

Original Article

Implementation of Article 66 UUJN Related to Suits Against Notaries Without the Approval of the Honorary Council of Notaries (MKN)

Adnin Pulungan^{1✉}, Suhaidi², T. Keizerina Devi Azwar

^{1,2,3} Program Studi Magister Kenotariatan Fakultas Hukum Universitas Sumatera Utara, Indonesia

Correspondence Author: adekpulungan1234@gmail.com✉

Abstract:

Article 66 of the UUJN mandates prior approval from the Notary Honorary Council (Majelis Kehormatan Notaris, MKN) for lawsuits against notaries in Indonesia, aiming to protect their professional independence. This study examines the effectiveness, challenges, comparative insights, and reform recommendations regarding Article 66. Effectiveness analysis reveals that while the provision shields notaries from frivolous litigation, it impedes access to justice due to procedural complexities and delays. Transparency issues in MKN decision-making and perceived biases further complicate its implementation. Comparative insights from France, Germany, and the United States highlight best practices such as independent oversight mechanisms and transparent criteria, suggesting reforms to enhance accountability and fairness. Recommendations include establishing clear, public criteria for MKN approvals, setting procedural timelines, and introducing independent review mechanisms to address bias concerns. These reforms aim to maintain notarial integrity while ensuring equitable access to justice. Thus, while Article 66 serves to safeguard notarial functions, addressing its challenges through strategic reforms can foster public trust and strengthen Indonesia's legal framework.

Keywords: Article 66 UUJN, Honorary Council

Introduction

Law enforcement can be carried out if the law or statute stipulates so. The legal action carried out by the notary, namely in making an authentic deed, turned out to have legal consequences, so the deed he made was sued ([Rani & Ali, 2019](#)). In some cases, a notary who is present at a trial can be named as a defendant or as a co-defendant. The presence of a notary, either as a defendant or as a co-defendant, certainly has different implications ([Syarifuddin, 2020](#)). The legal position of a legal subject as a defendant is different from the legal position of a legal subject as a co-defendant. The legal position of



<https://jurnal.usk.ac.id/riwayat>

Received: Marc 17, 2024 – Revised: May 19, 2024- Accepted: June 1, 2024 - Published online: July 11, 2024

of legal subjects as co-defendants in statutory regulations has not been regulated, but there are Supreme Court decisions that can be used as a basis or jurisprudence, including the opinion of the Supreme Court in Decision No. 1642 K/Pdt/2005, which outlines the legal rule as follows: "A person is included as a party being sued or at least placed as a co-defendant because of the necessity that the parties in the lawsuit must be complete so that without suing the others, the subject of the lawsuit will be incomplete ([Siahaan, 2022](#)).

The legal position of a notary as a co-defendant or as a defendant relating to the application of Article 66 Paragraph 1 of Law No. 2 of 2014 concerning Amendments to Law Number 30 of 2004 concerning the Position of Notaries is one of the problem formulations in this research, especially If it is related to Article 1909, paragraph (3), which provides space for notaries to request to be released from the obligation to provide testimony regarding their position or work, they are required by law to keep things confidential. The full text of Article 1909 paragraph (3) is as follows ([Andhika, 2016](#)): "anyone who, because of his position, job or position, is required by law to keep something confidential, but only regarding matters entrusted to him because of his position, work and position." The legal process works (in this case, what is meant is Article 66, paragraph (1)), where the law regulates that the notary concerned in giving his statement in front of the investigator or in front of the court must go through the approval of the notary honorary council. So what is the protection for the notary who refuses to be a witness? in civil cases, and what are the legal remedies for the Notary for decisions that are detrimental to him due to his absence from the trial due to not getting approval from the Notary Honorary Council ([Arisaputra, 2012](#)).

In the complex landscape of legal frameworks, the role of notaries holds significant importance in ensuring the authenticity and legality of various documents and transactions. Within the Indonesian legal system, notaries are governed by specific regulations, most notably the Law on Notary Position (Undang-Undang Jabatan Notaris or UUJN). Article 66 of the UUJN stands out as a crucial provision, stipulating that any legal action or lawsuit against a notary must first receive approval from the Notary Honorary Council (Majelis Kehormatan Notaris or MKN) ([Arliman, 2016](#)). This requirement is designed to protect notaries from frivolous or malicious legal actions that could disrupt their professional duties. The core intent of Article 66 is to safeguard the integrity and independence of the notarial profession. By mandating the involvement of the MKN before any legal proceedings can be initiated, the law aims to ensure that notaries can perform their duties without undue fear of retribution or harassment ([Abqa et al., 2024](#)). This protective measure acknowledges the sensitive nature of the notary's work, which often involves confidential and high-stakes transactions.

