IMPLICATIONS OF THE ENACTMENT OF BASIC AGRARIAN LAW ON THE EVIDENTIARY FORCE OF EIGENDOM: A CASE STUDY OF STATE-OWNED ENTERPRISE CLAIM OVER LAND OCCUPIED BY THE COMMUNITY

Fernando Anggrek[1*], Moh Saleh[2]
[1,2]Narotama University, Surabaya, Indonesia
fernando.anggrek@gmail.com[1*], saleh@gmail.com[2]

Received 05 Dec 2025 • Revised 31 Dec 2025 • Accepted 24 Jan 2026

Abstract

This study examines the legal implications of the enactment of Law Number 5 of 1960 (UUPA) on the status of colonial-era eigendom rights, specifically concerning land arising from the nationalization of colonial assets transferred to State-Owned Enterprises (SOEs/BUMN). The findings demonstrate that eigendom rights were extinguished upon the enactment of the UUPA and ought to have been converted into the Right to Manage (HPL) or other rights as prescribed by the UUPA. The focus of the study is directed at the conflict in Dukuh Pakis District, Surabaya City, between PT Pertamina (Persero), as the holder of nationalized assets, and community members who have obtained land title certificates. PT Pertamina (Persero)'s claim is founded upon colonial eigendom land rights acquired through the nationalization of Dutch companies. These nationalized assets have not been promptly converted by PT Pertamina (Persero) to date, thereby giving rise to disputes. The arising disputes are primarily attributed to the SOE's negligence in failing to perform the conversion of land rights as mandated by the UUPA. The National Land Agency (BPN), a state institution authorized to issue land title certificates, was also not diligent in tracing the land's provenance when the certificates were issued to the community. Consequently, both the BPN and the SOE failed to regulate and register the nationalized assets, resulting in an overlap between the land's historical status and the rights granted to the community. Therefore, a resolution should be pursued through administrative rectification and state asset verification, while taking into account the circumstances of community members acting in good faith (bona fide) who have acquired their rights through official procedures.

Keywords: Law Number 5 of 1960 on Basic Agrarian Principles, Eigendom rights, National Land Agency, Legal certainty

INTRODUCTION

Prior to the enactment of Act Number 5 of 1960 concerning Basic Provisions of Agrarian Law (hereinafter referred to as Basic Agrarian Law) on September 24, 1960, the agrarian legal system in Indonesia was dualistic. This was due to the Dutch colonial legal policies that differentiated between customary law and Western law (according to Western civil law). This condition is still felt until this time, where land disputes that currently occur in Indonesia cannot be separated from the influence and legacy of Dutch colonial land law that failed to be converted into Land Rights regulated in the Basic Agrarian Law. Currently, there is still a lot of land whose ownership is based on the Western land rights, such as *eigendom*, *erfpacht*, and *postal*. After the independence, the Indonesian government attempted to establish a more equitable national agrarian system with the enactment of the Basic Agrarian Law. Article 2, paragraph (1) of the Basic Agrarian Law emphasizes the principles of the State's Right to Control, which gives the State authority to regulate the designation, use, allocation, and maintenance of land for the prosperity of the people. This is also regulated in Article 33, paragraph (3) of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia (hereinafter referred to as the 1945 Constitution). Through the Basic Agrarian Law, the State provides an opportunity for the ownership of pre-existing land rights to be converted into land rights based on the Basic Agrarian Law. The conversion of land rights is a process of transforming or adjusting land rights arising based on previous legal regulations, both customary law and western law, into rights acknowledged within the national legal system based on the Basic Agrarian Law. The main purpose of this conversion is to create uniformity, legal certainty, and social justice. The main provisions regarding the conversion of land rights are regulated in the Conversion Provisions annexed to the Basic Agrarian Law from Article I to Article IX. However, until this time, there are still transition issues from previous rights to the new agrarian system, particularly related to documents of colonial land rights.

In the post-independence period, Indonesian's attempt to uphold economic sovereignty became crucial. One of the fundamental policies was the nationalization of Dutch-owned companies through Act Number 86 of 1958 concerning the Nationalization of Dutch-Owned Companies. According to Article 1 of this Act, Dutch-owned companies designated by the Government Regulation are nationalized and declared to be full and free property of the Republic of Indonesia. Thus, assets owned by Dutch companies, including land, which were previously held according to the colonial rights, become the state assets managed by the State-Owned Companies, in this case BUMN. This policy fundamentally transforms the economic structure and agrarian legal order with a significant impact on state-controlled companies, particularly those that later became PT. Kereta Api Indonesia (Persero) (PT KAI) and PT. Pertamina (Persero). The transfer of land rights after nationalization is further regulated by Basic Agrarian Law through its conversion provisions, which aim to abolish colonial agrarian law, including colonial land rights, and to replace them with national agrarian rights.

