Jurnal Notariil

Jurnal Notariil, Vol. 7, No. 1, May 2022, 39-45 P ISSN 2540 - 797X
Available Online at https://ejournal.warmadewa.ac.id/index.php/notariil E ISSN 2615 - 1545

JURIDICAL IMPLICATIONS OF THE SUPREME COURT'S DECISION NUMBER: 121 K/TUN/2017 ON DISCLOSURE OF DATA INFORMATION OF THE HOLDER RIGHT TO CULTIVATE

I Gede Cahya Widiangga*, I Wayan Wesna Astara and I Nyoman Alit Puspadma
Master of Notary, Universitas Warmadewa , Denpasar, Bali-Indonesia
*widianggacahya@gmail.com

How To Cite:
Widiangga, I. G. C., Astara, I. W. W., & Puspadma, I. N. A. (2022). Juridical Implications Of The Supreme Court's Decision Number: 121 K/Tun/2017 On Disclosure Of Data Information Of The Holder Right To Cultivate. *Jurnal Notariil*, 7 (1), 39-45, Doi: https://doi.org/10.22225/jn.7.1.2022.39-45

Abstract

The legal construction of Articles 187 and 191 of the Minister of Agrarian Affairs Number 3 of 1997 and Article 12 paragraph (4) letter i of the Perka BPN excludes HGU documents as documents that are not accessible to the public and can only be given to government agencies.This study aims to examine regulation of information transparency on the data of the holder of the Right to Cultivate and to examine the legal consequences of not implementing the Supreme Court's Decision Number: 121 K/TUN/2017 by the Ministry of Agrarian Affairs and Spatial Planning/National Land Agency (ATR/BPN) which has permanent legal force. This study uses a normative juridical method according to the applicable law. The results of this study revealed that Transparency of information on data on holders of the Right to Cultivate refers to Article 2 paragraph (1) of Government Regulation Number 24 of 1997 concerning Land Registration (hereinafter referred to as PP No. 24 of 1997) which stipulates that public information is open and accessible to every user of public information. The Right to Cultivate Documents are not exempt under Article 17 letters b and h of the KIP Law. Furthermore, the legal consequences of not implementing the Supreme Court's decision Number: 121 K/TUN/2017, namely the cassation respondent may be subject to administrative sanctions in accordance with Article 116 of the Administrative Court Law and criminal sanctions in accordance with Article 52 of the KIP Law.

Keywords: public information disclosure; right to cultivate; supreme court decision

1. INTRODUCTION

Right to Cultivate (*HGU*) is legally regulated in Article 28 and Article 29 of Law Number 5 of 1960 concerning Basic Agrarian Principles (hereinafter referred to as *UUPA*) (BPK, 2004) in conjunction with Article 19 to Article 32 of Government Regulation Number 18 of 2021 (hereinafter referred to as PP 18 of 2021) (Tanah & Susun, 2021). Related to land information, especially information on data on *HGU* holders, there are rules that restrict people from accessing land data based on Article 187 and Article 191 Regulation of the Minister of State for Agrarian Affairs/Head of the National Land Agency No. 3 of 1997 concerning the provisions of the Implementing Regulation of Government Regulation no. 24 of 1997 concerning Land Registration (hereinafter referred to as *Permen Agraria* No. 3 of 1997) (Nasional, 1997). Article 187 of the Minister of Agrarian Affairs No. 3 of 1997 states that information on physical and juridical data is open to the public and can be provided to interested parties. Furthermore, Article 191 of the Minister of Agrarian Affairs No. 3 of 1997 states that the data is only provided to Government Agencies that require it.

Another problem arose with the issuance of Regulation of the Head of the National Land Agency of the Republic of Indonesia (*Perka BPN*) No. 6 of 2013 concerning Public Information Services within the National Land Agency of the Republic of Indonesia. The provisions of Article 12 paragraph (4) letter I state that information on land books, documents, and documents are excluded information.