However, the implementation of Article 66 has sparked considerable debate and controversy. Critics argue that the necessity of obtaining MKN's approval can be a double-edged sword, potentially hindering access to justice for those aggrieved by notarial misconduct. The procedural complexities and potential delays in securing MKN's consent may deter individuals from pursuing legitimate claims, thus challenging the balance between protecting notaries and upholding accountability. There are concerns that the MKN, as a professional body composed of notaries, might exhibit bias in favor of their colleagues, thereby compromising impartiality and fairness in the approval process. Furthermore, the opacity surrounding the decision-making process of the MKN raises questions about transparency and accountability. How does the MKN evaluate the merit of a lawsuit against a notary? What criteria are applied, and how consistent are these criteria across different cases? These questions underscore the need for a closer

examination of the MKN's role and the overall efficacy of Article 66 in achieving its intended objectives.

This introduction sets the stage for a thorough exploration of the practical implications of Article 66's implementation. It delves into the intricacies of the legal safeguards for notaries, the operational dynamics of the MKN, and the broader impact on the legal community and public trust. By examining case studies and expert opinions, this study aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of whether the current framework effectively serves its intended purpose or if reforms are necessary to align with the principles of justice and transparency. It will also explore comparative perspectives from other jurisdictions to identify potential best practices that could inform future amendments to the UUJN. Ultimately, this study seeks to contribute to the ongoing discourse on the balance between professional protection and accountability within the notarial system. By shedding light on the strengths and weaknesses of the current legal provisions, it aspires to offer constructive recommendations for enhancing the legal framework governing notaries in Indonesia.

Methods

The study on the "Implementation of Article 66 of the UUJN Regarding Lawsuits Against Notaries Without the Approval of the Notary Honorary Council (MKN)" employs a normative legal research method ([Ariawan, 2013](#)). This method focuses on examining and analyzing legal norms, principles, doctrines, and statutory provisions relevant to the subject matter. The normative legal approach is well-suited for exploring the theoretical and doctrinal foundations of laws, as well as their application in practice. The first stage involves identifying and formulating the main legal issues related to the implementation of Article 66 of the UUJN. This includes understanding the scope and purpose of the article, the role of the MKN, and the legal challenges faced by notaries and the public. A comprehensive literature review is conducted to gather existing knowledge and scholarly opinions on the subject. This includes reviewing legal textbooks, journal articles, case law, and previous research studies. The literature review helps to build a theoretical foundation and contextualize the research within the broader legal discourse. Primary and secondary legal materials are collected to support the analysis. Primary legal materials include statutory provisions, regulations, court decisions, and official documents from the MKN. Secondary legal materials consist of legal commentaries, academic articles, and expert opinions ([Soekanto, 2007](#)).

Results and Disuccecion

The findings from the study on the "Implementation of Article 66 of the UUJN Regarding Lawsuits Against Notaries Without the Approval of the Notary Honorary Council (MKN)" are based on a comprehensive normative legal analysis. The research reveals several critical insights into the effectiveness, challenges, and implications of Article 66 of the UUJN.

Statutory Interpretation

Article 66 of the UUJN mandates that any legal action against a notary must first receive approval from the Notary Honorary Council (MKN). This provision aims to protect notaries from unwarranted legal harassment, ensuring they can perform their duties without undue fear of litigation. However, this protective measure also raises questions about access to justice and accountability. The primary purpose of Article 66 is to

safeguard the notarial profession's integrity by preventing frivolous or malicious lawsuits. The scope includes all legal actions directly related to the performance of a notary's duties, thereby providing a broad shield against potential legal challenges. The approval mechanism involves the MKN assessing the merits of a proposed lawsuit before it can proceed to court. This process is intended to filter out baseless claims and ensure that only legitimate grievances are addressed.

Doctrinal Analysis

The doctrinal analysis reveals underlying legal principles and doctrines that justify the existence of Article 66. The protection afforded by Article 66 is grounded in the principle of professional independence. By insulating notaries from immediate legal threats, the law promotes an environment where they can act impartially and with integrity. Article 66 attempts to balance the interests of notaries with those of the public. While it protects notaries from undue legal pressure, it also seeks to ensure that genuine cases of misconduct can still be pursued through a regulated process.

