



Legal Vacancies Regarding Notarial Deeds Made In Foreign Languages Without Official Translation And Their Implications for The Validity Of The Deed

***Titin Hartati, Ahmad Redi**

Universitas Borobudur, Indonesia

*Email: titinhartati42@gmail.com, ahmad_redi@borobudur.ac.id

Abstract

In accordance with Article 43 of Law Number 2 of 2014 concerning Amendments to Law Number 30 of 2004 concerning the Position of Notary (UUJN), this study investigates the legal gaps pertaining to the drafting of notarial deeds in foreign languages without an official translation. This phenomenon often occurs in transactions involving foreign parties or cross-border transactions. Although the UUJN stipulates that deeds must be prepared in Indonesian and, if the parties do not understand Indonesian, an official translation must be provided, there are no detailed regulations regarding the legal consequences if this provision is ignored. As a result, legal uncertainty arises that has the potential to reduce the validity of the deed from an authentic deed to a private deed, even triggering the cancellation of the deed in a dispute. This study outlines the existing regulations, identifies the legal gaps, and analyzes their implications from the perspectives of civil law, administrative law, protection of foreign parties, and legal risks for notaries. Several case studies and court decisions indicate differing interpretations regarding the validity of foreign-language deeds without an official translation, indicating the need for clear technical guidelines. Recommendations include revising the UUJN or issuing implementing regulations by the Ministry of Law and Human Rights, as well as implementing the precautionary principle by notaries through sworn translators to ensure legal protection and certainty for the parties. The results are expected to provide an academic basis for policymakers in strengthening regulations governing the language used in notarial deeds.

Keywords: Notarial Deed; Foreign Language; Official Translation; Legal Vacancy; Validity of Deed.

Abstrak

Sesuai dengan Pasal 43 Undang-Undang Nomor 2 Tahun 2014 tentang Perubahan Atas Undang-Undang Nomor 30 Tahun 2004 tentang Jabatan Notaris (UUJN), penelitian ini menyelidiki kesenjangan hukum yang berkaitan dengan penyusunan akta notaris dalam bahasa asing tanpa terjemahan resmi. Fenomena ini sering terjadi pada transaksi yang melibatkan pihak asing atau transaksi lintas batas. Meskipun UUJN menetapkan bahwa akta harus disusun dalam bahasa Indonesia dan, jika para pihak tidak memahami bahasa Indonesia, terjemahan resmi harus disediakan, tidak ada peraturan rinci mengenai konsekuensi hukum jika ketentuan ini diabaikan. Akibatnya, timbul ketidakpastian hukum yang berpotensi mengurangi keabsahan akta dari akta otentik menjadi akta privat, bahkan memicu pembatalan akta dalam suatu sengketa. Penelitian ini menguraikan peraturan yang ada, mengidentifikasi kesenjangan hukum, dan menganalisis implikasinya dari perspektif hukum perdata, hukum administrasi, perlindungan pihak asing, dan risiko hukum bagi notaris. Beberapa studi kasus dan putusan pengadilan menunjukkan interpretasi yang berbeda mengenai keabsahan akta bahasa asing tanpa terjemahan resmi, yang menunjukkan perlunya pedoman teknis yang jelas. Rekomendasi tersebut antara lain revisi UUJN atau menerbitkan peraturan pelaksana oleh Kementerian Hukum dan HAM, serta menerapkan prinsip kehati-hatian oleh notaris melalui penerjemah tersumpah untuk menjamin perlindungan dan kepastian hukum bagi para pihak. Hasilnya diharapkan dapat memberikan landasan akademis bagi pembuat kebijakan dalam memperkuat regulasi yang mengatur bahasa yang digunakan dalam akta notaris.

Kata Kunci: Akta Notaris; Bahasa Asing; Terjemahan Resmi; Kekosongan Hukum; Keabsahan Akta.

INTRODUCTION

The role of a notary as a public official is expressly regulated in Article 1, paragraph (1) of Law No. 2 of 2014, which affirms their authority to issue authentic deeds (Nurjanah, 2023). Authentic deeds hold a crucial position in civil law because they provide legal certainty and complete evidentiary force for the parties (Taliwongso, 2022). Field observations indicate that transactions involving foreign parties often require the issuance of deeds in a foreign language for easy understanding by the parties concerned. This situation presents a unique challenge when statutory provisions do not specifically regulate the procedures for using foreign languages in deeds (Budiman, 2024). As a result, interpretations of existing provisions can vary and potentially give rise to legal issues.

