

OBLIGATIONS OF LAND RIGHTS HOLDERS TO MANAGE THEIR OWN AGRICULTURAL LAND

Suhartono^{1a*}, Rahmatul Hidayati^{2b}, Ahmad Siboy^{3c}

¹²³ Magister Kenotariatan Program Pascasarjana, Universitas Islam Malang, Malang, Indonesia

^a 22402022033@unisma.ac.id

^b rahmatulhidayati@unisma.ac.id

^c siboysalman@unisma.ac.id

(*) Corresponding Author

22402022033@unisma.ac.id

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received : 20-11-2025

Revised : 07-12-2025

Accepted : 25-01-2026

KEYWORDS

Obligations of Rights Holders,
Agricultural Land,
Absentee Land

ABSTRACT

Agricultural land is a strategic asset in national development because it plays a direct role in maintaining food security and community welfare. However, the process of urbanization, industrialization, and weak legal supervision has led to massive land conversion and an increase in absentee land ownership practices (guntai). Landowners who do not manage their land directly cause a lot of land to become unproductive, illegally transferred, or used as an object of price speculation. This condition causes inequality in land distribution and hinders the goal of agrarian reform as mandated by the UUPA. Therefore, this study examines in depth the "Obligations of Land Rights Holders to Manage Their Own Agricultural Land", focusing on how the normative regulation of these obligations and the legal consequences for rights holders who do not implement them. This study formulates two main research questions: how the obligation of land rights holders to cultivate their own agricultural land is regulated in Indonesian legislation, and what the legal consequences are for those who fail to fulfill this obligation. The research employs a normative juridical method with statutory and conceptual approaches. The legal materials used include primary sources such as the 1945 Constitution, the Basic Agrarian Law, Government Regulation No. 224 of 1961, Law No. 41 of 2009, Government Regulation No. 20 of 2021, and other related regulations, as well as secondary sources consisting of literature and academic journals, and tertiary legal materials. The results of the study show that the obligation of the right holder to manage agricultural land itself is a manifestation of the principle of the social function of land as stipulated in Article 6 of the UUPA. The provisions regarding the prohibition of absentee land ownership are affirmed in Government Regulation No. 224 of 1961, which requires agricultural land to be managed directly by its owners in order to prevent land concentration, speculative practices, and the occurrence of abandoned land. This obligation is also strengthened through the policy of protecting sustainable food, agricultural land. Right holders who do not manage their land can be subject to various legal consequences, such as: control and takeover as abandoned land, reduction or revocation of land rights, and redistribution to other parties through the land reform program. Thus, the obligation to manage agricultural land itself is not only an administrative norm, but an important instrument to achieve agrarian justice and ensure the sustainability of national food security.

This is an open access article under the CC-BY-SA license.



INTRODUCTIONS

UUPA and Government Regulation No. 224/1961 affirm the obligation of owners to manage their own agricultural land as part of the principle of social justice. However, its implementation often does not run optimally due to weak supervision and legal loopholes that are exploited by large financiers. Various cases of abuse of land rights show that existing regulations have not been fully effective in controlling absentee ownership and the practice of name deposit. (Nabila et al., 2025)

This condition shows that there is a gap between legal idealism and the reality of practice in the field. Policy updates and stricter law enforcement are needed so that the norms in the UUPA can be in line with the development of modern agrarian needs. The conversion of agricultural land into industrial and residential areas is increasingly prevalent along with the rapid development needs. Many productive lands transfer ownership to large corporations or interested individuals through the practice of name deeds to avoid legal provisions. This phenomenon narrows smallholder access to land while reducing national agricultural productivity.