The existence of a lawsuit by Forest Watch Indonesia (FWI) as the applicant against the Ministry of Agrarian and Spatial Planning/National Land Agency of the Republic of Indonesia as the respondent, related to the request for data on the *HGU* holder because the respondent did not respond to the request for information. The lawsuit has received a decision from the Information Commission Center with decision No. 057/XII/KIP-PS-MA/2015 which was won by FWI, with a decision stating that the information requested by the applicant is in the form of a List of Oil Palm Plantation Rights (*HGU*) Documents as open public information and ordered the respondent to provide the information as intended to the applicant since this decision has permanent legal force (*inkracht van gewijsde*)."

The Ministry of Agrarian Affairs then filed an appeal, cassation, and judicial review (*PK*), but again FWI won by strengthening the previous decision. The decision states that administrative documents related to *HGU* do not include information that is exempt from being provided to the public as referred to in Article 11 paragraph (1) letter c of the KIP Law. Until the decision of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia No. 121 K/TUN/2017 and judicial review decision No. 61 PK/TUN/KI/2020 until now has not been implemented.

A study conducted by Winata & Sinaga (2019) that examined the contradicton between the Government policy and Supreme Court decision, and the transparency of Cultivation Rights informaton can promotes land redistributon based on constitutional rights to obtain informaton mentioned that there is contradicton and deviaton to Central Broadcastng Commission Decision No. 057/XII/KIP-PS-M-A/2015, Administratve Court Decision No. 2/G/KI/2016/PTUN-JKT, and Supreme Court Decision No. 121 K/TUN/2017 through actons of the Ministry of Agrarian Afairs and Spatal Planning, also the Circular Leter of the Coordinatng Ministry for Economic Afairs No.TAN.03.01/265/ D.II.M.EKON/05/2019 which excludes informaton about Cultvaton Rights as public informaton. Then, access to public informaton must take precedence over the right to privacy of personal informaton based on the guarantee of consttutonal rights under Artcle 28 F of the 1945 Consttuton as the enforcement of the rule of law, demoratc state, good governance, and public partcipaton principle. In additon, transparency is Government's responsibility, while at the same tme avoiding misuse of authority. For this reason, transparency of Cultvaton Rights can promotes land redistributon in order to realize agrarian reform. Meanwhile, a result study conducted by Fajri & Susilowati (2021) about whether the application of Perka BPN article 12 paragraph (4) letter i can be justified according to UU KIP article 17 letter j or not to understand the legal consequences that arise regarding the prohibition of land information that cannot be accessed by users of information or the public, revealed that the implementation of the Perka BPN regarding land use rights information are not in line with the elements contained in the UU KIP. The UU KIP states that information must be in the form of a law. However, the land use program does not use the law as the basis for the assessment, but uses the BPN Regulation. The existence of several decisions from the Supreme Court regarding the disclosure of land use rights information is also the basis for why land use rights information must be disclosed.

Based on the background and the previous studies above, this study aims to examine regulation of information transparency on the data of the holder of the Right to Cultivate and to examine the legal consequences of not implementing the Supreme Court's Decision Number: 121 K/TUN/2017 by the Ministry of Agrarian Affairs and Spatial Planning/ National Land Agency (ATR/BPN) which has permanent legal force.

2. METHOD

The research method used is normative juridical, namely research based on statutory regulations or binding legal norms that are relevant to the material discussed. The approach used in this research is a statute approach, conceptual approach and case approach. The statute approach is an approach that is based on the provisions of the applicable legislation and its relation to the issues discussed. The conceptual approach is an approach based on the opinions of scholars who understand the issues being discussed. Case approaches are approach by approaching cases related to the issues at hand, in which case there has been a court decision that has permanent legal force. The legal materials used are primary legal materials and secondary legal materials. Primary legal materials are binding legal materials consisting of applicable laws and

regulations and other regulations that support research, while secondary legal materials are legal materials in the form of literature books, scientific notes, scientific works and various applicable print media. and is related to the issue under discussion. The technique of collecting legal materials is by means of library research, namely through library research in the form of determining secondary data sources, identifying secondary data by quoting or recording and then analyzing the legal materials obtained in order to determine relevance to the problem formulation *HGU* holders. Legal certainty is a guarantee that the law is enforced to defend rights and that decisions must be enforced. Legal certainty and demands are met by being prosecuted and subject to legal sanctions as well. The importance of legal certainty theory in law enforcement against court decisions that have legal force to create justice for the parties.

3. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Regulation of Information Transparency of Holder's Data The Right to Cultivate

Transparency or openness of public information is one of the crucial things in a good government. One of the issues regarding the disclosure of public information is the disclosure of land data information. Based on a statement from the Central Information Commission which explained that there were forty-one lists of land disputes in the registration book from 2012 to 2015, the number of agrarian problems included eight disputes involving the National Land Agency of the Republic of Indonesia, four disputes involving the Regional Land Office, as well as twenty-nine disputes involving the Regency or City Land Offices (Publik et al., 2016). Some of these requests for dispute resolution to the information commission arise because the land agency excludes information so that information cannot be accessed by several parties, one of which is the applicant, namely FWI.

This is because based on the Agrarian Regulation No. 3 of 1997 where Article 187 states that:

"Information regarding physical and juridical data on land registration maps, land registers, measuring documents and land books, is open to the public and can be provided to interested parties visually or in writing, but the provision is in the form of a Land Registration Certificate"

Based on the article described above which is often interpreted that land information can only be provided to interested parties, namely government agencies in accordance with Article 191 of the Minister of Agrarian Affairs No. 3 of 1997. The problem was again caused by the issuance of Perka BPN Number 6 of 2013 precisely in Article 12 paragraph (4) letter i where it was explained that information on land books, certificates of measurement, and certificates were excluded information. On the other hand, similar regulatory issues are also contained in Article 34 paragraph (1) PP No. 24 of 1997 states everyone with an interest has the right to know physical data and land juridical data, but Article 34 Paragraph (2) PP No. 24 of 1997 states, Physical data and juridical data are only open to government agencies. While in Article 2 PP No. 24 of 1997 states that the implementation of land registration is based on the open principle. The principle of openness, meaning that through the implementation of land registration, both the community and the government who wish to obtain information on physical data and juridical data will be able to obtain correct data at any time at the land office (Harsono, 2008).

It can be seen that there is disharmony of norms between paragraphs 1 and 2 in Article 34 of PP Number 24 of 1997 as well as in Article 187 and Article 191 of the Agrarian Regulation Number 3 of 1997, therefore there is no guarantee of legal certainty in these paragraphs and articles. Jan Michiel Otto defines legal certainty as the possibility that in certain situations clear, consistent and accessible rules are available, issued by and recognized by the state, government agencies apply these legal rules consistently and are also subject to and obedient. to him, citizens in principle adjust their behavior to these rules (in Shidarta, 2006). There is a conflict of vertical norms between PP No. 24/1997 on Article 2 and the implementing regulations, namely Permen Agraria No. 3 of 1997 on Article 191 and *Perka BPN* Number 6 of 2013 on Article 12 paragraph (4) letter i. According to Hans Kelsen, in his book "Allgemeine der Normen" defines norm conflict:

"Conflict between two norms occurs when what is ordered in the provisions of one norm and what is ordered in the provisions of another norm is not compatible/incompatible so that complying with or implementing one of these norms will inevitably or may cause a violation of

other norms (Irfani, 2020)."

The conflict of norms mentioned above, creates a legal uncertainty, because the rules are not in line with each other. Legal certainty contains 2 (two) meanings, namely, first, there are general rules that make individuals know what actions may or may not be done and the second is security. Law for individuals from government arbitrariness because with the existence of general legal rules, individuals can know what the state may charge or do to individuals (Marzuki, 2005). In dealing with conflicts between legal norms (legal antinomy), then use the principles of conflict resolution or the so-called principle of preference, namely lex superiori derogate legi inferiori, lex specialis derogate legi generalis, and lex posteriori derogate legi priori (Suriyani, 2016). The problem of vertical conflict between Government Regulation Number 24 of 1997 in Article 2 and the Minister of Agrarian Affairs Number 3 of 1997 in Article 191 and Perka BPN Number 6 of 2013 in Article 12 paragraph (4) letter I, is to use the principle of lex superiori derogate legi inferiori. The higher legislation, namely PP No. 24/1997 overrides the lower-level legislation, namely Permen Agraria No. 3/1997 and *Perka BPN* No. 6/2013.