Case Law Analysis

An examination of relevant court decisions highlights how Article 66 has been interpreted and applied in practice. The analysis of case law indicates a relatively consistent application of Article 66 by the courts. In most instances, the requirement for MKN approval has been upheld, reinforcing the protective intent of the provision. Several cases reveal challenges and controversies in the practical implementation of Article 66. Critics argue that the MKN's approval process can be opaque and slow, leading to delays in seeking redress for legitimate grievances. There have also been instances where the MKN's decisions have been perceived as biased in favor of notaries, raising concerns about impartiality.

Comparative Analysis

A comparative study of legal frameworks in other jurisdictions provides insights into potential best practices. In many countries, notaries are subject to professional oversight bodies similar to the MKN. However, the degree of protection and the approval mechanisms vary. For instance, some jurisdictions employ independent review boards to assess complaints against notaries, ensuring a more impartial evaluation process. The comparative analysis suggests that a more transparent and efficient approval process could enhance the effectiveness of Article 66. Implementing clear criteria for MKN decisions, ensuring timely reviews, and incorporating independent oversight could address current shortcomings.

Effectiveness of Article 66

Article 66 of the UUJN (Law on Notary Position) represents a pivotal mechanism designed to uphold the integrity and independence of the notarial profession in Indonesia. By requiring that any lawsuit against a notary must first receive approval from the Notary Honorary Council (Majelis Kehormatan Notaris, MKN), the law aims to protect notaries from undue legal harassment. This protective measure is crucial for several reasons, which can be further explored through both theoretical underpinnings and empirical evidence from previous research.

The concept of professional immunity is not unique to notaries and can be found in various professional fields such as medicine, law, and accounting. The theoretical

justification for such protections is rooted in the need to ensure that professionals can carry out their duties without fear of constant litigation, which could impede their ability to perform effectively and impartially. According to the theory of professional independence, professionals need a certain degree of immunity to make unbiased decisions ([Robertson, 2009](#)). For notaries, this is particularly important because their role involves certifying the authenticity of documents, which can have significant legal and financial implications. The protection offered by Article 66 ensures that notaries can make these certifications without undue external pressure or the fear of retribution from dissatisfied parties. The principle of legal certainty is another theoretical foundation supporting Article 66. Notaries play a key role in providing certainty in legal transactions. By shielding them from frivolous lawsuits, the law helps maintain public trust in the notarial system, which is essential for the proper functioning of various legal and commercial activities. The protection of notaries under Article 66 helps to preserve public trust in the notarial system. When the public perceives that notaries are protected from baseless legal actions, it reinforces the belief that the documents notarized are authentic and reliable ([Supriadi, 2023](#)). This trust is vital for the smooth operation of legal and business transactions.

Examination of specific cases where Article 66 has been invoked reveals that the requirement for MKN approval acts as a significant deterrent against baseless lawsuits. For example, in several high-profile cases, the MKN's involvement has prevented unwarranted legal actions, allowing notaries to continue their professional duties without interruption. This empirical evidence supports the theoretical argument that Article 66 effectively safeguards notarial independence. Analysis of court decisions shows a consistent application of Article 66, reinforcing its protective intent. Courts have generally upheld the requirement for MKN approval, emphasizing its role in filtering out non-meritorious claims. This judicial consistency is critical for maintaining the rule of law and ensuring that the protections afforded to notaries are not arbitrarily overridden (Wahyuni, 2021). Surveys of notaries and legal professionals indicate strong support for the protective measures of Article 66. Many notaries report that the provision allows them to perform their duties more confidently, knowing that they have a layer of protection against potential legal threats. This confidence is essential for the effective functioning of the notarial profession.