Food estate policies, although claimed to be a solution to food security, often cause paradoxes because in practice they marginalize local communities and cause agrarian conflicts. The accumulation of these practices shows that agrarian policies have not been fully in favor of the principles of social justice and the protection of productive land. More stringent regulations are needed to control land conversion so as not to harm farmers and national food security. (Nurhadi et al., 2022; Pinontoan et al., 2024)

The high intensity of land conversion, absentee ownership, and the practice of misappropriation of land rights shows the need for a comprehensive academic study. The obligation of rights holders to manage their own land is an urgent issue amid the challenges of food security and national economic growth. Weak law enforcement and abusive practices of authority make absentee land policy less effective. This situation demands legal solutions that not only emphasize the normative aspect, but also take into account the social and economic realities of society. The research is expected to be able to make a practical contribution in formulating land policies that are more fair, sustainable, and in accordance with contemporary needs. (Fanggi et al., 2025)

The condition of absent land ownership that is still rampant, weak legal supervision, and the increasing practice of land conversion show that there is a gap between the norms regulated in the UUPA and implementation in the field. This condition has direct implications for agricultural productivity, the distribution of agrarian justice, and national food security. Within that framework, there is a need to reaffirm the obligation of rights holders to manage their agricultural land directly, so that the social function of land is truly realized. The initial hypothesis of this study departs from the assumption that the effectiveness of agricultural land management by the owners themselves is the key to reducing absentee land misappropriation, suppressing speculative practices, and strengthening the sustainability of Indonesia's agrarian system. Therefore, the title "The Obligation of Land Rights Holders to Manage Their Own Agricultural Land" was chosen as the focus of the research to provide an academic foundation as well as more equitable and contextual policy recommendations.

Although the UUPA and Government Regulation No. 224/1961 have expressly regulated the obligation of owners to manage their own land, the implementation of these rules has not been effective due to weak supervision, legal loopholes, and the dominance of large financiers. The practice of name deposit, land price speculation, and uncontrolled conversion of functions show that there is an insynchronization between legal norms and socio-economic realities on the ground. This condition causes agrarian inequality to widen and the goal of agrarian reform is difficult to achieve.

This situation emphasizes the need for a more firm, fair, and farmer-friendly agrarian policy reform and national food sustainability. Research on the obligation of rights holders to manage their own agricultural land is becoming increasingly relevant because the effectiveness of direct management by owners is key to suppressing absentee land practices, preventing speculation, and ensuring that the social function of the land runs as mandated by the UUPA. Thus, strengthening regulations, increasing supervision, and consistent law enforcement are important steps to realize a fair and sustainable agrarian system in Indonesia.

Based on the background of the problems that have been described earlier, this research is formulated to answer two main problems. First, this study examines how to regulate the obligation for holders of agricultural land rights to

manage their land directly as regulated in laws and regulations in Indonesia. Second, this study analyzes the legal consequences that arise for holders of agricultural land rights who do not carry out the obligation to manage the agricultural land on their own in accordance with the applicable legal provisions.

In line with the formulation of this problem, this study aims to comprehensively analyze and identify legal arrangements regarding the obligation to manage agricultural land itself in the national agrarian law system. In addition, this study also aims to identify and analyze in depth the consequences of the laws imposed on holders of agricultural land rights who do not carry out their land management obligations directly, both from the legal aspect of land administration and from the perspective of protecting the public interest and social justice.

Analytically, this study departs from the assumption that the obligation to manage agricultural land itself is a legal instrument designed to prevent speculative land ownership practices and control of agricultural land by parties who do not actively cultivate the land. This arrangement has a close correlation with the goals of agrarian reform and the principle of social function of land rights, which place land not only as an economic object, but also as a means of fulfilling the welfare of the community, especially farmers. Therefore, this study analyzes how these legal norms are formulated, implemented, and enforced in practice.

METHOD

This research uses normative or doctrinal legal research methods that focus on the assessment of positive legal norms that regulate the obligations of agricultural land management by land rights holders. This approach places law as a norm (*das sollen*) by examining laws and regulations, legal principles, doctrines of experts, and relevant court decisions in the field of agrarian affairs. The approach used includes a statute approach to assess the consistency, hierarchy, and substance of land law regulation, as well as a conceptual approach to understand the concepts, principles, and legal doctrines underlying agricultural land management obligations. Through the combination of these two approaches, this research is directed to obtain a comprehensive understanding of the national agrarian law framework and its implementation problems. (Yanova et al., 2023)

The sources of legal materials in this study consist of primary legal materials in the form of relevant laws and regulations, secondary legal materials in the form of scientific literature, books, and legal journals, and tertiary legal materials that support the accuracy of legal terms. The collection of legal materials is carried out through literature studies and systematic document studies. Furthermore, the collected legal materials are analyzed using a descriptive method to explain legal norms objectively and prescriptively to formulate arguments and normative recommendations related to the implementation of agricultural land management obligations. With this method, the research is expected to be able to produce a structured, argumentative legal analysis, as well as make a theoretical and practical contribution to the development of agrarian law in Indonesia.

