby creating scope for administrative errors in the issuance of certificates (Firmansyah & Evendia, 2024).

In addition to defects of authority, procedural defects are the most prevalent form of administrative defect associated with the emergence of duplicate certificates. Normatively, land registration procedures are regulated by Government Regulation No. 24 of 1997, which covers the stages of physical data collection, legal data collection, examination of evidence, data publication, registration of rights, and the issuance of certificates. These provisions were further reinforced in Government Regulation No. 18 of 2021, which emphasises the importance of the continuous maintenance of land

data to ensure the accuracy of land information. Errors in any of these stages can result in inaccurate administrative outputs and potentially lead to the issuance of more than one certificate for the same parcel of land.

Forms of procedural defects may include inadequate research into land history, suboptimal verification of evidence of rights, errors in the publication of legal data, or weak administrative oversight during the land registration process. Research on the issuance of administratively defective certificates indicates that weaknesses in administrative verification are a dominant factor in the emergence of dual certificate conflicts, as the data verification process is not carried out comprehensively (Alfons & Mujiburohman, 2021). Thus, duplicate certificates arise not only from technical errors, but also from the suboptimal implementation of land administration procedures.

Procedural issues are closely linked to the quality of physical and legal data. Physical data includes information on the location, boundaries, area and shape of a plot of land, obtained through surveying and mapping. Measurement errors or inaccuracies in the demarcation of land boundaries can result in overlapping land rights, which in turn leads to the issuance of duplicate certificates (Herman et al., 2022). Meanwhile, legal data relates to the identity of the rights holder, the basis for acquiring the rights, the history of land tenure, and the legal relationship between the subject and the object of the land. Inaccuracies in the examination of foundational documents or the verification of land history have the potential to result in new administrative legitimisation of land objects that have in fact already been registered previously (Koswara et al., 2024).

In addition to defects in authority and procedure, the issuance of duplicate certificates may also be affected by substantive defects. A substantive defect occurs when the content of an administrative decision is based on facts, data or legal conditions that do not correspond to the actual circumstances. In the context of land administration, substantive defects may arise due to discrepancies between the data in the land register, survey documents, registration maps and the actual conditions on the ground. This issue becomes increasingly complex when land administration integration is not yet functioning optimally, as synchronisation between manual archives, analogue maps, and electronic databases still faces various administrative obstacles.

These data integration issues demonstrate that the issuance of duplicate certificates cannot be understood merely as a conflict of ownership between individuals, but as a consequence of weaknesses in land administration governance. The relationship between defects in authority, procedural defects, and substantive defects indicates a causal link between the quality of land administration and the validity of the legal products produced. Thus, duplicate certificates are a manifestation of the failure of land administration to optimally perform its functions of verification, supervision, and prevention.

The research findings indicate that the occurrence of duplicate certificates is fundamentally not merely related to legal protection or institutional responsibility, but stems from administrative defects in the land registration process, which include defects of authority, procedural defects, and substantive defects. These conditions have a direct impact on the inaccuracy of physical and legal data within the land registration system, thereby creating legal uncertainty regarding land rights.

This finding is consistent with the view that (Rasyid & Winanti, 2023) which emphasises the importance of legal protection for rights holders in disputes over duplicate certificates. Furthermore, (Malaka & Adjie, 2017) emphasises the responsibility of the Head of the Land Office in the process of issuing certificates, which has implications for the validity of land data. Furthermore, (Mubarak et al., 2024) indicates that the legal status of holders of duplicate certificates still raises issues of legal certainty, whilst (Saluling, 2022) highlights the National Land Agency's responsibility in the handling of duplicate certificates in cases where land is subject to a blocking order. Thus, all these findings reinforce the analysis in this study that the main issue with duplicate certificates lies not only in the

legal consequences they entail, but also in the quality of the land administration process, which is the source of administrative defects.

In addition to contradicting the normative objectives of land registration, the issuance of duplicate certificates also indicates the suboptimal application of the General Principles of Good Governance (AUPB), particularly the principles of legal certainty, diligence, and accountability. In the context of land administration, the principle of diligence requires land administration officials to conduct a thorough examination of both physical and legal data before issuing administrative documents. When the verification process is carried out suboptimally, the risk of defective administrative decisions increases, thereby undermining the legitimacy of the certificates issued. Consequently, the issuance of duplicate certificates not only indicates an administrative error but also reflects the suboptimal implementation of the principles of good governance within land administration (Hartati et al., 2024).