In Government Regulation Number 61 of 2010 concerning the Implementation of Law Number 14 of 2008 concerning Public Information Disclosure, as the implementing regulation of the UU KIP, there is no explicit information found regarding land, therefore there is a gap in norms related to this matter. From this analysis, that land information is not absolute information that can be categorized as open or excluded before further examining aspects or issues that often accompany land issues. However, if it is traced based on the obligations of the HGU holder, then the implementation and realization of obligations will be closely related to the public interest, so it is not appropriate to say that the data and information on the HGU document are excluded information. This can be seen from the HGU granted to Indonesian citizens and legal entities that must meet certain requirements based on Article 27 PP No. 18 Year 2021.

Regarding the dispute between FWI and the Ministry of Agrarian Affairs, it can be understood that Article 11 paragraph (1) letter a of the UU KIP is one of the obligations of the Public Agency to provide information that is under its control, but does not include information that is excluded, while in paragraph (2) stipulates that public information that has been declared open based on objection and/or dispute resolution efforts is declared as public information that can be accessed by users of public information. In this case, public information that is excluded can become non-exempt for public access. Article 17 of the UU KIP regulates information that is exempt from open access for applicants for public information. Article 17 letter b of the UU KIP regulates the exclusion of information that interferes with the protection of intellectual property rights and the protection of unfair business competition. Furthermore, Article 17 letters d, e, and f of the KIP Law regulate the exclusion of information in the investment and economic fields, while Article 17 letters g, and h of the KIP Law regulates the exclusion of information against personal secrets. With regard to the exclusion of public information, there are arrangements that allow information to be opened/ accessed based on Article 18 of the UU KIP.

Article 18 paragraph (1) letter g of the KIP Law stipulates that other information as referred to in Article 11 paragraph (2) does not include exempt information. Public information that is excluded, can be made public through objection and/or dispute resolution mechanisms. In this case there is a contradiction in Article 17 letter b with Article 18 paragraph (1) letter g of the UU KIP, but this can be resolved by making an effort to file a lawsuit to the court.

The exclusion of limited public information is based on the law, propriety, and public interest and is based on testing the consequences based on Article 2 paragraph (1) and paragraph (4) of the UU KIP. In addition to these considerations, Article 17 letters b and h of the KIP Law regulates related to unfair business competition and may reveal personal secrets. For this matter, related to the definition of HGU in Article 28 of the LoGA and legal subjects based on Article 30 of the LoGA, the document that FWI wants is the policy domain of the Ministry of Agrarian Affairs and Spatial Planning/ National Land Agency of the Republic of Indonesia based on the Regulation of the Minister of Agrarian Affairs Number 3 of 1999 concerning Delegation of Authority Granting and Cancellation of Decisions on the Granting of Land Rights.

The granting of HGU permits is given in the form of land certificates based on Article 19 paragraph (2) of the UUPA, so that if you pay attention to the definition of Article 1 paragraph 2 of the KIP Law and the provisions of Article 11 paragraph (1) letter c of the KIP Law, the reason for causing unfair business competition is based on Article 17 letter b and Article 17 letter h of the KIP Law, which states that they can disclose personal secrets regarding a person's financial condition, assets, income, and bank accounts, are not appropriate because they do not contain information containing business plans, business practices, and business agreements of HGU license holders, so that information regarding the name of the HGU permit holder is public information.