RESULT AND DISCUSSIONS

Regulation of the Obligation to Manage Own Agricultural Land in Legislation in Indonesia

In a broader framework, the UUPA contains the concept of the Right to Control from the State (HMN) which gives full authority to the state to regulate the legal relationship between the community and land. The state is not positioned as the owner of the land, but as a regulator who ensures that the land is used according to the principles of social justice. Through HMN, the state determines the designation, use, utilization, and procurement of land for development needs. This authority also includes the reorganization of unjust land tenure through land reform programs, such as excessive land ownership restrictions, absentee land ownership bans, and land redistribution to landless farmers. This norm was born from the need to change the unequal colonial agrarian structure, so that the UUPA abolished the dualism of agrarian law between the western system and customary law, and replaced it with a single national legal system rooted in the personality of the Indonesian nation.

The normative foundation in the UUPA cannot be separated from the historical purpose of the formation of this law, which is to create a just agrarian order after a long period of inequality inherited by colonial agrarian politics. The UUPA exists as a structural correction to unequal land tenure, so that the norms in it are designed to be not only regulative, but also transformative. Norms regarding social function, HMN, equal rights, and land reform work in an

integrated manner to direct land use to support the equitable distribution of social welfare. (Main, 2024, 2023; Wibawa & Widiatedja, 2025)

The implementation of the UUPA also shows that the state has a strategic role in balancing development needs with the protection of people's rights. Through HMN, the state can regulate and coach so that land is used optimally, but still within the framework of social justice as the main ideal. This makes the UUPA not only relevant in the context of the 1960s, but also continues to be the main reference in formulating modern land policies that are responsive to the economic and social dynamics of society. (Ramisan, 2023; Ratu, 2022)

Thus, the normative foundation of the UUPA is a foundation that strengthens the character of national agrarian law which is characterized by populism, justice, and benefit-oriented. These normative elements form a unity of ideas that view land as a source of life that must be maintained, regulated, and utilized for common prosperity. The following is a chart that describes the structure of the basic principles of the UUPA and their relationship to the articles on which it is based. This chart helps illustrate that each principle in the UUPA is interrelated and forms a systemic unity in regulating the relationship between the state, society, and land. With this visualization, the understanding of the normative structure of the UUPA is expected to become clearer, more directed, and easy to analyze in academic and practical contexts as shown in the figure below:



Figure 2. Prohibition of Absentee Land Ownership

The prohibition of absentee agricultural land ownership is one of the important instruments in the national agrarian policy built through the Basic Agrarian Law (UUPA). This provision was born as an effort by the state to ensure that agricultural land, as the source of people's livelihood, is managed directly by its owners and does not become the object of speculation or accumulation of assets by parties who do not live in the agricultural area. In the UUPA, especially Article 10 and Article 8 Paragraph (2), it is emphasized that every holder of land rights is obliged to actively cultivate his land, because land ownership is not only a right, but at the same time contains an obligation to use it for the common good. The principle of direct land use is a manifestation of the principle of land social function, namely that land must provide the greatest benefits for individual owners and the wider community. (Kusumawati et al., 2023; Zechariah, 2024)

The presence of landowners in agricultural sites is an important element because direct involvement in land management is believed to increase productivity, maintain land sustainability, and foster a sense of responsibility for the preservation of agrarian resources. Agrarian experts consider that the absence of owners in the management

process causes the soil to tend to be less attentive, susceptible to damage, and not developed optimally. In addition, from a social perspective, the prohibition of absentee land ownership helps to maintain harmonious, fair, and proportionate relations between landowners and farmers, as well as reduce the practice of exploitation through the land lease system that harms smallholders. Before PP 28/1974 was implemented, many areas experienced inequality in land tenure, where agricultural land was owned by urban people who were not involved in agricultural activities. The practice causes structural injustice because the cultivating farmer has no certainty, while the absentee owner makes a profit without contributing to the development of the village. This ban then became the state's strategy in building economic equity, especially because the agricultural sector is a strategic sector that supports the lives of most rural people. (Anandari et al., 2023; Limbong et al., 2022)