4.2. The Impact of Administrative Defects on Legal Certainty Regarding Land Rights

Legal certainty is the primary objective of land registration, as it is through this mechanism that the state seeks to provide legal protection to land rights holders. Normatively, Article 19(2)(c) of Law No. 5 of 1960 on the Basic Agrarian Principles (UUPA) stipulates that land registration includes the issuance of a certificate of title which serves as strong evidence. This provision is reinforced in Article 32(1) of Government Regulation No. 24 of 1997 on Land Registration, which states that a certificate is a document evidencing rights that serves as strong evidence regarding the physical and legal data contained therein, provided that such data corresponds to the information in the land register and survey documents. Thus, legal certainty in land matters depends not only on the existence of a certificate, but also on the quality of the administration that produces that certificate (Melynia et al., 2022).

From the perspective of the theory of legal certainty, the law must be capable of creating order, predictability and protection of the public's rights. Legal certainty in land registration is not merely understood as the availability of formal evidence in the form of certificates, but also encompasses the assurance that the land in question, the rights holders and the legal relationships attached to that land can be clearly identified and will not give rise to conflicts in the future (Sudiro & Putra, 2023). Consequently, the issuance of duplicate certificates indicates a disruption to the fundamental function of land registration as an instrument of legal protection.

The first consequence of the issuance of duplicate certificates is the emergence of uncertainty regarding the lawful legal entity holding the rights to the land. When more than one party holds a certificate for the same plot of land, the legitimacy of ownership becomes unclear because each party possesses formal evidence that appears administratively valid. This situation causes the certificate to lose its practical function as an instrument of ownership legitimacy and instead has the potential to become a source of new conflict (Ayuningtyas et al., 2020).

The second impact relates to the lack of clarity regarding the subject of land rights. Measurement errors, discrepancies in land boundaries, and poor maintenance of land records mean that the same parcel of land may be recorded in more than one land administration document. This situation demonstrates that legal certainty is not only a matter of certainty regarding the holder of the rights, but also concerns certainty regarding the location, boundaries, area, and identity of the registered land parcel (Herman et al., 2022).

The third impact is the weakening of the probative value of certificates as evidence of land rights. Indonesia's land registration system adopts a negative publication system with positive elements, meaning that certificates do indeed possess strong probative value, but this is not absolute.

Consequently, where administrative defects are found in the certificate issuance process, there is scope for administrative correction, cancellation, or judicial review. This situation demonstrates that the evidential value of a certificate is heavily influenced by the quality of the administration underpinning its issuance (Apriani & Bur, 2021).

In addition to affecting rights holders, duplicate certificates also increase the potential for administrative disputes and litigation. Dispute resolution not only requires significant time and expense, but also creates prolonged uncertainty regarding the use and control of land. In certain circumstances, both disputing parties may even have obtained certificates through procedures that appear administratively valid, meaning the state has a responsibility to carry out administrative corrections and restore rights in a proportionate manner (Nasir, 2024).

From the perspective of the state's administrative responsibility, the issuance of duplicate certificates not only has consequences for the disputing parties, but also gives rise to institutional liability for the land administration. This liability encompasses the obligation to carry out administrative corrections, the annulment of defective land administration documents, the restoration of rights to the aggrieved party, and the improvement of administrative governance to prevent the recurrence of similar errors. This view is consistent with research showing that the Land Office's responsibility does not end with the issuance of certificates, but also includes accountability for the legal consequences arising from the administrative documents issued (Malaka & Adjie, 2017).

In the context of land administration, the state's responsibility regarding the occurrence of duplicate certificates does not end with the resolution of conflicts that have arisen, but also includes the obligation to improve the administrative system. Regulation of the Minister of Agrarian Affairs and Spatial Planning/Head of the National Land Agency No. 21 of 2020 on the Handling and Resolution of Land Cases has provided a normative basis for the implementation of administrative corrections to land-related documents containing administrative defects. However, the effectiveness of this mechanism remains dependent on the quality of land data, the integration of information systems, the capacity of officials, and consistent administrative oversight.

Based on this overall analysis, it can be understood that the impact of administrative defects on the legal certainty of land rights is not only evident in the emergence of ownership conflicts, but is also reflected in the lack of clarity regarding the subject of the right, the lack of clarity regarding the object of the right, the weakening of the probative value of certificates, the increase in land disputes, and the decline in public confidence in the land administration system. Thus, the quality of land administration is a key factor in determining the effectiveness of land registration as an instrument providing legal certainty.

