



LAND DISPUTE RESOLUTION THROUGH LITIGATION IN THE STATE ADMINISTRATIVE COURT AND THE URGENCY OF ESTABLISHING A SPECIAL LAND COURT

Sandra Priyatama, Sulani, Elly Christanty Gautama

Universitas Sunan Giri Surabaya

correspondence: dr.sulani@gmail.com

Abstract

This research analyzes the constraints of land dispute resolution through litigation in the State Administrative Court and formulates the urgency of establishing a special land court. The normative juridical approach with descriptive analytical specification was employed through literature study of primary, secondary, and tertiary legal materials. The findings reveal that bureaucratic reform in the State Administrative Court encounters significant obstacles including overlapping authority with the General Court, unclear absolute competence, and weak execution of final and binding decisions. Land disputes arising from infrastructure development and public interest conflicts further complicate the litigation process. The existence of multiple decisions regarding a single land object indicates the need for a special court with its own procedural law. The special land court is expected to adjudicate disputes comprehensively with a single binding and executable decision. Strengthening judicial institutions through the establishment of a special court represents a strategic measure to realize legal certainty, justice, and good governance.

Keywords: land dispute, state administrative court, litigation, special court, legal certainty, execution of decision, bureaucratic reform

Introduction

Bureaucratic reform in Indonesia has been underway for more than sixteen years as a response to demands for changing the system of government from an authoritarian model toward democracy. This paradigm shift requires a thorough transformation in the structure and working mechanisms of the bureaucracy, including within judicial institutions. One of the institutions experiencing a significant impact from the reform is the State Administrative Court, which holds the function of supervising and adjudicating disputes arising from decisions made by government officials. The change in bureaucratic orientation from a conventional approach toward good governance requires the judicial institution to be capable of providing responsive, effective, and efficient legal services (Saputro et al., 2025). Such efficiency also presupposes organized and sustainable institutional resource management, as emphasized by Mardikaningsih and Nuraini (2022). The readiness of the judicial bureaucracy in responding to work dynamics in the digital era also constitutes an important factor for the success of reform, as noted by Darmawan (2023).

One of the forms of disputes frequently brought to the State Administrative Court is land disputes. These disputes stem from written decisions issued by state administrative bodies or officials in the form of land certificates that are concrete, individual, and final. Such decisions create legal ownership consequences that frequently trigger conflicts among parties claiming rights to the same land (Ari et al., 2024). The issue of redistributive injustice in land policy likewise influences the credibility of the institutions handling these disputes, as explained by Mohammad (2023). The continuously increasing volume of land dispute cases indicates that land issues represent a strategic matter requiring adequate legal handling, both through litigation in court and out-of-court settlement mechanisms.

In litigation practice within the State Administrative Court, land dispute resolution faces various procedural and substantive obstacles. Unclear legal status of land ownership constitutes one of the primary causes preventing disputes from being resolved thoroughly. In addition, court decisions that have obtained permanent legal force are frequently incapable of being executed due to overlapping authority between the

General Courts and the State Administrative Courts (Harahap & Harahap, 2024). Certainty regarding final decisions likewise serves as an important prerequisite in the judicial process, as asserted by Rawi et al. (2026). The litigation process is further complicated by the presence of multiple decisions concerning the same parcel of land, generated from lawsuits filed in various judicial forums with different legal bases. This condition demonstrates that the existing judicial system has not yet fully been able to provide legal certainty for disputing parties.

The inability of the judicial system to execute land dispute decisions creates serious implications for law enforcement and justice. Parties winning cases frequently cannot enjoy their rights because decisions cannot be genuinely implemented. This is caused by the characteristic of the State Administrative Court, which functions as an overseer of decision implementation rather than a direct executor (Hatta et al., 2024). The commitment of public officials in implementing decisions is closely related to the leadership pattern exercised within the institution, as outlined by Mardikaningsih et al. (2022). An ethical work culture likewise shapes the good faith of apparatuses in carrying out their legal obligations, as stated by Mardikaningsih et al. (2022b). The obligation to execute decisions actually rests upon the related government officials, meaning the effectiveness of decisions heavily depends on the commitment and good faith of public officials. This situation creates a legal loophole utilized by losing parties to avoid implementing decisions, rendering the purpose of litigation as a dispute resolution tool suboptimal.

The complexity of land disputes is further heightened by infrastructure development for public interest that frequently triggers disagreements concerning compensation and ownership rights. Parties entitled to receive compensation often reject the compensation offered, causing disputes to proceed to litigation. In this process, clashes occur between the public interest and individual rights, as well as between written law and living customary law within society. Customary figures who have long played an important role in resolving land disputes through deliberation are increasingly marginalized by strict legal formalism. As a result, dispute resolution through litigation frequently takes a long time, incurs high costs, and not uncommonly ends with dissatisfaction among the parties. The social inequality arising from

prolonged disputes also impacts the quality of life of affected communities, as conveyed by Nalin et al. (2022).