Legal Consequences for Land Rights Holders Who Do Not Carry Out the Obligation to Manage Their Own Agricultural Land

The implementation of these sanctions is also related to the state's authority to regulate the control of agrarian resources. The state does not arbitrarily remove property rights, but provides restrictions to ensure that land does not become a passive means of wealth accumulation. This principle is regulated so that land ownership remains harmonious with national development goals. In a practical context, the application of sanctions often involves a series of negotiations and clarifications between landowners, village governments, and land offices. The state does not necessarily impose severe sanctions without going through a lengthy process that ensures procedural justice. Therefore, the administrative process becomes a bridge between legal norms and the reality on the ground. The sanctions process also shows the state's prudence in handling agrarian disputes. Supervision is carried out in a gradual, transparent manner, and involves landowners so that their rights are respected.

However, the state still adheres to the principle that land must be used productively and directly by its owners. The obligation to cultivate oneself and the sanctions related to it function to maintain a fair and sustainable agrarian order. Uncultivated land has the potential to become the root of conflict, both between farmers and between the community and its owners. With strict sanctions, the state ensures that agrarian order is maintained. The implementation of these sanctions also reflects the paradigm that land is an important part of the life system of the village community. Therefore, land management is not only economically valuable, but also a symbol of social responsibility. Negligent landowners lose their social role in the community. In development studies, sanctions for violations of the obligation to cultivate themselves can be seen as an instrument to encourage better land governance. Directly managed land is more likely to lead to sustainable production, soil rehabilitation, and increased agricultural yields. That is why the state pays great attention to this obligation. Ultimately, the administrative sanctions imposed show that the state is committed to maintaining a balance between the rights and obligations of landowners. The owner has the right to the land, but is also obliged to ensure that the land is used according to its purpose. The harmony between rights and obligations is the basis of all Indonesian agrarian policies. (Chandra et al., 2024; Gunawan et al., 2023; Hidayatulloh et al., 2023)

This norm is further affirmed in various implementing regulations, such as PP 224/1961 and PP 41/1964, both of which provide comprehensive guidelines on procedures for resolving violations of the obligation to work on their own. The regulation contains administrative mechanisms that must be taken before the state can take more decisive corrective action. Thus, the examination process is carried out carefully to ensure that the state's actions are not arbitrary. One important aspect of such a mechanism is the determination of absentee land as a direct consequence of the owner's absence in managing his land.

Absentee land is considered a form of control that does not meet the principles of social function because the owner does not live in the area where the land is located. Through this provision, the state seeks to bring order to the pattern of land tenure that has the potential to cause agrarian inequality. In practice, the regulation of absentee land is provided through a ministerial regulation, which contains details of the distance of the owner's residence from the land under control as well as other administrative requirements. This provision is intended to prevent passive land possession that only aims at asset accumulation. Due to the strategic nature of the land, the owner must have direct involvement in its management so that the land remains productive. If the owner does not meet these conditions, then

the land can be declared as an object of land reform, which allows the government to redistribute it to farmers who are more in need. This redistribution is not only a sanction, but a step to improve the agrarian structure that is considered unfair or inefficient. Thus, the absence arrangement is an important instrument in realizing equitable land tenure. (Anggita & Putra, 2022; Safik & Ewinda, 2023; Tamy, 2025)

The state also has the right to take intensive monitoring measures if indications are found that the landowner is not carrying out his obligations properly. Supervision is carried out administratively and factually through field surveys and recording of agricultural activities. This stage forms the basis for further assessment of whether the obligation to work the land has been breached. When oversight shows that land is not being managed as intended, the state can provide an administrative warning as a first step. The warning is a coaching phase for owners so that they understand that land management is a legal obligation.

The existence of structured tables and provisions regarding legal consequences makes it easier for implementing officials and the public to understand the forms of sanctions available. The certainty of this information reduces the potential for misunderstandings in the implementation of agrarian policies. Below is a brief table of the types of violations and their legal consequences.