The issues concerning the conversion of land rights formerly held by Dutch companies remain unresolved agrarian problems in Indonesia to this day, resulting in complex legal and social conflicts. One of the main causes is the failure to convert Western rights, such as *eigendom* and *erfpacht*, into rights recognized by the Basic Agrarian Law. This right often results in overlap between colonial ownership documents and the fact that the land has been physically occupied by local communities who have resided or worked on the land for many years. Moreover, incompleteness or loss of colonial land records complicates the evidentiary process of ownership and triggers disputes, as occurred in unresolved conversion disputes over land formerly held by Dutch companies in Surabaya, as reflected in the claim of Pertamina over land approximately 220.4 hectares in Perumahan Darmo Hill, Kecamatan Dukuh Pak, and its surrounding areas. This dispute involves Pertamina, which claims the land according to the rights of *Eigendom Verponding* (E.V.) No. 1278, a Dutch colonial document, while hundreds of residents who have occupied and resided on the land for decades are unable to obtain their land certificates. The community experienced legal difficulties due to Pertamina's claim. This situation results in legal uncertainty, blocks property transactions, and harms communities because they perceive their lands threatened by a colonial document that should be converted according to the Basic Agrarian Law.

According to the background above, this study discusses the following research problems: Can the *eigendom* rights from the nationalization be the legal basis for ownership claims by the State-Owned Enterprises (BUMN) over land that has been occupied and certified by local communities? and What are the legal implications of not converting and re-registering nationalized assets as state land or Land Rights according to the provisions of Basic Agrarian Law?

Several previous studies have discussed the legal position of *eigendom verponding* rights after the enactment of the Basic Agrarian Law. Boedi Harsono (2008) explains that Western rights, including *eigendom*, normatively have been abolished since the enactment of the Basic Agrarian Law and must be converted into the national land rights system to have legal force. A similar study was

also conducted by R. Soeprapto (2014) in the Agrarian Law Journal, which emphasizes that *eigendom verponding* only has value as evidence of land ownership history and can no longer be used as a basis for land ownership rights. However, these studies are general normative and have not studied *the eigendom* rights from the results of nationalization of Dutch companies and the role of State-Owned Enterprise (BUMN) as administrators of nationalized assets.

Other studies in the form of thesis and dissertation have studied the dispute between the former *eigendom* document and the land title certificate. For example, a study by Andi Pratama (2017) in his thesis at Universitas Airlangga discusses the conflict between the evidence of *eigendom verponding* and Certificate of Building Use Right by placing the dispute as a civil conflict among parties. A similar study was also conducted by Siti Rahmawati (2019) in her Master's of Notary thesis in Universitas Indonesia, which analyzes the evidentiary force of *eigendom* in the dispute of Freehold Title certificates. These studies have not studied the dispute from the perspectives of State administrative negligence, particularly related to the regulation of land assets resulting from nationalization.

Moreover, there is a study that specifically discusses legal protection for holders of land title certificates who act in good faith. Maria S.W. Sumardjono (2005) emphasizes that land title certificates issued through the legal procedures must be protected to ensure legal certainty for the community. A similar perspective is also expressed by Urip Santoso (2016), who states that the State is required to provide legal protection for the certificate holders as strong evidence of land rights. However, these studies have not connected the legal protection for certificate holders with the status of land as a state asset resulting from nationalization that has not been administratively regulated.

Another previous study also examined former *eigendom* land occupied by state institutions, such as the thesis conducted by Dwi Handayani (2018), which discussed the occupation of former *eigendom* land by the Indonesian National Armed Forces and its implications for community rights. This study provides an overview of conflicts between the community and the State institution, but it does not discuss the State-Owned Enterprise as a legal entity with dual characters, as a private legal subject, and as an administrator of separate state assets.

Moreover, there is a study analyzing the verdict of the Supreme Court related to the dispute of *eigendom* rights. A study by Ahmad Rifai (2020) examines a legal consideration of the Supreme Court in several verdicts of *eigendom* disputes and concludes that the land title certificate has a stronger evidentiary force than former land rights documents. However, this study is descriptive of jurisprudence and has not developed a court verdict as a basis to formulate a land dispute resolution model based on administrative and non-litigation regulations.