The existence of overlapping court decisions regarding a single land object also serves as an indication of weak coordination among judicial institutions and the absence of a specialized court possessing absolute authority in resolving land disputes. Hitherto, land disputes can be brought to the General Courts if concerning civil ownership, or to the State Administrative Courts if concerning the validity of land certificates. This duality of authority creates legal uncertainty and potentially generates contradictory decisions. In the litigation process, parties are frequently confronted with unclear forum choices, requiring judges to determine the absolute competence of the court themselves, which culminates in the dismissal of lawsuits or rejection of execution. The effectiveness of the legal system in guaranteeing equal rights for parties serves as a benchmark for public trust in the constitutional structure, as put forward by Rizky et al. (2021). This condition worsens public trust in the judicial system.

These various problems indicate that current litigation mechanisms have yet to become effective instruments for land dispute resolution. Institutional breakthroughs are required in the form of establishing a specialized land court possessing its own procedural law, equipped with competent judges, and supported by experts such as appraisers, translators, and land officers. The involvement of a workforce from various age groups within such institutional structures also needs to be considered to ensure inclusive implementation, as explained by Darmawan (2023). More flexible working patterns likewise provide opportunities for judicial institutions to optimize the performance of supporting experts, as outlined by Darmawan (2023). This specialized court is expected to adjudicate disputes comprehensively whether civil, criminal, or state administrative in nature with a single binding and executable decision. Consequently, the litigation process can proceed simply, swiftly, and at low cost in accordance with the simple justice principle mandated by law.

The data collection technique is carried out through library research by inventorying, identifying, and analyzing various written legal sources. Data analysis is conducted qualitatively using legal interpretation methods, namely grammatical interpretation and systematic interpretation (Hamzani et al., 2023). Grammatical interpretation is used to understand

the meaning of words or phrases in laws and regulations based on grammar, whereas systematic interpretation is carried out by connecting a regulation with other regulations within the overall legal system. The results of the analysis are then presented in the form of a systematic narrative to address the problems formulated in this research.

Method

This research uses a normative juridical approach with an analytical descriptive research specification. The normative juridical approach is carried out by examining library materials or secondary data consisting of primary legal materials, secondary legal materials, and tertiary legal materials. Primary legal materials include laws and regulations related to the State Administrative Court and land disputes, whereas secondary legal materials encompass literature, scientific journals, and relevant research results. Tertiary legal materials such as legal dictionaries and encyclopedias are used to clarify the understanding of legal terms used in the research.

The data collection technique is carried out through library research by inventorying, identifying, and analyzing various written legal sources. Data analysis is conducted qualitatively using legal interpretation methods, namely grammatical interpretation and systematic interpretation (Hamzani et al., 2023). Grammatical interpretation is used to understand the meaning of words or phrases in laws and regulations based on grammar, whereas systematic interpretation is carried out by connecting a regulation with other regulations within the overall legal system. The results of the analysis are then presented in the form of a systematic narrative to address the problems formulated in this research.

Result and Discussion

Dynamics of Bureaucratic Reform and the Challenges of the State Administrative Court

Bureaucratic reform in Indonesia has been underway for more than sixteen years as a response to changes in the system of government from an authoritarian model toward democracy. This paradigm shift requires a thorough transformation in the structure and working mechanisms of the bureaucracy, including within judicial institutions. The State Administrative Court, as an institution experiencing the impact of reform,

holds the function of supervising and adjudicating disputes arising from decisions made by government officials (Antoro, 2024). The change in bureaucratic orientation from a conventional approach toward good governance requires the judicial institution to be capable of providing responsive, effective, and efficient legal services. Nevertheless, in litigation practice, this institution still faces various obstacles that hamper the effectiveness of dispute resolution. The flexibility of human resource management constitutes one of the important prerequisites for judicial institutions to adjust to continuously developing public service demands, as put forward by Mardikaningsih (2025). The continuous arrangement of work processes likewise plays a role in supporting the operational performance of an institution, as outlined by Barzani et al. (2022).