The authority of a notary is regulated in Article 15 of Law No. 2 of 2014, which covers the issuance of authentic deeds for various legal purposes of the parties (Cahayani, 2024). In exercising this authority, a notary must ensure that the deed they create meets all formal and material requirements as stipulated by law (Sirait, 2023). Creating a deed in a foreign language can raise questions about its validity if it is not accompanied by clear provisions regarding translation (Mayshinta, 2024). The validity of a deed is determined not only by its form and content, but also by the parties' ability to understand the substance contained therein. When the parties do not understand the language of the deed, the potential for disputes and cancellation of the deed increases.

According to Article 1868 of the Civil Code, an authentic deed is one that has been prepared by a legally mandated official or in front of one (Dalimunthe, 2023). The linguistic element in creating a deed is closely related to compliance with the statutory form. If the language used is incomprehensible to one of the parties without an official translation, the formal elements of the deed can be questioned (Akbar, 2021). This situation is further complicated if there are no detailed regulations governing the use of foreign languages in notarial deeds. The potential for a deed to be downgraded to a private deed is also a real threat.

Article 43 of the UUJN explicitly states that notarial deeds must be drawn up in Indonesian. If the parties do not understand Indonesian, the notary is required to translate or explain the contents of the deed into a language they understand (Keristion, 2025). This translation can be performed by an official or sworn translator present during the deed-making process. Despite this provision, the consequences of not providing an official translation are not further elaborated. This creates potential uncertainty in assessing the validity of a deed drawn up entirely in a foreign language.

The distinction between the terms "official translation" and "translation by a sworn translator" often leads to confusion in the field. An official translation typically refers to a translation that is legally recognized and legalized according to procedures. A translation by a sworn translator has formal authority recognized by the state based on a decree of appointment from the Ministry of Law and Human Rights (Anjani et al., 2024). The UUJN does not provide a clear definition of these two terms, allowing notaries to have varying interpretations in their application. This situation adds another layer of uncertainty to the practice of drafting foreign-language deeds.

The absence of explicit provisions in the UUJN regarding the legal consequences if a deed is drawn up entirely in a foreign language without an official translation presents a significant gap (Riansyah, 2024). This gap can lead to differing court decisions when similar cases are challenged. Judges may base their judgments on the principle of fairness and the fact that the parties understood the contents of the deed, or conversely, declare the deed invalid due to a violation of the statutory format. This situation demonstrates the

need for uniform legal guidelines to avoid uncertainty in decisions. Without clear regulations, notaries risk being caught in differing interpretations that are detrimental to all parties (Sidik, 2021).

The absence of technical guidelines from the Ministry of Law and Human Rights regarding the use of foreign languages in deeds exacerbates this legal vacuum (Alief, 2023). Technical guidelines should provide clear directions starting from translation procedures, forms of translation certification, and the obligation to include two languages in the deed. Without these guidelines, practice in the field is highly dependent on the policies of individual notaries, which can vary widely (Ellsya, 2020). This situation undermines the principle of uniformity in public services and can undermine public trust in notarial institutions. Standardization of procedures is essential to ensure legal certainty.

The 1945 Constitution's Article 1 Paragraph 3 and Article 28D Paragraph 1 both establish the notion of legal certainty, requires that every legal action have a clear regulatory basis (Neltje, 2023). Drafting a notarial deed in a foreign language without official translation guidelines creates uncertainty for the parties. This uncertainty can disrupt the stability of legal relationships that depend on the deed's validity (Wulandari, 2024). Legal certainty requires detailed and consistently enforceable regulations. Without them, the primary purpose of an authentic deed is diminished.

The principle of legal protection for the parties must also be met when drafting a deed (Yesi, 2023). Parties who do not understand the language of the deed without an official translation are vulnerable to abuse. Legal protection includes the right to fully understand the contents of a signed agreement or legal statement (Wijaya, 2023). As public officials, notaries have a moral and legal obligation to ensure this is fulfilled. Unclear regulations regarding translation can undermine this protection.