Legal due to The Not Implementation of The Supreme Court's Decision Number: 121 K/TUN/2017 by The Ministry of Agrarian and Spatial Planning/National Land Agency (ATR/BPN) that has Permanent Law Power

The word "execution" comes from the word "executie" which means carrying out the judge's decision (uitvoer leggig van vonnissen). Execution is to enforce court decisions with the help of legal force, in order to carry out court decisions that have been decided and have permanent legal force (Abdullah, 2005). The practice of carrying out executions often encounters obstacles, due to the fact that the losing party generally finds it difficult to accept defeat and tends to ignore/reject decisions. Sometimes the Chief Justice has to intervene in order to expedite the execution. Decisions with permanent legal force can be requested for execution by the party who won, provided that the losing party does not voluntarily implement the contents of the decision in question. Meanwhile, only decisions with condemnatoir decisions can be requested, while declaratory and constitutive decisions cannot be requested for execution.

"TUN disputes are disputes that arise in the TUN field between individuals or civil legal entities and TUN bodies or officials, both central and regional, as a result of the issuance of TUN decisions, including employment disputes based on applicable laws."

The basis of the dispute is the Agrarian Regulation No. 3 of 1997, namely Article 191 and Perka BPN Number 6 of 2013 to be exact in Article 12 paragraph (4) letter i which is contrary to the UU KIP and the principle of Openness in PP. 24 of 1997 relating to the principles of Good Governance. The object of the dispute is the object of the TUN dispute based on Article 1 Number 9 of the Administrative Court Law which explains that:

"TUN decision is a written determination issued by a TUN agency or official based on the applicable regulations that are concrete, individual, and final which has legal consequences for a person or civil legal entity".

Because through the TUN court, the nature of the TUN Court's decision in this case uses a condemnatory decision, where the decision contains a punishment for the defendant. If it is related to the form of decision regulated in the Administrative Court Law, the condemnatory decisions include: The obligation to revoke administrative decisions that have been declared void (Article 97 paragraph (9) letter a); Obligation to revoke administrative decisions and issue replacement decisions (Article 97 paragraph (9) letter b); The obligation to issue a decision in the event that the object of dispute is a negative fictitious decision (Article 97 paragraph (9) letter c); Obligation to pay compensation (Article 97 paragraph (10)); The obligation to carry out rehabilitation and pay compensation in employment disputes (Article 97 paragraph (11)) (Paulus JJ. Sipayung, 1995).

After the Administrative Court Decision has permanent legal force, the Plaintiff together with the Administrative Court can carry out the execution with the characteristics of the TUN that the implementation of the decision is voluntary. However, the success of the implementation of the decision is highly dependent on the authority of the court and the legal awareness of the officials (Abdullah, 2005).

Based on this case, the HGU document is a policy issued by the Cassation Petitioner, and the granting of a HGU permit in the form of a certificate is proof of rights according to Article 19 paragraph (2) letter c of the BAL. Article 1 number 19 PP 24 of 1997 states that a land book is a document in the form of a list containing juridical data and physical data of an object of registration for which rights are already in place. In addition, Article 1 number 2 of the KIP Law and Article 11 paragraph (1) letter C of the KIP Law stipulate that public bodies are required to

provide public information which includes existing policies with supporting documents. In this case the document revealing personal data and asset condition according to Article 17 letter h of the KIP Law is not appropriate, it can be justified by the decision of the Supreme Court Decision Number: 121 K/TUN/2017 because it is in accordance with the applicable laws and regulations.

In this dispute, there is no clear legal protection for FWI over differences in the interpretation of substance regarding information disclosure and up to the level of the Supreme Court and also the PK, FWI has not yet received the right to obtain information that is in accordance with the decision. In formulating the principle of legal protection, Indonesia is based on Pancasila as the ideology and philosophy of the state. According to Philipus M. Hadjon, the principles of the Pancasila state law are a) The existence of a legal relationship between the government and the people based on the principle of harmony, b) A proportional functional relationship between state powers, c) The principle of dispute resolution by deliberation and the judiciary is a means of balancing rights and obligation (Astara, 2018).