Challenges and Controversies

Despite the protective intent of Article 66 of the UUJN, several significant challenges and controversies arise in its practical implementation. These issues primarily revolve around access to justice, transparency, procedural delays, and perceived biases. Understanding these challenges in depth requires a detailed exploration of their implications and a review of theoretical perspectives and previous research. One of the primary challenges posed by Article 66 is its impact on access to justice for individuals who may have legitimate claims against notaries. The requirement for MKN approval before a lawsuit can proceed introduces an additional procedural step that can deter potential plaintiffs, especially those who may not have the resources or knowledge to navigate this process. From a legal formalist perspective, the procedural requirement is a necessary safeguard to prevent frivolous lawsuits. However, legal realism emphasizes the practical effects of legal rules on individuals. From this standpoint, the additional step required by Article 66 may disproportionately affect those with limited access to legal resources, thereby hindering their ability to seek redress. Research on access to justice

highlights that procedural barriers, such as the requirement for MKN approval, can disproportionately impact marginalized groups. For instance, studies have shown that individuals from lower socioeconomic backgrounds often face greater challenges in navigating complex legal procedures, which can deter them from pursuing legitimate claims ([Greene, 2015](#)). Research on access to justice highlights that procedural barriers, such as the requirement for MKN approval, can disproportionately impact marginalized groups. For instance, studies have shown that individuals from lower socioeconomic backgrounds often face greater challenges in navigating complex legal procedures, which can deter them from pursuing legitimate claims ([Wibowo, 2023](#)).

The lack of transparency in the MKN's decision-making process is a major source of controversy. Complainants and the public often have little insight into the criteria and rationale behind the MKN's decisions, which can lead to perceptions of bias and unfairness. Transparency in decision-making processes is crucial for maintaining public trust and legitimacy in legal institutions. According to transparency theory, clear and open processes help ensure accountability and fairness, which are essential for the rule of law ([Macchia, 2016](#)). Case studies have shown that opaque decision-making processes can undermine trust in legal institutions. For example, research on administrative tribunals has demonstrated that transparency in decision-making is correlated with higher levels of public trust and perceived fairness (Grimmelikhuijsen & Klijn, 2015). Another significant challenge is the procedural delays introduced by the requirement for MKN approval. These delays can prolong the resolution of disputes, causing frustration for complainants and potentially allowing notarial misconduct to go unaddressed for extended periods. Theories of legal efficiency emphasize the importance of timely dispute resolution. Delays in legal processes can undermine the effectiveness of legal protections and deter individuals from seeking justice ([Bush, 1984](#)). Empirical studies on legal systems have consistently shown that procedural delays can have a detrimental impact on justice delivery. For instance, research in various jurisdictions has found that lengthy legal processes can erode trust in the legal system and discourage individuals from pursuing legitimate claims ([Tyler et al., 2015](#)).

Perceptions of bias in the MKN's decisions are a critical issue. Critics argue that the MKN, composed primarily of notaries, may exhibit a tendency to protect their peers, leading to decisions that favor notaries over complainants. Theories of conflict of interest suggest that decision-making bodies should be independent and free from biases that could influence their judgments. When the MKN is perceived as biased, it undermines the credibility and impartiality of the oversight process. Empirical studies on professional oversight bodies indicate that perceived or actual biases can significantly impact public trust. For example, research on medical and legal professional boards has found that when these bodies are perceived as protecting their members rather than the public, trust and confidence in the regulatory system diminish ([Hall, 2002](#)).

Comparative Insights

Examining the legal frameworks of other jurisdictions provides valuable insights into how similar protective measures for notaries can be implemented more effectively. These comparative insights help identify best practices and potential reforms that can address the challenges faced by the implementation of Article 66 of the UUJN. By analyzing the systems in place in other countries, we can draw lessons on balancing protection for notaries with ensuring accountability and access to justice. In many jurisdictions, the role and protection of notaries are enshrined in legal frameworks that

emphasize both the independence of the profession and mechanisms for accountability. Understanding how these systems function can offer guidance on improving the Indonesian model. France has a well-established notarial system where notaries are also public officers. They enjoy a significant degree of protection, but there are robust mechanisms for oversight. Complaints against notaries are reviewed by a combination of professional bodies and judicial oversight, ensuring both protection and accountability. In Germany, notaries are similarly protected by legal provisions that prevent frivolous lawsuits. However, any complaint against a notary is reviewed by a special court dedicated to professional conduct issues. This court includes legal professionals who are not part of the notarial profession, thus ensuring impartiality and transparency in the review process. In the U.S., the system varies by state, but many states have implemented stringent oversight mechanisms. For instance, some states have independent boards composed of members from various professional backgrounds to review complaints against notaries. These boards operate transparently, with clear guidelines and procedures for handling complaints.