The legal vacuum theory explains that the absence of norms in a particular field creates room for uncertainty and conflict (Putra, 2024). The legal vacuum in the language aspect of notarial deeds involving foreign parties is a concrete example of this phenomenon. This situation allows for diverse practices in the field without clear guidelines from lawmakers. Resolving this legal vacuum can be done through the creation of new regulations or revisions to existing regulations. This step is crucial for restoring the function of authentic deeds as instruments that provide certainty and optimal legal protection.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study employs a normative juridical methodology that combines a conceptual approach with a statutory regulatory approach. The statutory regulatory approach is used to examine the applicable positive legal provisions, particularly Article 43 of Law Number 2 of 2014 concerning Amendments to Law Number 30 of 2004 concerning the Position of Notary (UUJN), Article 1868 of the Civil Code (KUHP_{perdata}), as well as other relevant provisions such as Article 1 paragraph (3) and Article 28D paragraph (1) of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia. Analysis of these norms is carried out to identify the extent to which current regulations regulate the use of foreign languages in the preparation of notarial deeds, including the obligation of official translation. The conceptual approach is used to explore and understand legal concepts related to authentic deeds, the principle of legal certainty, the principle of legal protection, and the theory of legal vacuum (*recht vacuum*). This approach allows researchers to link existing norms with abstract legal principles, so that they can formulate more comprehensive legal arguments. The research data sources were obtained through a literature review that included legislation, legal literature, jurisprudence, and expert

opinions. The results of this analysis are processed qualitatively by combining normative and conceptual findings to answer research problems and provide recommendations for regulatory improvements.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Analysis of Legal Regulations and Vacancies

Notarial deeds must be prepared in Indonesian, according to Article 43 of Law No. 2 of 2014 concerning Amendments to Law No. 30 of 2004 respecting the Position of Notary Public. The notary must translate or explain the terms of the deed into a language that the parties can understand if they are not familiar with Indonesian, which can be done by the notary themselves or through an official translator. This provision aims to ensure that the parties fully understand the substance of the deed before signing. Despite this provision, there is no detailed explanation of the translation procedure, format, or supporting documents that must be attached as proof of official translation. This situation creates a legal loophole that can result in differences in interpretation in the field.

The UUJN is not supplemented by implementing regulations specifically governing the mechanism for translating foreign-language deeds. The Ministry of Law and Human Rights has not issued a ministerial regulation or decree providing technical guidance on this procedure. The absence of implementing regulations forces notaries to rely on customs, internal policies, or guidelines that are not legally binding. This situation undermines the principle of uniformity in public services, as each notary can apply different procedures to similar cases. This uncertainty is very likely to give rise to legal issues later when the deed is disputed in court.

The language provisions for deeds in the UUJN are essentially intended to protect the rights of the parties and ensure that the deed can serve as authentic evidence in accordance with Article 1868 of the Civil Code. When these provisions are not accompanied by adequate technical regulations, the purpose of legal protection can be undermined. Notaries who draft deeds in a foreign language without official guidance risk facing lawsuits from parties who feel aggrieved due to their lack of understanding of the deed's contents. The potential for the deed to be annulled or downgraded to a private deed can have serious consequences. This demonstrates that the mere existence of norms is insufficient without the support of operational implementing regulations.

The legal vacuum is evident when a deed is drafted entirely in a foreign language without an official, legalized translation. The UUJN does regulate the obligation to translate, but it does not stipulate sanctions or legal consequences if these provisions are violated. This situation creates a gray area that can be exploited to justify the validity of a deed, despite the potential for misunderstanding by one of the parties. Without norms that clearly regulate the consequences, law enforcement officials and judges are faced with broad freedom of interpretation.

This gray area has implications for the potential for multiple interpretations when deeds are disputed in court. One judge may rule that a deed remains valid as long as the parties claim to understand its contents, while another judge may annul the deed because it does not comply with the format stipulated in Article 43 of the UUJN. This discrepancy can undermine the principle of legal certainty as mandated by Article 28D paragraph (1) of the 1945 Constitution. This situation can also create uncertainty for parties involved in cross-language agreements, particularly in the international business sector.

The absence of implementing regulations also places notaries in a legally vulnerable position. Article 85 of the UUJN regulates administrative sanctions for violations of official obligations, but does not explicitly mention sanctions for notaries who prepare

foreign-language deeds without an official translation. This gap makes oversight of this practice weak and difficult to enforce. This situation has the potential to lower the standard of professionalism of notaries in exercising their authority as public officials.