The continuously increasing volume of land dispute cases is not matched by the court's capability to resolve cases according to established standards, resulting in a disparity between case burdens and resolution capacity. This condition indicates that bureaucratic reform within the judicial environment has not yet fully succeeded in overcoming the root problems within the state administrative judicial system. The primary problem of bureaucratic reform lies in human resources as bureaucratic implementers, ranging from leadership commitment to the quality and morality of human resources, including bureaucratic behavior and performance (Safitri & Susanto, 2024). The apparatus's capacity to adapt to change is likewise determined by each individual's self-efficacy in carrying out their duties, as explained by Mardikaningsih and Darmawan (2022). Numerous strategies have been launched to improve the bureaucratic system, yet the achieved results remain unsatisfactory. Even though innovation occurs within the culture of innovation and bureaucratic reform, the government's bureaucratic machine is obliged to follow established regulations.

In the public sector, innovation refers to the implementation of new ideas possessing the potential to impact governance, public policy, and public services. The public or government agencies have begun innovating by applying good governance to deliver quality services that are responsive, effective, efficient, and accountable within a state administrative court. The correlation between the implementation of e-government and the government relates to the basic objectives of public services, yet more

significantly by offering community services featuring fast work processes and the modernization of community services (Susanto, 2024). A culture of innovation balancing technological speed and humane considerations serves as the key to success in implementing new systems within public services, as asserted by Darmawan (2023a). Sound knowledge management likewise serves as an important asset for institutions to maintain excellence in executing their functions, as noted by Darmawan (2023b). With the advancement of information and communication technology, effective governance can be created. The paradigm shift in government bureaucracy makes information technology an unavoidable part of every process and resolution related to government administration.

The application of bureaucratic working styles utilizing information technology constitutes one of the characteristics of the changing times and the changing world. This working method creates a borderless bureaucracy presenting a new face for a bureaucracy that is no longer fully hierarchical (McSweeney, 2017). The shift toward increasingly modern working patterns does not necessarily erase old values and habits still held by certain circles, as depicted by Amri and Khayru (2022). The continuous evolution of information technology and global economic competitiveness likewise influence transformations across various sectors, including the public sector. The change in the political system from the New Order era to the reform era has generated new dynamics in the administration of government, where single-majority dominance is no longer an inherent characteristic of Indonesia's political system. The orientation and ideology of the bureaucratic system and government administration changed drastically after the collapse of the New Order regime, bringing significant implications for the administration of state administrative justice (Rahmat et al., 2024).

The government has undertaken various initiatives to improve the bureaucratic system previously labeled as centralized, conventional, authoritarian, and military in describing the structure of bureaucracy and government administration. Fundamental changes in political, social, and economic systems have occurred as a consequence of reform. It is difficult to imagine a single majority controlling the government produced by its political system today. The change in bureaucratic orientation from a conventional approach toward good governance requires the judicial

institution to be capable of providing responsive, effective, and efficient legal services. Nevertheless, within state administrative judicial institutions, there are still found volumes of complaints submitted alongside court records in land dispute resolution that remain below standards. Legal certainty and social justice in handling land issues constitute a policy framework that needs to be continuously strengthened, as put forward by Aziz et al. (2023).

Land as an Object of Litigation and the Problem of Court Authority

State administrative disputes in the field of land can occur due to written decisions issued by state administrative bodies or officials containing state administrative legal actions based on prevailing laws and regulations. Such decisions are concrete, individual, and final in the form of land certificates regarding ownership rights to land issued by the government to a person or entity. Land certificates as objects of dispute create legal ownership consequences that frequently trigger conflicts among parties claiming rights to the same land (Ari et al., 2024). In the litigation process, the fundamental problem that arises is the absence of clear absolute competence between the General Courts and the State Administrative Courts in analyzing, determining, and resolving disputes whose object is land. This duality of authority creates legal uncertainty for disputing parties. A flexible institutional structure capable of adjusting to changing situations constitutes one of the keys for these two judicial institutions to work in harmony, as put forward by Darmawan and Mardikaningsih (2023).

The parties are frequently confronted with unclear forum choices in determining the proper court to challenge decisions made by government officials. Judges are likewise faced with difficulties in determining the absolute competence of the court, which culminates in the dismissal of lawsuits or the rejection of decision execution. In reality, in Indonesia, there are still many land disputes found that are contested yet ignored because their legal ownership status remains unclear (Yuherman et al., 2025). Strengthening mediation mechanisms as an alternative dispute resolution path outside pure litigation can serve as an alternative when certainty regarding judicial forums is difficult to achieve, as outlined by Aidin et al. (2026). Decisions that have obtained permanent legal force

turn out to be partly incapable of being executed. There are countless decisions possessing long-lasting legal consequences on various contested land objects, making this one of the reasons why decisions regarding land disputes cannot be pursued and implemented. The unclear legal status of land ownership constitutes one of the primary causes preventing disputes from being resolved thoroughly through the judicial mechanism.