According to the previous studies above, it can be concluded that although there are many studies discussing *eigendom* rights, its conversion, dispute with land title certificate, protection for certificate holders, and jurisprudence of Supreme Court, there is no study that specifically and comprehensively examines *eigendom* rights resulting from the nationalization of Dutch companies managed by BUMN and analyze conflict between claims over state assets that have not been administratively regulated and land title certificates owned by the community within a single analytical framework integrating agrarian law, State-Owned Enterprise law, and administrative law. Therefore, this study aims to fill the gap and develop an agrarian law study from the perspective of state administrative negligence and legal certainty in society.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study was a normative legal study (doctrinal legal research), which aims to analyze the legal norms regulating the status of *eigendom* rights after the nationalization and its implications on legal certainty over land rights based on the Basic Agrarian Law. The approaches used were:

1. Statue approach

   By examining Basic Agrarian Law, the Regulation of Basic Agrarian Law Conversion, Nationalization Law, State-Owned Enterprise Law, Government Regulation on Land Registration, and regulations related to the management of state assets.
2. Conceptual approach

   This was used to study the concept of *eigendom* rights, conversion of land rights, management rights, the State's right of control, and the principle of legal certainty in agrarian law.
3. Case approach

   By analyzing the land claim dispute of PT Pertamina (Persero) in Dukuh Pakis Surabaya and the relevant court verdict, especially the Verdict of Supreme Court Number 1234 K/Pdt/2012 and Number 342 K/Pdt/2013.

The legal materials used were:

1. Primary legal materials: laws and regulations, and court verdicts;

2. Secondary legal materials: books, scientific journals, and opinions of agrarian law experts;
3. Tertiary legal materials: legal dictionary and encyclopedia.

Legal material analysis was conducted qualitatively with a systematic and argumentative interpretation method to draw a prescriptive conclusion regarding the legal status of *eigendom* rights post-nationalization and legal protection for people with good faith.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Chronology of Problems between PT Pertamina (Persero) and the Community in Surabaya City

Dispute of land ownership between Surabaya residents and PT Pertamina (Persero) began with claims over former assets known as *Eigendom Verponding* (E.V.) No. 1278 and No. 1305, which during the colonial period were owned by the Dutch oil company N.V. De Bataafsche Petroleum Maatschappij (Shell). After the nationalization of foreign assets in 1965, the government took over the property and handed it over to Pertamina according to the Decree of the Minister of Oil and Gas of 1966 as a form of state asset management (Suara Surabaya, 22 September 2025). Along with time, the claimed area had been occupied by the community for decades and has had legal administrative evidence, such as Freehold Title Certificates (SHM) and Building Use Right Certificates (HGB) issued by the National Land Agency (BPN). The community also routinely pays taxes and makes transactions according to the applicable legal provisions (JatimNow, 15 October 2025).

However, on June 16, 2023, PT Pertamina (Persero) sent an official letter to Surabaya National Land Agency to postpone all land administrative processes within the area included in the E.V. No. 1278, on the grounds of the need to clarify physical boundaries and trace juridical evidence regarding the legal status of the land (Pawarta Jatim, 7 October 2025). As a follow-up, BPN Surabaya I temporarily postponed the service for the extension of rights, new certificate registration, and the legalization of other documents within the relevant area (Antara Jatim, 15 October 2025).

This postponement resulted in a significant impact on the community. Many residents are unable to renew the Building Use Right Certificate (HGB), process name transfer, and sell their land as the land administration system is temporarily suspended. This condition mainly occurred in *Kecamatan* (District) Dukuh Pakis with an area of ± 220.4 Ha, where ownership claim by Pertamina hampers the legalization process of land in the National Land Agency (Suara Surabaya, 22 September 2025). As a result, the community had economic loss and legal uncertainty over the land that they had occupied legally under administrative procedures.

Nationalization of Dutch Company and Transfer of Assets, Including Land Rights to PT Pertamina (Persero)

The process of transferring assets of Dutch Companies to Pertamina began with the nationalization policies implemented by the Indonesian government from the late 1950s to the mid-1960s. After the recognition of sovereignty through the Round Table Conference (KMB) in 1949, several oil and gas companies, such as *Bataafsche Petroleum Maatschappij* (*BPM*), a subsidiary of Royal Dutch Shel, still controlled the infrastructure of oil production and processing in Indonesia (Kompas.com, 2023). This condition is contradictory to the provisions of Article 33, paragraph (3) of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, which states that natural resources must be controlled by the State for the prosperity of the community. Therefore, the government issued Act Number 86 of 1958 concerning the Nationalization of Dutch-Owned Companies, which serves as the legal basis for the takeover of all Dutch companies in Indonesia, including the oil and gas sectors. As a follow-up, the government established State Company Permina (PN. Permina) through the Government Regulation Number 19 of 1960 concerning the Government Regulation in Lieu of Law Number 19 of 1960 concerning the State Company to manage exploration activities and oil production, which previously was operated by Dutch companies.