5. Conclusion

Based on the research findings, it can be concluded that the issue of duplicate certificates in land administration arises due to the suboptimal nature of the land administration system, particularly in the processes of data collection, surveying, and the verification of both physical and legal data. These shortcomings lead to overlapping land ownership data, which in turn results in the issuance of duplicate certificates. Furthermore, a lack of accuracy in record-keeping and the failure to integrate land data systems are also major factors that increase the potential for conflicts over land rights. In terms of legal protection, redress for aggrieved parties is predominantly sought through repressive channels, namely the courts, meaning that preventive legal protection has not been effectively implemented to prevent disputes from arising in the first place.

Furthermore, the implications of these issues demonstrate that the weakness of the land administration system has a direct impact on the lack of legal certainty for land rights holders and a decline in public trust in land administration institutions. Therefore, recommendations are required to strengthen an integrated and digital-based land administration system to minimise data errors, improve the accuracy and professionalism of Land Office staff in every administrative process, and strengthen internal oversight mechanisms. Furthermore, there is a need to optimise preventive legal protection by improving data validation prior to the issuance of certificates so that land disputes can be prevented from the outset, rather than merely resolved after a conflict has arisen.

6. References

- Alfons, A., & Mujiburohman, D. A. (2021). Penerbitan dan Pembatalan Sertipikat Hak Atas Tanah Karena Cacat Administrasi. *Jurnal Ilmu Hukum*, 10(2), 277–288. <https://doi.org/10.30652/jih.v10i2.8095>
- Alfons, S. S., Soplanit, M., & Mail, S. M. H. (2024). Creating Substantive Justice in State Administrative Courts: A Theoretical, Philosophical, and Human Rights Review. *Jurnal Suara Hukum*, 6(2), 298–306. <https://doi.org/10.23920/jbmh.v5i2.11>
- Apriani, D., & Bur, A. (2021). Kepastian hukum dan perlindungan hukum dalam sistem publikasi pendaftaran tanah di indonesia. *Bina Mulia Hukum*, 5(2), 221–239. <https://doi.org/10.23920/jbmh.v5i2.11>
- Ashidiq, T. O. B., & Silviana, A. (2024). Penanganan Sengketa Pertanahan dalam Perspektif Agraria. *Ranah Research: Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Development*, 6(6), 2824–2830. <https://doi.org/10.38035/rrj.v6i6.1161>
- Ayuningtyas, A. S., Candrakirana, R., & Najicha, F. U. (2020). Perlindungan Hukum Bagi Pemegang Sertifikat Hak Atas Tanah Dalam Kasus Sertifikat Ganda. *Jurnal Discretie*, 1(1), 69–77. <https://doi.org/10.20961/jd.vii.50222>
- Firmansyah, A. A., & Evendia, M. (2024). Rejuvenasi Kebijakan yang Responsif dalam Pengaturan Administrasi Pemerintahan. *Konferensi Nasional Asosiasi Pengajar Hukum Tata Negara Dan Hukum Administrasi Negara*, 2(1), 27–54. <https://doi.org/10.15575/kh.v2i3.8187>
- Gandara, M. (2020). Kewenangan atribusi, delegasi dan mandat. *Khazanah Hukum*, 2(3), 92–99. <https://doi.org/10.15575/kh.v2i3.8187>
- Hartati, W., Wijaya, S. A., & Bahri, S. Y. (2024). Pertanggungjawaban Hukum Pejabat Administrasi Negara Terhadap Keputusan Tata Usaha Negara Yang Dibatalkan Oleh Pengadilan Tata Usaha Negara. *Parlementer: Jurnal Studi Hukum Dan Administrasi Publik*, 1(4), 193–200. <https://doi.org/10.62383/parlementer.vii4.368>
- Herman, H., Simanjuntak, M. H., Sipayung, A., & Agustina, Y. (2022). Analisis Hukum Terhadap Sertifikat Atas Kesalahan Pengukuran Tanah. *Jurnal Darma Agung*, 30(2), 155–168. <https://doi.org/10.35814/otentik.v7i1.8228>
- Kaplan, A. M., & Haenlein, M. (2010). Users of the world, unite! The challenges and opportunities of Social Media. *Business Horizons*, 53(1), 59–68. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2009.09.003>
- Koswara, D., Fakhriah, E. L., & Haspada, D. (2024). Konsekuensi Hukum Sertipikat Hak Atas Tanah Ganda Ditinjau Dari Undang Undang No. 5 Tahun 1960 (Uupa) Dan Peraturan Pemerintah No. 24 Tahun 1997 Tentang Pendaftaran Tanah Dikaitkan Dengan Kepastian Hukum. *Iustitia Omnibus: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum*, 5(2), 91–105. <https://doi.org/10.24912/adigama.v2i1.5248>