Land acquisition for infrastructure development for the public interest that is initiated can result in disagreements. In one form, parties entitled to receive compensation are unwilling to surrender their land. Land disputes involving public interest conflicts may also entail government administration and civil litigation. Different conditions between urban and rural communities likewise influence the perspective and response of each party toward proposed development plans, as explained by Amri and Khayru (2021). Equal treatment toward all affected parties also needs to be observed so that land acquisition processes do not foster a sense of being ignored among specific groups, as put forward by Hardyansah et al. (2021). The location is determined by the local government developing the project for the public interest; parties entitled to take up cases in civil matters disagree with the type of payment or the amount offered by the National Land Agency's appraisal of losses at the development land site for the general public's needs. The institution requiring land is notified locally if there are still interested parties at the intended development location during public consultation (Elvira & Yahman, 2023). If differences of opinion occur regarding who the rightful party is in a dispute, the institution can decide where the development plan should be placed.

Decisions determining the placement of development for the public interest remain a subject of debate to this day. Several rules with clear legal consequences also establish several ownerships of a single contested property part featuring multiple owners, resulting in a lack of legal clarity regarding the actual status of land ownership. This occurs because various legal options for land dispute resolution are available, filed through the State Administrative Court concerning decree letters issued by the National Land Agency and the District Court (Putri & Hadi, 2025). Good communication established between institutions handling the same land object becomes important so that issued decisions do not clash with one

another, as asserted by Gardi et al. (2021). Ranging from matters related to land ownership to those concerning individual criminal acts, decisions possessing permanent legal force can occur. Civil Procedural Law regulated by HIR/RBg is utilized to resolve land disputes concerning ownership, with lawsuits filed in the court where the defendant resides in accordance with Article 118 Paragraph (1) of the HIR and Article 16 of Law Number 4 of 2004 concerning Judicial Power.

Such provisions actually allow for the birth of multiple decisions possessing permanent legal force concerning several land owners on a single disputed land parcel. The litigation process is further complicated by the presence of multiple decisions concerning the same parcel of land, generated from lawsuits filed in various judicial forums with different legal bases. This condition demonstrates that the existing judicial system has not yet fully been able to provide legal certainty for disputing parties. This duality of authority creates legal uncertainty and potentially generates contradictory decisions. Consequently, the purpose of litigation as a dispute resolution tool becomes suboptimal and worsens public trust in the judicial system. The psychological attachment and sense of responsibility of the apparatus toward the duties assigned to them likewise determine the extent to which judicial institutions can maintain the consistency of their decisions, as outlined by Darmawan and Mardikaningsih (2022). The existence of overlapping court decisions regarding a single land object also serves as an indication of weak coordination among judicial institutions and the absence of a specialized court possessing absolute authority in resolving land disputes.

Obstacles to Decision Execution and the Role of Customary Law in Land Dispute Litigation

The problem of decision execution constitutes one of the crucial issues in land dispute litigation within the State Administrative Court. The characteristic of the State Administrative Court, which functions as an overseer of decision implementation rather than a direct executor, causes the effectiveness of decisions to depend heavily on the commitment and good faith of public officials. The obligation to execute decisions rests upon the related government officials, meaning that if such officials fail to execute the decisions, the winning parties cannot genuinely enjoy their

rights. This situation creates a legal loophole utilized by losing parties to avoid implementing decisions (Hartono et al., 2025). The apparatus's readiness in adjusting to more flexible work demands likewise determines the extent to which decisions can truly be implemented, as put forward by Mardikaningsih (2025). Consequently, numerous decisions possessing permanent legal force cannot be pursued and implemented. Law enforcement through the State Administrative Court also proceeds gradually and requires adequate infrastructure and facility support from the government.

The State Administrative Court represents the newest judicial institution in Indonesia where several problems are still encountered, making law enforcement through this institution carried out gradually. The infrastructure and facilities required to streamline the application of state administrative decisions for law enforcement must become a consideration for the government or policymakers (Deseano et al., 2025). The application of organized and sustainable management principles can improve an institution's operational performance in executing its functions, as outlined by Barzani et al. (2022). Good institutional knowledge management also serves as an important asset so that policies adopted remain relevant to law enforcement needs, as noted by Darmawan (2023a). The State Administrative Court functions as an overseer of decision implementation in accordance with prevailing laws and regulations and the characteristics of the State Administrative Court, rather than as an executive handler of decision implementation. Public officials themselves are obligated to carry out the execution or implementation of these decisions. The inability of the judicial system to execute land dispute decisions creates serious implications for law enforcement and justice, because parties winning cases frequently cannot enjoy their rights since decisions cannot be genuinely implemented.