Several disputes over the validity of notarial deeds prepared in foreign languages without an official translation demonstrate the complexity of enforcing legal norms. For instance, PT Bangun Karya Pratama Lestari and Nine AM Ltd. filed a complaint against BKPL for nullity in the Loan Agreement case since the agreement was only written in English and lacked an Indonesian equivalent. The agreement was deemed unlawful and void by the West Jakarta District Court due to the noncompliance with the requirement to use Indonesian as outlined in Article 31 of Law No. 24 of 2009 concerning the National Flag, Language, and Emblem, as well as the National Anthem (Nofriandi, 2021). Given that using Indonesian in agreements involving Indonesian parties is essential, the DKI Jakarta High Court and the Supreme Court later confirmed the ruling and denied the foreign party's appeal. This decision demonstrates how courts can rely on formal norms, even though the substance of the agreement has been agreed upon by the parties.

Different approaches also emerged in other disputes, resulting in differing decisions based on interpretations of formal norms versus the substantive elements of the contract. In some cases, judges rejected arguments for annulment solely due to the lack of an Indonesian language version, arguing that the valid conditions for an agreement focus more on material elements such as a lawful cause, the parties' agreement, and a clear object, as stipulated in Article 1320 of the Civil Code—rather than solely the language used. This position demonstrates the multiple interpretations of linguistic norms by law enforcement officials and judges, leading to legal uncertainty and inconsistent decisions. The absence of standard rules often results in dispute resolution based on language preferences, rather than the certainty of written rules.

This legal vacuum also has the potential to create obstacles in international legal relations. Foreign parties wishing to transact in Indonesia may lose confidence if there is no guarantee that the legal documents they sign are legally binding. Deeds drawn up in a foreign language without an official translation can become grounds for foreign parties to file lawsuits or arbitration. The situation can undermine the investment climate and confidence in the national legal system. A solution to this legal vacuum could begin with the creation of implementing regulations that detail the procedures for using foreign languages in notarial deeds. These regulations should include the obligation to use a sworn translator, the translation format, the certification procedure, and administrative and civil sanctions for violations. This step would not only provide legal certainty but also enhance protection for the parties and maintain the professionalism of notaries. Clarifying norms would help avoid multiple interpretations and maintain the function of authentic deeds as a strong and reliable legal instrument.

Implications for the Validity of the Deed

According to Article 1868 of the Civil Code, a deed that is completely written in a foreign language without an official translation may not be considered authentic. According to this article, a deed prepared in the legally required format by or in front of an authorized public authority at the deed's location is considered authentic. If the linguistic criteria outlined in Article 43 of Law No. 2 of 2014 respecting Notaries are included in the intended form, failure to meet the language requirements can be considered a formal defect. Consequently, the deed may lose its authenticity and remain only a private deed, thus losing its evidentiary power.

The downgrade from an authentic deed to a private deed has serious implications for the parties. An authentic deed gives the parties and their successors full proof, as stated in Article 1870 of the Civil Code. Conversely, a private deed only has evidentiary power to the extent that it is acknowledged or not denied by the signing party (Article 1875 of the Civil Code). This situation can be exploited by the aggrieved party to renege on the agreed-upon deed, thus opening the opportunity for new disputes and prolonging the legal process.

The notary's administrative responsibilities in cases such as this are clearly regulated in Articles 67 to 69 of the UUJN. Article 67 emphasizes that supervision of notaries is conducted by a Supervisory Board established by the Minister of Law and Human Rights. Article 68 establishes the Supervisory Board's authority to investigate alleged violations by notaries, including violations of deed preparation procedures. Article 69 authorizes the Supervisory Board to impose administrative sanctions if violations are found. This may include of written or verbal warnings, temporary or permanent suspension, or both.

Neglecting the obligation to officially translate foreign-language deeds can also pose a risk of loss to foreign parties who do not master the language used. The principle of equality of parties, as guaranteed by Article 28D paragraph (1) of the 1945 Constitution, requires fair treatment and legal certainty. If the foreign party does not understand the contents of the deed, then the principle of good faith as regulated in Article 1338 paragraph (3) of the Civil Code can be considered to have been violated. This situation could strengthen the foreign party's argument to annul or challenge the validity of the deed in court.

The principle of informed consent, derived from the principle of free and conscious agreement in a contract, becomes relevant when the parties signing the deed do not fully understand its contents. Article 1320 of the Civil Code requires agreement as a valid element of an agreement. If agreement is reached without complete understanding due to language barriers, the subjective requirements of the agreement are not met, which can result in the deed being legally void or subject to cancellation at the request of the aggrieved party. It has the potential to undermine the deed's credibility as a valid legal document.