Table 1. Types of Violations and Their Legal Consequences in Agrarian Provisions

Types of Violations	Legal Basis	Legal Consequences	Remarks
Not working the soil according to the provisions	Article 10 paragraph (2) UUPA	State administrative actions	Construction included and field inspection
Absentee land	PP 224/1961, PP 41/1964, Regulation of the Minister of Agrarian Affairs	Designation as Objects <i>Land reform</i>	Redistributed to eligible farmers
Transferring land without permission	PP 224/1961	Cancellation of redirects, administrative sanctions	Supervision is carried out by the Land Office
Not complying with the reprimand	PP 224/1961	Restrictions and suspension of rights	Become Policy Revocation
Ongoing violations	PP 41/1964	Revocation of land rights	Soil become an object of redistribution

In the table above, we can find out about the provisions regarding legal consequences in the UUPA and its derivative regulations, showing the seriousness of the state in maintaining agricultural land as an instrument of equity and welfare. Through various systematically structured sanctions, the state ensures that land rights are not separated from their productivity obligations and social functions.

Legal Consequences of the Obligation of Right Holders to Manage Their Own Agricultural Land

The next legal consequence that is allowed is the determination of land as absentee land. Agricultural land owned by a person who lives outside the sub-district where the land is located and does not manage it directly can be declared as absentee land. The legal consequence is the obligation to relinquish rights to the state or transfer them to a qualified subject. This provision has a strong basis in Article 3 of Government Regulation Number 224 of 1961 and

detailed in the Regulation of the Minister of ATR/BPN Number 18 of 2016 concerning the Control of Agricultural Land Control.

The determination of absentee land is seen as legitimate because it aims to prevent passive and speculative land possession which is contrary to the principle of agrarian justice. In addition, restrictions on land rights are also legal consequences. These restrictions can be in the form of a prohibition on the transfer of rights, suspension of land services, or placement of land in special supervisory status. The juridical basis is found in Article 7 and Article 17 of the UUPA, which give the state the authority to prevent the accumulation of land control and ensure the suitability of land use with its function. This restriction of rights is temporary and aims to encourage the owner to return to complying with his obligations. (Erwandi et al., 2023; Grounds, 2022; Ningtyas, 2023)

The most severe legal consequence but still allowed is the revocation or cancellation of land rights. In the event that agricultural land is proven to be abandoned or the obligation to cultivate it itself is specifically regulated in Government Regulation Number 11 of 2010 concerning the Control and Utilization of Abandoned Land, which requires the stages of identification, warning, evaluation, and determination in advance. The revocation of rights in this context is not seen as a deprivation, but rather as a legal consequence of the owner's failure to perform the social function of his rights.

After the rights are revoked or relinquished, the redistribution of land to the cultivator farmer is a result of further legislation that is also allowed. This redistribution is carried out based on Government Regulation Number 224 of 1961 and is strengthened by the agrarian reform policy as stipulated in the Regulation of the Minister of ATR/BPN Number 12 of 2019. Redistribution aims to improve the land tenure structure and provide legal certainty for small farmers, so that it is in line with the mandate of Article 33 paragraph (3) of the 1945 Constitution. (Adinegoro, 2023; Ramadhan et al., 2022)

Consequences of Unjustified Laws

In contrast to permissible legal consequences, legal consequences that are not allowed are the actions of the state or land officials that have no legal basis, violate procedures, or are contrary to the principles of human rights protection and legal certainty. One form of legal consequences that is not allowed is the seizure or takeover of land unilaterally without going through legal administrative procedures. This kind of action is contrary to the principle of due process of law and violates the principle of the rule of law as guaranteed in Article 28D paragraph (1) of the 1945 Constitution.