Land disputes arising from infrastructure development for the public interest also constitute one of the complex problems in litigation. Parties entitled to receive compensation often reject the compensation offered by the National Land Agency, causing disputes to continue into civil or state administrative litigation paths (Jaelani, 2025). A land acquisition policy framework guaranteeing both legal certainty and social justice becomes fundamental in suppressing potential disputes resulting

from development, as asserted by Aziz et al. (2023). In this process, clashes occur between the public interest and individual rights, as well as between written law and living customary law within society. The values and habits of indigenous communities relocating to urban areas continue to be maintained amidst the rapid current of modernization, as depicted by Amri and Khayru (2022). Customary figures who have long played an important role in resolving land disputes through deliberation are increasingly marginalized by strict legal formalism. Parties in land disputes do respect decisions made by customary heads or leaders, yet certain elected officials remain deeply concerned with their understanding and compliance toward written law in state administrative justice.

In Indonesia, land dispute problems arising from infrastructure development frequently occur in customary residential areas handled by local figures or customary leaders recognized within society. These individuals possess a very important and essential role in resolving land disputes. The allocation and regulation of land use by local residents are likewise influenced by the function of community leaders (Sungsang et al., 2023). The balance between the speed of formal rule application and considerations of humanistic values held by indigenous communities needs to be continuously maintained so that dispute resolution does not lose its meaning of justice, as outlined by Darmawan (2023b). This occurs because local customary heads and leaders frequently possess information regarding the quantity, boundaries, and use of land in their respective regions. The relevant customary head understands the history of land ownership even though it is rarely recorded, because groups chosen to serve as customary heads or leaders are drawn from residents within that area. Consequently, disputing parties respect decisions made by customary heads or leaders, yet there remain decisions concerning State Administrative matters that have been rendered and possess permanent legal force.

This is driven by the fact that certain elected officials remain deeply concerned with their understanding and compliance toward written law in state administrative justice. Dispute resolution through litigation frequently takes a long time, incurs high costs, and not uncommonly ends with dissatisfaction among the parties. Land conflicts that remain unresolved for increasingly longer periods result from ongoing

development, while the presence and influence of customary heads or leaders are also diminishing. Law enforcement apparatuses' capacity to adapt to continuously developing policy and system changes likewise influences the speed of handling conflicts that grow in number, as explained by Mardikaningsih and Darmawan (2022). Laws and rules established by the government, whose effectiveness may be local or national, must inevitably encompass these limitations. This requirement becomes increasingly urgent given that Indonesia is experiencing an increasing number of land conflicts as a consequence of rising birth rates that significantly impact society's need for land dispute resolution. The Civil Code (KUHPdata), which is imbued with Western legal perspectives, serves as the most tangible target of the HIR/RBg legislation, which was not intended to uphold the UUPA along with its customary law concepts, even though the UUPA functions as an organization practicing in Indonesia.

The Specialized Land Court as an Alternative and Strengthening of the Judicial Institution

Various problems in land dispute litigation indicate that the current resolution mechanism through the State Administrative Court has yet to become an effective instrument. Therefore, in line with the spirit of Law Number 5 of 1960 concerning Agrarian Basic Principles (UUPA), the government needs to establish a specialized land court under the general judicial environment. This step possesses a strong juridical basis in Article 27 Paragraph (1) of Law Number 48 of 2009 concerning Judicial Power, which legitimizes the formation of specialized courts through law. This specialized court is intended to examine, handle, adjudicate, and decide all land disputes encompassing both civil and criminal dimensions—with a single binding and executable decision. The concept of simple and swift justice can be applied through a specialized court possessing *sui generis* characteristics, including the involvement of commissioners, translators, public appraisers, and National Land Agency (BPN) officers who act to supply cadastral data to judges. Judges are also granted broad authority (judicial activism) to conduct direct trial examinations in the field and summon related parties or sectoral agencies to synchronize physical and juridical data (Yuherman et al., 2025).

This specialized land court will be capable of rendering decisions with strong execution power as long as there are no formal exceptions in the form of missing parties (*plurium litis consortium*) or other procedural objections. To realize the principle of swift, simple, and low-cost justice as mandated by Article 2 Paragraph (4) of the Law on Judicial Power, this special procedural law limits the chain of judicial bureaucracy by opening only a single appeal tier at a specialized high court. Meanwhile, Case Review (*Peninjauan Kembali - PK*) legal remedies to the Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia are strictly limited only when new, decisive evidence (*novum*) is discovered (Fathoni & Vasalo, 2023). Through this one-roof system unification, convoluted resolution arguments no longer constitute a major obstacle because the court can produce a single binding decision (*inkracht*), allowing land conflicts to be thoroughly resolved to achieve legal certainty and distributive justice for landowners.