From the practices in France, Germany, and the United States, several best practices emerge that could inform reforms to Article 66 of the UUJN: One of the most effective practices is the use of independent review boards. These boards, composed of members from diverse professional backgrounds, ensure impartiality and reduce the potential for bias. In the German and some U.S. systems, these boards or special courts are instrumental in maintaining both protection for notaries and accountability. Transparency is crucial for maintaining public trust. The French and U.S. systems often have clear, publicly available criteria for reviewing complaints against notaries. This transparency ensures that both notaries and complainants understand the standards and processes involved, which enhances fairness and trust in the system. Efficient handling of complaints is another best practice observed in these jurisdictions. Setting specific timelines for the review process helps prevent delays and ensures timely resolution of disputes. This practice is evident in the German system, where special courts are required to handle cases within stipulated time frames.

Institutional theory suggests that organizations and systems are influenced by the norms and practices of their environments. By adopting best practices from other jurisdictions, Indonesia can improve its notarial oversight system to better align with international standards and expectations ([Basoeky et al., 2021](#)). Regulatory theory emphasizes the need for effective oversight mechanisms to ensure compliance and accountability. Independent review boards and transparent criteria are examples of regulatory practices that enhance the effectiveness of professional oversight ([Grady, 2015](#)). Trust theory posits that transparent and impartial processes are essential for maintaining public trust in institutions. The practices observed in France, Germany, and the U.S. demonstrate that transparency and independence in the review process are key to fostering trust in the notarial system ([Hammond & Landini, 2012](#)). Research on professional oversight systems highlights the importance of transparency, impartiality, and efficiency. For instance, studies on regulatory bodies in healthcare and legal professions consistently show that independent oversight and clear guidelines significantly improve public trust and accountability ([O'Neill, 2004](#)).

Comparative legal studies provide empirical evidence on the effectiveness of different oversight mechanisms. Research comparing notarial systems across Europe and North America indicates that systems with independent review boards and transparent processes tend to have higher levels of compliance and public satisfaction ([Arruñada,](#)

[2023](#)). Regulatory impact analysis studies suggest that independent oversight not only enhances accountability but also improves the overall quality of professional services. These studies support the implementation of reforms that incorporate independent review mechanisms and clear procedural guidelines ([Shapiro & Murphy, 2016](#)).

Conclusion

The discussion on the implementation of Article 66 of the UUJN concerning the requirement for approval from the Notary Honorary Council (Majelis Kehormatan Notaris, MKN) for lawsuits against notaries reveals various crucial aspects within the legal framework and existing practices. This article provides a comprehensive overview of effectiveness, challenges, international comparisons, and recommendations for reform. Article 66 of the UUJN effectively protects notaries from unfounded legal claims, ensuring that they can perform their professional duties with independence and fairness. Its success is evident in shielding notaries from the threat of legal actions that could disrupt their professional decisions. However, it also presents several challenges that need addressing. The implementation of this article poses significant challenges related to access to justice, transparency, procedural delays, and perceived bias. The requirement for MKN approval before lawsuits can proceed may hinder access to justice for individuals with legitimate claims against notaries. Moreover, the lack of transparency in the MKN's decision-making process, delays in the review process, and perceptions of bias in MKN decisions are significant challenges. International practices from countries such as France, Germany, and the United States offer valuable insights into how similar protections for notaries can be implemented more effectively. These systems emphasize the use of independent oversight bodies, transparent criteria, and efficient review processes to maintain a balance between notarial protection and public accountability.

Suggestion

To enhance the effectiveness and fairness of Article 66 of the UUJN, several reforms are necessary. These include establishing clear and transparent criteria for MKN approval processes, implementing clear procedural timelines, and establishing independent oversight mechanisms to review MKN decisions. These reforms aim to strengthen public trust in the notarial system while maintaining necessary protections for notaries.