Given that the KIP Law is a special regulation (lex specialis), it emphasizes that public information is open and accessible to the entire community, so that the argument of the Cassation Petitioner using Article 17 letter b of the KIP Law cannot be accepted because it has gone through the objection and/or dispute resolution mechanism in accordance with Article 18 paragraph (1) letter g of UU KIP In this case, based on the decision of the Supreme Court which affirms the previous decision and rejects the request for cassation from the Cassation Petitioner and punishes the Cassation Petitioner to pay court fees, the Cassation Respondent needs to request supervision by the President by ordering representatives of the people, namely the DPR so that the Cassation Petitioner carries out the decision as it has permanent legal force.

4. CONCLUSION

Based on the results obtained, it can be concluded that 1) the regulation of transparency of information on data on land use rights holders with respect to its regulation found problems that arose based on the disharmony of norms in paragraphs (1) and (2) of Article 34 PP no. 24 of 1997 which states that everyone with an interest has the right to know physical data and juridical data on land, while the next paragraph is only open to government agencies. 3 of 1997 there is a disharmony of norms which states that physical and juridical land data are open to the public and can be given to interested parties but article 191 states that it can only be given to Government Agencies, therefore there is no guarantee of legal certainty in it. Regulations on the transparency of public bodies are regulated in the UU KIP. The existence of UU KIP as a form of implementation of the principle of lex specialist derogate legi generali. Article 17 of the UU KIP regulates the exclusion of public information because it has the potential to cause dangerous consequences, there is a contradiction with Article 18 paragraph (1) letter g of the UU KIP, namely the category of information that is not excluded as referred to in Article 11 paragraph (2). The existence of empty norms related to data transparency of HGU holders, because the UU KIP and its implementing regulations do not find explicit information on land, but if it is traced based on the obligations of HGU holders, the implementation and realization of obligations will be closely related to the public interest, so it is not appropriate if the data is and HGU document information is said to be excluded information. 2) The legal consequences of not implementing the Supreme Court's decision by the Ministry of Agrarian Affairs and Spatial Planning/ National Land Agency of the Republic of Indonesia, namely FWI together with the court based on Article 116 point 4 of the Administrative Court Law may regulate the official concerned may be subject to forced money, number 5 of the court's decision can be published in the media local mass by the clerk, number 6 the court can ask the President to force the official concerned to implement the PTUN decision and request the DPR to carry out its supervisory function. In accordance with the provisions of the PTUN, the official may be subject to imprisonment for 1 year or a fine in accordance with Article 52 of the UU KIP. In this case, the Ministry of Agrarian Affairs and Spatial Planning/ National Land Agency of the Republic of Indonesia may be subject to criminal sanctions, however, prior to that, it is necessary to revoke the position based on Article 17 paragraph (2) of the 1945 Constitution. This proves that although it is

difficult to implement the rule of law, The law has provided legal certainty.

REFERENCE

Abdullah, R. (2005). *Hukum Acara Peradilan Tata Usaha Negara*. Raja Grafindo Persada.

Astara, I. (2018). *HUKUM KEPAILITAN: TEORI DAN PRAKTIK*. Warmadewa University Press.

Bhatia, V. K., & Engberg, J. (2005). *Vagueness in normative texts* (Vol. 23). Peter Lang.

BPK. (2004). Undang-Undang Pokok Agraria. *Undang-Undang No.5 Tahun 1960*, *1*, 1–5. dalam Shidarta, L. J. van A. (2006). Moralitas Profesi Hukum Suatu Tawaran Kerangka Berfikir. *PT Repika Aditama, Bandung*.

Fajri, M. F., & Susilowati, I. F. (2021). Analisis Yuridis Terhadap Informasi Pertanahan Hak Guna Usaha Yang Dikecualikan Oleh Publik. *Novum: Jurnal Hukum*, 1–13. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.2674/novum.v0i0.42691

Harsono, B. (2008). Hukum Agraria Indonesia, Sejarah Pembentukan Undang-undang Pokok Agraria, Isi dan Pelaksanaannya, Jilid 1: Hukum Tanah Nasional. *Djambatan, Jakarta*.