In the implementation of good governance, strong and credible institutions are required to realize it. Based on institutional theory, the judicial institution represents the rules of the game created to regulate the order of social, political, and economic interactions within society so that they run within legal corridors (Hussein & Abbas, 2024). The characteristics of a good institution encompass the ability to safeguard the property rights of every individual to encourage investment, monitor and limit the abuse of power by elite groups so as not to harm the economic rights of other parties, and guarantee equality before the law (equality before the law). In developing countries like Indonesia, the existence of less effective judicial institutions frequently serves as a primary obstacle to enhancing human capabilities because they fail to resolve structural agrarian conflicts fairly.

The process of economic, social, and political change within society exponentially causes the development of needs and the diversity of dispute types, which in turn urges legal institutions to adapt. There is a dynamic interaction between judicial institutions and mass organizations or corporations under conditions of land resource scarcity, thereby triggering competition that constitutes a key factor for institutional change. This fierce competition demands organizations to continuously invest in expertise, mastery of technology, and land cyber knowledge, which will gradually alter the perspective of law enforcement. A responsive

institutional framework will influence the birth of ideal judge decisions, wherein a judge's choices and legal considerations are shaped by their perception of the effectiveness of the decision's implementation amidst a society interconnected within a social network (Pahlevi et al., 2025).

Through this dynamic of institutional change, the establishment of the Specialized Land Court serves as a crucial step in creating a judicial institution with integrity. Although the government has undertaken several institutional strengthening measures, bureaucratic reform in the agrarian sector still needs to be accelerated given the persistently high figures of land disputes and land mafia practices within society (Wahid & Sulistiyono, 2025). Strengthening this dispute resolution function also serves as an instrument for enforcing the General Principles of Good Governance (AAUPB) in alignment with the spirit of Law Number 30 of 2014 concerning Government Administration. Ultimately, the establishment of this specialized court constitutes a strategic step requiring full support from stakeholders whether the executive branch, judicial institutions, or society so that it is capable of providing optimal and equitable legal protection for all citizen.

Conclusion

Land dispute resolution through litigation in the State Administrative Court faces significant structural and procedural barriers. The overlapping authority between the General Court and the State Administrative Court creates legal uncertainty, leading to conflicting judgments and weak execution of rulings that have obtained permanent legal force. The characteristic of the State Administrative Court functioning as a supervisor of judgment implementation, rather than as a direct executor, causes the effectiveness of decisions to depend heavily on the commitment of public officials. Furthermore, strict legal formalism increasingly marginalizes the role of customary figures in resolving land disputes through deliberation, causing the litigation process to be lengthy, costly, and frequently ending in the dissatisfaction of the parties.

The establishment of a specialized land court under the general court jurisdiction with its own procedural law is a strategic alternative to address these problems. This specialized court is expected to have absolute authority to examine, try, and decide all land disputes, whether

civil or criminal, with a single binding and executable decision. Strengthening judicial institutions through the establishment of a specialized land court becomes a crucial step in supporting bureaucratic reform and the implementation of good governance, thereby creating legal certainty, justice, and utility for all justice seekers. The success of this step requires full support from the government, judicial institutions, and all stakeholders.

References

- Aidin, A., Suwito, S., & Mujito, M. 2026. Strengthening Mediation as an Instrument of Restorative Justice in the Criminal Justice System. *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 6(1), 185–204.
- Amri, M. W., & Khayru, R. K. 2021. The Dynamics of Social Mobility: A Comparison Between Urban and Rural Communities. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 1(2), 39–43.
- Amri, M. W., & Khayru, R. K. 2022. Keeping Tradition in the Midst of Modernity: The Social Life of Indigenous Communities in Urban Areas. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 2(1), 135–138.
- Antoro, B. H. W. 2024. Development of Democratization on Indonesia Through Administrative Court. *Journal of Administrative Law and Governance*, 2(1), 101–122. <https://doi.org/10.55292/0xkdaz62>
- Ari, K., Roza, D., & Syofiarti. 2024. Disparity in Authority of the State Administrative Court and District Court in Adjudicating Certified Land Claims. *Visi Juridica*, 3(1). <https://doi.org/10.60034/vj3h5n02>
- Aziz, M., Sulani, & Suwito. 2023. Land Acquisition, Land Rights, and Consignment: A Policy Framework for Legal Certainty and Social Justice in National Development. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 3(1), 281–294.
- Barzani, L. A., Darmawan, D., & Zulkarnain, M. A. B. 2022. The Application of Sustainable Supply Chain Management Principles in the Manufacturing Industry to Improve Operational Performance and Corporate Social Responsibility. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 1(1), 38–45.
- Darmawan, D. 2023. Innovation Culture That Balances Technological Speed with the Depth of Humanistic Thought. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 4(1), 47–54.