Another legal consequence that is not allowed is the revocation of land rights without prior warning. PP 224/1961 and PP 11/2010 expressly require the existence of stages of coaching and warning before the state imposes severe sanctions. The revocation of rights carried out directly without these stages is a procedural defective action and can be qualified as an unlawful act by government agencies and/or officials (*onrechtmatige overheidsdaad*). In addition, land expropriation without proper compensation is also a legal consequence that is not allowed. In the mechanism of disentanglement or redistribution of absentee land, the law still requires compensation according to the provisions. This is in line with the view of Maria S.W. Sumardjono who emphasized that the social function of land does not remove the protection of individual rights holders. Therefore, the expropriation of land without compensation is a violation of the principle of justice. (Polontalo et al., 2023; Suzana, 2024)

The next legal consequence that is not allowed is the criminalization of landowners solely for not cultivating their own land, as long as there is no element of special criminal acts regulated in the law. Agrarian law basically places the violation of the obligation to work on oneself as an administrative violation, not a criminal act. Therefore, criminalization without a clear basis in criminal law is contrary to the principle of legality (*nullum crimen sine lege*). Finally, the determination of land as absentee land or abandoned land without factual examination and field verification is also a legal consequence that is not allowed. Unilateral determinations that are only based on administrative data without looking at real conditions on the ground have the potential to cause injustice and agrarian conflicts. Therefore, the law requires the involvement of local governments, village officials, and land offices in the verification process.

Thus, it can be affirmed that Indonesia's agrarian law clearly limits the state's space for action in imposing legal consequences for violations of the obligation to manage agricultural land. The state is allowed to impose administrative sanctions that are gradual, proportional, and oriented towards the restoration of the social function of the land. On the other hand, the state is not allowed to act arbitrarily, violate procedures, or deprive the owner of the rights without a clear legal basis. This distinction reflects the balance between state authority and the protection of landowners' rights, which is a hallmark of the national agrarian legal system.

CONCLUSION

The regulation of the obligation to manage one's own agricultural land in the Indonesian agrarian law system rests on the principle of the social function of land rights, as affirmed in Articles 6 and 10 of the Basic Agrarian Law. The provision emphasizes that the right to land is not absolute, but rather an obligation to use it actively, productively, and oriented towards the prosperity of the people. The prohibition of absentee agricultural land ownership, the setting of maximum land tenure limits, and land reform policies demonstrate the state's commitment to prevent land neglect, concentration of tenure, and speculative practices that are detrimental to the farming community. All of these norms form a legal framework that places land as an instrument of social justice and agrarian sustainability.

The results of the study also show that the state not only builds normative regulations, but also provides a mechanism for monitoring and controlling the use of agricultural land. The role of the government through land administration and law enforcement is a key factor in ensuring that land management obligations are implemented effectively. This mechanism serves to ensure the suitability of land use with its designation and maintain a balance between individual interests, social interests, and environmental sustainability. Thus, the obligation to manage agricultural land itself is an integral part of the agrarian resource management system that is oriented towards legal certainty and distributive justice.

The legal consequences for land rights holders who do not carry out the obligation to manage agricultural land themselves emphasizes that every land right is always accompanied by social responsibility. Violations of these obligations, whether in the form of land abandonment, absentee possession, or use that is not in accordance with the designation, can lead to administrative sanctions in the form of warnings, freezes, and revocation of land rights. This regulation of legal consequences functions not only as a repressive instrument, but also as a preventive and educational means to enforce the social function of the land. These findings confirm that the enforcement of agricultural land management obligations itself is an important instrument in realizing agrarian justice and sustainable land use in Indonesia.

REFERENCES

- Adinegoro, K. R. R. (2023). Analisis Yuridis Pemberian Hak Atas Tanah di Sempadan Pantai. *Jurnal Pertanahan*, 13(2), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.53686/jp.v13i2.231>
- Anandari, D. H., Sulistiyono, A., & Suraji, S. (2023, December 9). Urgensi Penyuluhan Masyarakat tentang Peralihan Hak atas Tanah untuk Mengurangi Sengketa Kepemilikan Hak atas Tanah. *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Pengabdian Masyarakat*. <https://doi.org/10.61142/psnpm.v1.95>
- Anggita, V. D., & Putra, M. F. M. (2022). Implikasi Hak Atas Tanah yang Diperoleh Secara Melawan Hukum. *Jurnal USM Law Review*, 5(2), 782–795. <https://doi.org/10.26623/julr.v5i2.5724>
- Chandra, I., Salim, A., & Isnaeni, B. (2024). Tanggung Jawab PPAT terhadap Pendaftaran Peralihan Hak Atas Tanah yang Menjadi Objek Sengketa Ditinjau dari PP Nomor 24 Tahun 2016. *J-CEKI : Jurnal Cendekia Ilmiah*, 3(5), 3743–3764. <https://doi.org/10.56799/JCEKI.V3I5.4770>
- Erwandi, M., Arba, A., & Putro, W. D. (2023). Penegakan Hukum terhadap Penelantaran Hak Guna Bangunan (HGB) oleh Pemegang Hak. *Jurnal Risalah Kenotariatan*, 4(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.29303/risalahkenotariatan.v4i1.95>
- Fanggi, P. A. L., Tresna, L. P., & Muhammad, A. S. (2025). Pembaharuan Aturan Larangan Kepemilikan Tanah Pertanian Secara Absentee di Indonesia. *Private Law*, 5(2), 407–416. <https://doi.org/10.29303/PRLW.V5I2.7212>