The legal risks faced by notaries in cases like this also include administrative sanctions as regulated in Article 85 of the UUJN. This article stipulates that notaries who violate the UUJN provisions may be subject to sanctions in the form of verbal warnings, written warnings, temporary suspension, honorable dismissal, or dishonorable dismissal. Violations of Article 43 of the UUJN regarding the language of the deed have the potential to fall into the category of procedural violations, which can trigger such sanctions, especially if the violation causes real losses to the parties.

In addition to administrative sanctions, there is also the potential for a claim for compensation against a notary public under Article 1365 of the Civil Code. This article stipulates that any unlawful act that results in loss to another person requires the perpetrator to compensate for that loss. If the notary's negligence in fulfilling the provisions of the deed language causes financial or legal losses to one of the parties, the notary can be sued in civil court to pay compensation.

These potential losses are not only material but also immaterial. Immaterial losses can include loss of business reputation, reduced trust from business partners, or loss of opportunities that are difficult to quantify in nominal terms. Article 1371 of the Civil Code provides a legal basis for claiming immaterial damages, although proving them is

more difficult than material losses. In the case of a foreign language deed without an official translation, proof of immaterial loss can be strengthened by evidence of loss of business opportunity or loss of contractual relationship.

The notary's obligation to provide maximum legal protection to all parties involved in making deeds is in line with the principle of prudence in the profession. Failure to comply with language provisions not only violates written norms but also the notary code of ethics, which requires services based on the principles of professionalism and responsibility. The Notary Honorary Council can assess this violation as an act that tarnishes the dignity of the position, thus increasing the ethical consequences received by the notary.

The need to apply strict sanctions to notaries who fail to comply with the provisions of the language of the deed aims to maintain the integrity of the notarial legal system. The provisions in the UUJN are not merely administrative but also serve as a preventive legal protection instrument for the parties. With clear and consistent sanctions, it is hoped that the practice of deed preparation will be carried out in accordance with legal standards, thereby reducing the potential for disputes and maintaining public trust in notarial institutions.

CONCLUSION

The legal vacuum regarding notarial deeds drawn up in a foreign language without an official translation is evident and has given rise to differing interpretations at both the practical and judicial levels. This situation poses a significant risk of legal uncertainty, particularly due to the lack of implementing regulations that specifically regulate the obligation for official translation, as mandated by Article 43 of Law No. 2 of 2014 concerning the Office of Notaries. The implications of this vacuum are serious, ranging from the degradation of the evidentiary power of an authentic deed to merely a private deed, to the potential for cancellation of the deed if it is proven that one of the parties does not understand the document's contents. This situation also places notaries vulnerable to administrative sanctions, claims for compensation under Article 1365 of the Civil Code, and even the risk of violating the professional code of ethics, which could impact their reputation and the sustainability of their practice.