- Darmawan, D. 2023. Knowledge Management as a Source Of Competitive Advantage in Information Technology Companies. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 3(2), 44-50.
- Darmawan, D. 2023. Measuring Employee Productivity in the Digital Era by Considering Human Creativity and Innovation. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 4(3), 47-53.
- Darmawan, D. 2023. Social Inclusion for Older Workers in the Implementation of Digital Technology within Organizations. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 4(2), 44-51.
- Darmawan, D. 2023. The Concept Of Remote Work: A Literature Review on its Impact on Work Dynamics, Psychological Well-Being, and Social Relationships Among Employees. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 3(3), 49-55.
- Darmawan, D. 2024. Strategies for Enhancing Employee Knowledge and Engagement in Automated Routine Work. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 6(1), 65-71.
- Darmawan, D. 2024. The Role of Technology in Promoting or Hindering Gender Equality in the Workplace. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 6(2), 67-73.
- Darmawan, D., & Mardikaningsih, R. 2022. The Role of Positive Psychological Factors in Enhancing Employee Engagement and Commitment to Work Tasks. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 1(2), 37-45.
- Darmawan, D., & Mardikaningsih, R. 2023. The Role of Flexible Organizational Structures in Enhancing Corporate Adaptability to Environmental Dynamics. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 3(1), 44-49.
- Deseano, A. A., Putra, N. H. A. A. A., & Gusthomi, M. I. 2025. Administrative Court as Bureaucratic Reform Catalyst through Administrative Law Enforcement. *Reformasi Hukum*, 29(1), 111-123. <https://doi.org/10.46257/jrh.v29i1.1075>
- Elvira, A. J., & Yahman. 2023. Dispute resolution related to the determination of compensation price in land acquisition for public interest of wonokromo - jombang double track railway. *Journal of Law Theory and Law Enforcement*, 2(4), 66-82. <https://doi.org/10.56943/jlte.v2i4.411>
- Fathoni, M. Y., & Vasalo, A. F. 2023. Establishment of Land Court in Indonesia: an effort to realise justice based on Pancasila. *Journal of Law*

- and *Environmental Justice*, 1(2), 86–104.
<https://doi.org/10.62264/jlej.v1i2.6>
- Gardi, B., Udjari, H., & Darmawan, D. 2021. Understanding the Function of Communication in Building and Sustaining Quality Relationships Across Organizational Boundaries. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 1(2), 245–252.
- Hamzani, A. I., Widyastuti, T. V., Khasanah, N. A., & Rusli, M. H. M. 2023. Legal Research Method: Theoretical and Implementative Review. *International Journal of Membrane Science and Technology*, 10(2).
<https://doi.org/10.15379/ijmst.v10i2.3191>
- Harahap, H. H. 2024. Legal protection for land owners who have a land ownership certificate. *Jurnal Meta Hukum*, 3(1), 112–120.
<https://doi.org/10.47652/jmh.v3i1.728>
- Hardyansah, R., Saputro, R., & Negara, D. S. 2021. Social Perception and Stigma: Creating an Inclusive and Equal Society. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 1(1), 79–86.
- Hartono, C., & Wijaya, A. 2025. Binding Force of Judgment of State Administrative Court Decisions against Government Agencies. *Lex Journal*, 9(2), 307–322. <https://doi.org/10.25139/lex.v9i2.10228>
- Hatta, M., Anditya, A. W., Rayhan, A., Akhmaddhian, S., & Anugrah, D. 2024. The Legal Hurdles in Executing Land Dispute Cases in Court. *Unifikasi: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum*, 11(2), 109–125.
<https://doi.org/10.25134/unifikasi.v11i02.771>
- Hussein, M. M., & Abbas, H. 2024. The Role of Governance in Strengthening of the Constitutional Judiciary. *ZANCO Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 1(1), 273–294. <https://doi.org/10.70516/zaccsssh.v1i1.46>
- Issalillah, F., & Khayru, R. K. 2025. Mental Health as an Organizational Construct: A Strategic Reorientation of Human Resource Management for Work Environment Design. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 8(3), 1–9.
- Jaelani, A. K. 2025. Land Procurement for Infrastructure Projects under the Job Creation Law. *Contrarius: Journal of Law and Society*, 1(1).
<https://doi.org/10.53955/contrarius.v1i1.80>
- Mardikaningsih, R. 2021. Urbanization and Social Inequality: Challenges in Building Social Cohesion in a City-Based Environment. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 1(1), 135–140.
- Mardikaningsih, R. 2025. The Deconstruction of Work and HRM Reconfiguration: Flexibility and Employer Branding in the Digital Era.