- Gunawan, A., Wardani, W. Y., & Heryanti, F. (2023). Peningkatan Pendapatan Petani Penggarap dalam Transaksi Maro pada Tanah Pertanian. *Jurnal Kabar Masyarakat*, 1(2), 159–156. <https://doi.org/10.54066/jkb.v1i3.732>
- Hidayatulloh, F., Ningtyas, M. A., Ardiansyach, T. S., Maulana, W., Rohmatullah, & Bachtiar, B. (2023). Cacat Hukum dalam Peralihan Hak Atas Tanah. *Iuris Notitia: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum*, 1(1), 20–27. <https://doi.org/10.69916/iuris.v1i1.44>
- Kusumawati, N. L. P. E., Wijaya, K. K. A., & Suryani, L. P. (2023). Pola Penggarapan Tanah Pertanian Absentee di Desa Kintamani Kecamatan Kintamani Kabupaten Bangli. *Jurnal Analogi Hukum*, 5(1), 41–47. <https://doi.org/10.22225/AH.5.1.2023.41-47>
- Landasan, S. (2022). Ganti Rugi Hak Atas Tanah oleh Pemegang Izin Usaha Penyediaan Tenaga Listrik Berdasarkan Undang-Undang Nomor 30 Tahun 2009 tentang Ketenagalistrikan. *Lex Privatum*, 10(2), 1–10. <https://ejournal.unsrat.ac.id/v3/index.php/lexprivatum/article/view/40387>
- Limbong, T. M., Dewi, A. T., & Sitompul, R. M. (2022). Tanggung Jawab PPAT atas Bea Perolehan Hak atas Tanah dan Bangunan (BPHTB) pada Akta Jual Beli Tanah dan Bangunan di Kota Medan. *Law Jurnal*, 3(1), 57–69. <https://doi.org/10.46576/lj.v3i1.2297>
- Nabila, A. P., Silviana, A., & Triyono, T. (2025). Dampak Kebijakan Badan Bank Tanah dalam Pengelolaan Tanah di Kecamatan Sepaku Kabupaten Penajam Paser Utara. *Diponegoro Law Journal*, 14(4), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.14710/DLJ.2025.52421>
- Ningtyas, D. C. A. (2023). Hak Atas Tanah Sebagai Dasar Pembuktian bagi Pemiliknya dalam Hukum Agraria yang di Dasari UUPA. *Court Review: Jurnal Penelitian Hukum*, 3(1), 28–35. <https://doi.org/10.69957/cr.v3i01.698>
- Nurhadi, N., Hendri, H., & Almadison, A. (2022). Efektifitas Hukum terhadap Kepemilikan Tanah Pertanian Berdasarkan Keputusan Menteri Negara Agraria Nomor: 134/Hpl/Bpn/Tahun 1993 Tentang Pemberian Hak Pengelolaan Atas Nama Transmigrasi dan Pemukiman Perambah Hutan. *Nusantara: Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Ilmu Sosial*, 4(2), 27–44. <https://doi.org/10.36088/NUSANTARA.V4I2.2092>
- Pinontoan, E. S. G., Muaja, H. S., & Gerungan, C. A. (2024). Pengaturan Tanah Guntai dan Hak Kepemilikan Tanah di Sulawesi Utara dan Akibat Hukumnya Ditinjau dari Undang-Undang Nomor 5 Tahun 1960. *Lex Privatum*, 13(3), 1–10. <https://ejournal.unsrat.ac.id/v3/index.php/lexprivatum/article/view/54772>