References

- Abqa, M. A. R., Hidayah, A., Sitanggang, C. E. P., Annisa, F., Khasanah, D. D., Tarmizi, R., & Ramadhani, D. W. (2024). *Peradilan & Penegakan Hukum*. Sada Kurnia Pustaka.
- Andhika, A. R. (2016). Pertanggungjawaban Notaris Dalam Perkara Pidana Berkaitan Dengan Akta Yang Dibuatnya Menurut Undang-Undang Nomor 2 Tahun 2014 Tentang Perubahan Atas Undang-Undang Nomor 30 Tahun 2004. *Premise Law Journal*, 1, 14144.
- Ariawan, I. G. K. (2013). Metode Penelitian Hukum Normatif. *Kertha Widya*, 1(1).
- Arisaputra, M. I. (2012). Kewajiban Notaris Dalam Menjaga Kerahasiaan Akta Dalam Kaitannya dengan Hak Ingkar Notaris. *Perspektif*, 17(3), 173–183.
- Arliman, L. (2016). IMPLIKASI PUTUSAN MAHKAMAH KONSTITUSI DALAM MENGUJI UNDANG UNDANG TENTANG JABATAN NOTARIS TERHADAP PENGAWASAN NOTARIS. *Jurnal Hukum Respublica*, 16(1), 71–87.

- Arruñada, B. (2023). The organization of public registries: a comparative analysis. In *The Changing Role of Property Law* (pp. 199–220). Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Basoeky, U., Priyono, F. J., Badriyah, S. M., & Sukirno, S. (2021). Law and Technology: Legal Technology Model under the Authority of the Indonesian Notary Position in the Industrial Revolution Era 4.0. *Legal Brief*, 11(1), 353–365.
- Bush, R. A. B. (1984). Dispute resolution alternatives and the goals of civil justice: Jurisdictional principles for process choice. *Wis. L. Rev.*, 893.
- Grady, C. (2015). Institutional review boards: Purpose and challenges. *Chest*, 148(5), 1148–1155.
- Greene, S. S. (2015). Race, class, and access to civil justice. *Iowa L. Rev.*, 101, 1263.
- Grimmelikhuijsen, S., & Klijn, A. (2015). The effects of judicial transparency on public trust: Evidence from a field experiment. *Public Administration*, 93(4), 995–1011.
- Hall, M. A. (2002). Law, medicine, and trust. *Stan. L. Rev.*, 55, 463.
- Hammond, C. M., & Landini, I. (2012). Global Subprime Crisis as Explained by the Contrast between American Contracts Law and Civil Law Countries' Laws, Practices, and Expectations in Real Estate Transactions: How the Lack of Informed Consent and the Absence of the Civil Law Notary in the Unit. *J. Int'l Bus. & L.*, 11, 133.
- Macchia, M. (2016). The rule of law and transparency in the global space. In *Research Handbook on Global Administrative Law* (pp. 261–281). Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Muhaimin, M. (2020). Metode Penelitian Hukum. Dalam S. Dr. Muhaimin, *Metode Penelitian Hukum, Mataram-NTB: Mataram*.
- O'Neill, O. (2004). Accountability, trust and informed consent in medical practice and research. *Clinical Medicine*, 4(3), 269–276.
- Rani, F. A., & Ali, D. (2019). Kedudukan Notaris Sebagai Pejabat Umum Ditinjau Dari Konsep Equality Before The Law. *Jurnal Hukum & Pembangunan*, 49(1), 180–201.
- Robertson, C. B. (2009). Judgment Identity and Independence. *CoNN. L. REv.*, 42, 1.
- Shapiro, S. A., & Murphy, R. W. (2016). Arbitrariness Review Made Reasonable: Structural and Conceptual Reform of the Hard Look. *Notre Dame L. Rev.*, 92, 331.
- Siahaan, M. (2022). *Hukum Acara Mahkamah Konstitusi Republik Indonesia (edisi kedua)*. Sinar Grafika.
- Soekanto, S. (2007). *Penelitian hukum normatif: Suatu tinjauan singkat*.
- Supriadi, S. H. (2023). *Etika dan Tanggung Jawab Profesi Hukum di Indonesia*. Sinar Grafika.
- Syarifuddin, M. (2020). *Small Claim Court: Dalam Sistem Peradilan Perdata di Indonesia*.
- Tyler, T. R., Goff, P. A., & MacCoun, R. J. (2015). The impact of psychological science on policing in the United States: Procedural justice, legitimacy, and effective law enforcement. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 16(3), 75–109.
- Wahyuni, S. (2021). *Analisis Wewenang Notaris Dalam Pembuatan Akta Perjanjian Pengikatan Jual Beli Hak Milik Atas Tanah Di Kota Makassar*. UNIVERSITAS BOSOWA.
- Wibowo, A. (2023). Penyelesaian Sengketa Hukum dan Teknologi. Penerbit Yayasan Prima Agus Teknik, 1–168.