- International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 8(2), 10-17.
- Mardikaningsih, R., & Darmawan, D. 2022. The Role of Self-Efficacy in Predicting Employee Adaptability to Technological Change in the Workplace. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 2(3), 43-55.
- Mardikaningsih, R., & Nuraini, R. 2022. Implementation of Circular Economy Principles for Sustainable Waste Management in the Industrial Sector. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 1(3), 41-47.
- Mardikaningsih, R., Halizah, S. N., Darmawan, D., Masithoh, N., & Nuraini, R. 2022. Examining the Role of Authentic Leadership in Shaping Positive Work Climate and Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 2(1), 52-59.
- Mardikaningsih, R., Halizah, S. N., Nuraini, R., & Darmawan, D. 2022. The Role of Ethical Leadership in Shaping a Positive and Sustainable Organizational Culture. *International Journal of Service Science, Management, Engineering, and Technology*, 2(2), 48-55.
- McSweeney, B. 2017. A Post-Bureaucratic Age?: Caricatures, Claims, and Counter-Evidence. *Handbook of Research on Bureaucracy and Public Administration*, 19-40. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-5225-1983-6.CH002>
- Mohammad, N. L. B. 2023. Community Perspectives on Redistributive Justice and Institutional Credibility in Remote Land Policy Implementation. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 3(2), 47-54.
- Nalin, C., Saidi, S. A. B., Hariani, M., Mendrika, V., & Issalillah, F. 2022. The Impact of Social Disparities on Public Health: An Analysis of Service Access, Quality of Life, and Policy Solutions. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 2(1), 39-46.
- Pahlevi, A. N., Permatasari, N., & Kania, D. 2025. Comparison of the application of responsive legal theory in responding to social change in the criminal law and civil law. *Bengkoelen Justice: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum*, 15(1), 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.33369/jbengkoelenjust.v15i1.40023>
- Putri, D. C. W., & Hadi, S. 2025. The National Land Agency's Efforts in Anticipation and Resolving Disputes Regarding Multiple Land Ownership Certificates. *Law Development Journal*, 7(3), 541-550. <https://doi.org/10.30659/ldj.7.3.541-550>

- Rahmat, B., Hartanto, B., & Hilman, A. 2024. Bureaucratic Reform in Indonesia: From "Public Administration" to "Public Management." *Journal of Local Government Issues*, 7(2), 144–158. <https://doi.org/10.22219/logos.v7i2.33848>
- Rawi, M., Pakpahan, N. H., & Saktiawan, P. 2026. The Finality of Acquittal in Indonesian Criminal Procedure Law. *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 6(1), 1–24.
- Rizky, M. C., Herisasono, A., Hardyansah, R., Saktiawan, P., & Saputra, R. 2021. The Effectiveness of the Legal System in Guaranteeing Equal Rights of Minority Groups in Constitutional Structures. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 1(2), 193–196.
- Safitri, A. I., & Susanto, S. N. H. 2024. Challenges in Executing State Administrative Court Decisions Regarding Land Disputes. *International Journal of Social Science and Human Research*, 7(12). <https://doi.org/10.47191/ijsshr/v7-i12-90>
- Saputro, A., Suriana, R. K., Hutasoit, E., Tay, S., & Setiawan, B. 2025. Role of Administrative Court to Resolve Administrative Disputes in Indonesia: A Systematic Review. *Journal of Progressive Law and Legal Studies*, 3(2), 255–286. <https://doi.org/10.59653/jplls.v3i02.1748>
- Sungsang, J., Fakrulloh, Z. A., & Israhadi, E. I. 2023. Analysis of Land Disputes Arising from Land Procurement Activities in The Development of Public Facilities and Infrastructure (Review of Law Number 2 of 2012 concerning Land Acquisition). *Proceedings of the International Conference on Law, Economics, and Health (ICLEH 2022)*. <https://doi.org/10.4108/eai.12-11-2022.2327337>
- Susanto, S. N. H. 2024. The Implementation of E-Government Policies in Innovation of Public Service Provision in Indonesia. *Pakistan Journal of Life and Social Sciences*, 22(2). <https://doi.org/10.57239/pjlss-2024-22.2.001117>
- Wahid, A., & Sulistiyono, A. 2025. Justification for the establishment of a land court in indonesia: realizing justice in land dispute resolution. *Masalah-Masalah Hukum*, 54(2), 179–213. <https://doi.org/10.14710/mmh.54.2.2025.179-213>
- Yuherman, Y., Nugroho, W., Nuriyatman, E., & Aziz, H. A. 2025. Integration of Absolute Authority of District Courts and State Administrative Courts in Land Disputes through Koneksitas Courts. *Administrative and Environmental Law Review*, 6(1), 45–60. <https://doi.org/10.25041/aclr.v6i1.4223>