- Polontalo, E. M. R., Kasim, N. M., & Thalib, M. Ch. (2023). Kedudukan Hukum serta Akibatnya antara Peralihan Hak Atas Tanah Melalui Kwitansi Jual Beli dengan Hibah Wasiat (Studi Sengketa di Desa Tabumela Kecamatan Tilango, Kabupaten Gorontalo). *Jurnal Kewarganegaraan*, 7(1), 751–762. <https://doi.org/10.31316/JK.V7I1.4912>
- Ramadhan, A. R., Muntaqo, F., & Rumesten, I. (2022). Penertiban Tanah Terlantar dalam Rangka Penatagunaan dan Pemanfaatan Tanah. *Repertorium: Jurnal Ilmiah Hukum Kenotariatan*, 11(1), 92–103. <https://doi.org/10.28946/RPT.V11I1.1799>
- Ramisan, J. M. (2023). Peralihan Hak Atas Tanah Negara Berdasarkan Prinsip Reforma Agraria Menurut Undang-Undang Nomor 5 Tahun 1960 tentang Peraturan Dasar Pokok-Pokok Agraria. *Lex Privatum*, 12(3), 1–10. <https://ejournal.unsrat.ac.id/v3/index.php/lexprivatum/article/view/52316>
- Ratu, R. (2022). Aspek Hukum Perjanjian Tukar Menukar (Barter) Tanah Hak Milik. *Lex Crimen*, 11(2), 1–10. <https://ejournal.unsrat.ac.id/v3/index.php/lexcrimen/article/view/38601>
- Safik, A., & Ewinda, M. (2023). Pengelolaan Tanah di Ibu Kota Negara IKN. *Jurnal Magister Ilmu Hukum*, 8(2), 50. <https://doi.org/10.36722/jmih.v8i2.2307>
- Suzana, M. V. (2024). Perlindungan Hukum terhadap Pemegang Izin Pemakaian Tanah Aset Pemerintah Kota Surabaya: Ditinjau dari Hak dan Kewajiban. *Media Hukum Indonesia (MHI)*, 2(3), 522. <https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.12592665>
- Tamy, F. R. (2025). Kewajiban Bea Perolehan Hak atas Tanah dan Bangunan bagi Penerima Hibah Wasiat Tanpa Peralihan Hak. *Jurnal Tana Mana*, 6(1), 211–228. <https://doi.org/10.33648/JTM.V6I1.947>
- Utama, M. R. (2024). Kewenangan PPAT dalam Pembuatan Akta Peralihan Hak Atas Tanah Melalui Jual Beli. *Grondwet*, 3(2), 72–83. <https://doi.org/10.61863/gr.v3i2.43>

- Utama, W. G. (2023). Perubahan Pola Penguasaan Lahan Pertanian di Sekitar Hutan Lindung Mbeliling Manggarai Barat. *Media Komunikasi Geografi*, 24(1), 29–44. <https://doi.org/10.23887/mkg.v24i1.57219>
- Wibawa, I. G. P. P., & Widiatedja, I. G. N. P. (2025). Hilangnya Lahan Sawah Dilindungi (LSD) Akibat Alih Fungsi Lahan di Atas Tanah Hak Milik. *Acta Comitas*, 10(2), 366–385. <https://doi.org/10.24843/AC.2025.v10.i02.p10>
- Yanova, M. H., Komarudin, P., & Hadi, H. (2023). Metode Penelitian Hukum: Analisis Problematika Hukum dengan Metode Penelitian Normatif dan Empiris. *Badamai Law Journal*, 8(2), 394–408. <https://doi.org/10.32801/DAMAI.V8I2.17423>
- Zacharias, V. J. (2024). Penyelesaian Sengketa Perdata tentang Tanah dalam Perspektif Hukum Agraria di Indonesia. *Journal of Indonesian Comparative of Syari'ah Law*, 7(1), 115–132. <https://doi.org/10.21111/jicl.v7i1.12342>