Possible solutions include both regulatory and practical measures. From a regulatory perspective, a revision of the UUJN or the issuance of implementing regulations by the Ministry of Law and Human Rights is needed to establish standard procedures for official translations of deeds involving parties who do not speak Indonesian, including the obligation to use the services of a state-recognized sworn translator. In practice, notaries must exercise prudence by ensuring that every deed containing a foreign language is accompanied by a legally valid official translation. This approach will not only minimize the risk of disputes and provide legal protection for the parties but also maintain the integrity and credibility of the notary profession as a public official who plays a vital role in ensuring legal certainty in society.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Akbar, A. F. (2021). Peran Dan Tanggung Jawab Notaris Dalam Pembuatan Akta Perjanjian Dalam Bahasa Asing Berdasarkan Pasal 1338 Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Perdata Dan Undang-Undang Jabatan Notaris. *PALAR (Pakuan Law review)*, 7(3), 234–251.
- Alief, N. M. (2023). Tanggung Jawab Notaris dalam Proses Pembuatan Akta Otentik dengan Menggunakan Format Bahasa Asing (Studi Kasus Putusan Pengadilan Negeri Jakarta Barat Nomor 451/Pdt. G/2012/PN. *Jkt. Bar*). *UNES Law Review*, 6(1), 1695–1709.
- Anjani, M., Budiarta, I. N. P., & Renaya, N. (2024). Settings for Copies of Deeds Issued by Notaries in Agreements Between Indonesian Citizens and Foreign Citizens. *Journal of Political And Legal Sovereignty*, 2(3), 278–287.
- Budiman, A. B. (2024). Rekognisi Hukum Penggunaan Bahasa Asing dalam Pembuatan Akta Notaris Berdasarkan Ketentuan Hukum di Indonesia. *Syntax Idea*, 6(9), 3877–3896.
- Cahayani, D. (2024). Kewenangan Notaris Dalam Pembuatan Akta Otentik Berdasarkan Undang-Undang Nomor 2 Tahun 2014 Tentang Jabatan Notaris. *Jurnal Pendidikan Dasar dan Sosial Humaniora*, 3(10), 853–860.
- Dalimunthe, A. I. (2023). Sinkronisasi Pasal 1868 Kuhp Perdata Dalam Menunjang Terselenggaranya Konsep Cyber Notary Di Indonesia. *Journal of Innovation Research and Knowledge*, 3(3), 705–716.
- Ellsya, A. (2020). Tanggung Jawab Notaris Terhadap Akta Pendirian Perseroan Terbatas PT PFI Dengan Fasilitas Penanaman Modal Asing Yang Tidak Diterjemahkan Oleh Penerjemah Resmi. *Indonesian Notary*, 1(004).
- Keristion, K. (2025). Legal Certainty of Using Indonesian Language in Notarial Deeds. *JHK: Jurnal Hukum dan Keadilan*, 2(2), 63–75.
- Mayshinta, A. (2024). Keabsahan Perjanjian Berbahasa Inggris Tanpa Terjemahan Bahasa Indonesia. *DIVERSI: Jurnal Hukum*, 10(2), 326–357.
- Neltje, J. (2023). Nilai-Nilai Yang Tercakup Di Dalam Asas Kepastian Hukum. *Innovative: Journal of Social Science Research*, 3(5), 2034–2039.
- Nurjanah, A. (2023). Substansi Prinsip Profesionalisme Dalam Peran Notaris Sebagai Pejabat Umum Terhadap Pembuatan Akta Autentik. *Cakrawala Repositori IMWI*, 6(2), 1028–1036.
- Putra, W. P. (2024). Analisis Peranan Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi (KPK) Dalam Menanggulangi Tindak Korupsi Di Indonesia. *Legal Advice Journal of Law*, 1(1), 41–50.
- Riansyah, R. M. (2024). Perbandingan Profesi Notaris dan Implementasi Jurnal Notaris di Negara Bagian New York dan Protokol Notaris di Indonesia dalam Era Reformasi Teknologi. *PALAR (Pakuan Law review)*, 10(2), 43–66.
- Sidik, J. H. (2021). Peningkatan Pemahaman Bahasa Asing pada Perjanjian Akta Notaril Bagi Anggota Ikatan Notaris Indonesia Kabupaten Bandung. *Jurnal Pengabdian Tri Bhakti*, 3(1), 57–68.
- Sirait, G. N. (2023). Pertanggungjawaban Akta Notaris Sebagai Akta Autentik Sesuai Dengan Undang-Undang Jabatan Notaris. *Unes Law Review*, 5(4), 3363–3378.
- Taliwongso, C. A. (2022). Kedudukan Akta Otentik Sebagai Alat Bukti Dalam Persidangan Perdata Di Tinjau Dari Pasal 1870 KUH Perdata (Studi Kasus Putusan Nomor 347/Pdt. *Lex Administratum*, 10(2).

- Wijaya, V. C. (2023). Perlindungan Hukum Secara Keperdataan Bagi Klien Notaris Yang Mengalami Kerugian Akibat Diterbitkannya Akta Autentik Yang Cacat Hukum Oleh Notaris. *Acta Diurnal Jurnal Ilmu Hukum Kenotariatan*, 7(1), 15–30.
- Wulandari, A. R. (2024). KEWAJIBAN PENGGUNAAN BAHASA INDONESIA DALAM AKTA NOTARIS BERDASARKAN STUDI KASUS AMAR PUTUSAN PENGADILAN NEGERI JAKARTA BARAT NOMOR 451/PDT. G/2013/PN/JKT. *BRT. JURNAL ILMIAH NUSANTARA*, 1(5), 165–175.
- Yesi, F. (2023). Peran Notaris dalam Memberikan Penyuluhan Hukum untuk Memenuhi Asas Proporsionalitas dalam Akta Para Pihak. *Officium Notarium*, 3(1), 86–97.