Irfani, N. (2020). Asas Lex Superior, Lex Specialis, dan Lex Pesterior: Pemaknaan, Problematika, dan Penggunaannya Dalam Penalaran dan Argumentasi Hukum. *Jurnal Legislasi Indonesia*, *17*(3), 305–325. https://e-jurnal.peraturan.go.id/index.php/jli/article/view/711

Marzuki, P. M. (2005). *Metode Penelitian Hukum*. Kencana Prenada Media Group.

Nasional, B. P. (1997). *MENTERI NEGARA AGRARIA/*.

Paulus JJ. Sipayung. (1995). *Mencegah Pejabat Tata Usaha Negara sebagai Tergugat dalam PTUN*. Departemen Dalam Negeri.

Peraturan Pemerintah Republik Indonesia Nomor 18 Tahun 2021 Tentang Hak Pengelolaan, Hak Atas Tanah, Satuan Rumah Susun, Dan Pendaftaran Tanah (Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2021 Nomor 28, Tambahan Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Nomor 6630)

Peraturan Menteri Negara Agraria/ Kepala Badan Pertanahan Nasional Nomor 3 Tahun 1997 Tentang Ketentuan Pelaksanaan Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 24 Tahun 1997 Tentang Pendaftaran Tanah

Peraturan Menteri Agraria Nomor 3 Tahun 1999 tentang Pelimpahan Kewenangan Pemberian dan Pembatalan Keputusan Pemberian Hak Atas Tanah.

Peraturan Kepala Badan Pertanahan Nasional Republik Indonesia Nomor 6 Tahun 2013 Tentang Pelayanan Informasi Publik di Lingkungan Badan Pertanahan Nasional Republik Indonesia

Publik, F. G. D. I., Pertanahan, D., Pusat, K. I., Debora, A., Law, E., & Maret, J. (2016). *Status Informasi Pertanahan*. 1–16.

Putusan Peninjauan Kembali Nomor : 61 PK/TUN/KI/2020

Putusan Mahkamah Agung Nomor: 121 K/TUN/2017

Putusan Pengadilan Tata Usaha Negara Nomor: 2/G/KL/2016/PTUN-JKT

Putusan Komisi Informasi Pusat Republik Indonesia Nomor: 057/XII/KIP-PS-M-A/2015

Sentana, M. R. D. H., Astara, I. W. W., & Sugiartha, I. N. G. (2020). Peranan Hakim untuk Mendamaikan Para Pihak yang Bersengketa dalam Perkara Perdata di Pengadilan Negeri Denpasar. *Jurnal Analogi Hukum*, *2*(2), 203–208. https://doi.org/10.22225/ah.2.2.2020.203-208

Suriyani, M. (2016). Pertentangan Asas Perundang-undangan dalam Pengaturan Larangan Mobilisasi Anak pada Kampanye Pemilu. *Jurnal Konstitusi*, *13*(3), 657–679. https://doi.org/10.31078/jk1339

Tanah, A., & Susun, S. R. (2021). *Cipta perlu*. *086597*.

Undang-Undang Dasar Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 1945

Undang-Undang Nomor 5 Tahun 1960 Tentang Peraturan Dasar Pokok-Pokok Agraria (Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 1960 Nomor 104, Tambahan Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Nomor 2043)

Undang-Undang Nomor 51 Tahun 2009 Perubahan Kedua Atas Undang-Undang Nomor 5 Tahun 1986 Tentang Pengadilan Tata Usaha Negara (Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2009 Nomor 160, Tambahan Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Nomor 5079)

Undang-Undang Nomor 14 Tahun 2008 tentang Keterbukaan Informasi Publik (Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2008 Nomor 61, Tambahan Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Nomor 4846)

Winata, M. R., & Sinaga, E. M. C. (2019). Transparansi Hak Guna Usaha Mendukung Redistribusi Lahan Berdasarkan Hak Konstitusional Mendapatkan Informasi. *Jurnal Rechts Vinding: Media Pembinaan Hukum Nasional*, *8*(3), 421. https://doi.org/10.33331/rechtsvinding.v8i3.341