- Mahadewi, K. J., & Adinda, I. G. A. S. (2024). Bentuk Penyelesaian Sertifikat Tumpang Tindih Hak Milik Atas di Tangani Oleh SWA Law Office. *Belom Bahadat*, 14(1), 41–64. <https://doi.org/10.33363/bb.v14i1.1165>
- Malaka, Z., & Adjie, H. (2017). Tanggung Jawab Kantor Pertanahan terhadap Terbitnya Sertifikat Ganda (Studi Kasus Putusan Kasasi MA No. 162 K/TUN/2012). *Jurnal Al-Q*, 20(2), 251–274. <https://doi.org/10.15642/alqanun.2017.20.2.1-24>
- Marino, E. F., & Arnanda, R. (2021). Penyelesaian Sengketa Sertifikat Tanah Ganda Serta Bentuk Kepastian Hukumnya. *Jentera: Jurnal Hukum*, 4(2). <https://doi.org/10.38035/jim.v4i1.871>
- Melynia, S., Fathimah, E., & Gibtiah, G. (2022). Kedudukan Sertifikat Sebagai Alat Bukti Yang Kuat Menurut Hukum Positif dan Hukum Islam. *Muqaranah*, 6(1), 41–50. <https://doi.org/10.19109/muqaranah.v6i1.12253>
- Mubarak, K., Haerani, R., & Zain, I. I. (2024). Kedudukan Hukum Kepemilikan Tanah bagi Pemegang Sertifikat Ganda (Analisis Putusan 5/Yur/Pdt/2018). *Unizar Recht Journal (URJ)*, 3(3), 348–356. <https://doi.org/10.36679/urj.v3i3.192>
- Nasihuddin, A. A. (2024). *Teori Hukum Pancasila*. Tasikmalaya: CV. Elvaretta Buana.
- Nasir, S. M. (2024). Tanggung Jawab Badan Pertanahan Nasional dalam Penyelesaian Sertifikat Tanah Ganda di Kabupaten Gorontalo. *SINERGI: Jurnal Riset Ilmiah*, 1(11), 1106–1116. <https://doi.org/10.62335/fehfbri2>
- Putra, Z., Risna, A., Kristiana, D., Olivia, S., Soleha, M., & Nurhikmah, N. (2023). Perspektif hukum tentang sertifikat ganda. *Athena: Journal of Social, Culture and Society*, 1(1), 22–25. <https://doi.org/10.58905/athena.viii.4>
- Rasyid, M. R., & Winanti, A. (2023). Perlindungan Hukum Terkait Pemegang Hak Milik Atas Tanah dalam Kepemilikan Sertifikat Ganda (Studi Kasus Putusan Mahkamah Agung Nomor 3061 K/Pdt/2022). *Al Qalam: Jurnal Ilmiah Keagamaan Dan Kemasyarakatan*, 17(4), 2271–2281. <https://doi.org/10.35931/aq.v17i4.2366>
- Remaja, I. N. G. (2021). Kewenangan Pengadilan Tata Usaha Negara Dalam Penyelesaian Sengketa Sertifikat Ganda. *Repertorium: Jurnal Ilmiah Hukum Kenotariatan*, 10(1), 111–120. <https://doi.org/10.28946/rpt.v10i1.1172>
- Riza, D. (2018). Keputusan tata usaha negara menurut undang-undang peradilan tata usaha negara dan undang-undang administrasi pemerintahan. *Jurnal Bina Mulia Hukum*, 3(1), 85–102. <https://doi.org/10.23920/jbmh.v3n1.7>
- Sahnan, S., Arba, M., & Suhartana, L. W. P. (2019). Kewenangan Badan Pertanahan Nasional dalam Penyelesaian Sengketa Pertanahan. *Jurnal IUS Kajian Hukum Dan Keadilan*, 7(3), 436–450. <https://doi.org/10.29303/ius.v7i3.714>
- Saluling, D. D. (2022). *Penerbitan Sertipikat Ganda Hak atas Tanah pada Masa Pemblokiran di Badan Pertanahan Nasional Kota Manado*. Universitas Hasanuddin.
- Sudiro, A. A., & Putra, A. P. (2023). Kepastian Hukum Terhadap Hak Atas Pendaftaran Tanah dan Hak Kepemilikan Atas Tanah Yang Telah Didaftarkan. *Jurnal Magister Ilmu Hukum: Hukum dan Kesejahteraan*, 5(1), 36–46. <https://doi.org/10.36722/jmih.v5i1.2370>