This policy is reinforced by the Decree of the Presidium of the Dwikora Cabinet of the Republic of Indonesia No. Aa/D/161/1965 of December 31, 1965 concerning the Approval of the Head of Agreement and Additional Agreement with PT Shell Indonesia ("the Decree of the Presidium of the Dwikora Cabinet of the Republic of Indonesia No. Aa/D/161/1965"), the Presidium of Dwikora Cabinet as cited from the Decree Number 194/ Pdt.G/ 2024/ PN Sby, has decided to:

a. Grant approval of the Head of Agreement and additional approval with PT Shell Indonesia concerning the transfer of PT Shell Indonesia's assets to the Indonesian Government.
b. Order PT Shell Indonesia to dissolve within the shortest possible period, not more than three (3) years.
c. The implementation of the Head of Agreement and Additional Agreement referred to in item 1 is authorized to the Ministry of Oil and Gas Affairs, provided that annual installment payments

are only made from the results of oil export, as stipulated in Article 4 of the Head of Agreement.

This policy legally stipulates that all BPM (Shell) assets and their facilities are transferred to the authorization of PN. Permina. The decree became a valid administrative and juridical basis for the State to assert the ownership of assets from the results of nationalization.

In the next stage, the government united PN. Permina and PN. Pertamin through the Government Regulation Number 27 of 1968 concerning the Merger of PN. Permina and PN. Pertamin into PN. Pertamina, which formed a new entity called PN. Pertamina to strengthen the efficiency and consolidation of national oil and gas management. This step is then reinforced by Act Number 8 of 1971 concerning the State Oil and Gas Mining Company, which established Pertamina as the only State-Owned Enterprise fully mandated to manage all oil and gas exploration, production, processing, and distribution. Entering the era of economic liberalization, the government enacted Act Number 22 of 2001 concerning Oil and Gas, which abolished the monopoly of Pertamina and mandated the separation of upstream and downstream business activities. Under this regulation, Pertamina changed its status to a limited liability company through the Government Regulation Number 31 of 2003 concerning the Conversion of Pertamina into Limited Liability Company (Persero), and since this time, it has been known as PT Pertamina (Persero). All its assets, including land resulting from the nationalization of Dutch companies, are designated as separate state assets and used as capital for the company in accordance with the provisions of Article 4 paragraph (1) of Act Number 19 of 2003 concerning State-Owned Enterprise. From the perspective of agrarian law, the status of these land assets is regulated in the Conversion Provision of Basic Agrarian Law, where colonial rights, such as *eigendom verponding*, are converted into Freehold Rights, Rights to Cultivate, or Management Rights, depending on the legal subject. As nationalized assets are controlled by the State, the rights over land were transferred into state land, managed by State-Owned Enterprise, namely Pertamina (Antara News, 2024). Thus, Pertamina had a strong historical and juridical basis over the land ownership and management resulting from the nationalization of Dutch companies.

Status of Colonial Land Rights That Have Not Been Converted into Land Rights under the Basic Agrarian Law

In its practice, not all assets resulting from the nationalization are immediately consolidated and re-registered as state land or Management Rights, Right of Use, Right to Cultivate, or Building Rights in the name of the State-Owned Enterprise. Many assets are administratively still recorded in former documents, such as *eigendom verponding*, without data update at the Land Office. This condition causes problems when the community has occupied and utilized the land for years, and some have obtained land title certificates from the National Land Agency. Conceptually, a historical ownership record is different from a legal title. Historical ownership record only demonstrates the origin of administrative control, while legal title is a formal legal recognition established through land registration in accordance with Article 19 of Act Number 5 of 1960 concerning Basic Agrarian Law and Article 3 of Government Regulation Number 24 of 1997 concerning Land Registration. Thus, former ownership documents, such as *eigendom* or *verponding*, no longer have legal force as land rights, but they can be used as historical evidence to trace the legal status of the land (Budi Harsono, 2005: 246).

The National Land Agency, an institution authorized to implement land registration, has a legal obligation to examine the origin of land and ensure no overlapping claims of state assets before issuing new rights. This is asserted in Article 9 of Government Regulation No. 24 of 1997, which regulates that land registration officials are required to examine the history and legal status of the object before registration is carried out. If the National Land Agency fails to conduct verification and further issues a Freehold Title or Building Rights certificate over land that actually results from the nationalization of a State-Owned Enterprise, so that this issuance is included in an administrative defect and is voidable (Sumardjono, 2017, p. 133).

In the Verdict of Supreme Court Number 1234 K/Pdt/2012, the Court emphasizes that a land certificate issued by the National Land Agency has a higher legal force than former land rights evidence, such as *verponding* or *eigendom*, provided that no administrative defects are proven. This verdict emphasizes the principle of legal certainty, as regulated in Article 19 paragraph (1) of the Basic Agrarian Law, which states that the government ensures legal certainty through land registration throughout Indonesia. However, if it is later proven that the certified land is part of assets resulting from the nationalization and the issuance is carried out without verification and coordination with the agency that owns the asset (State-Owned Enterprise or Ministry of Finance), the certificate is voidable as it contains an administrative defect from the negligence of public officials (Mahkamah Agung RI, 2012). This is in line with the principle of maladministration, as regulated in Article 1,

number 3 of Act Number 37 of 2008 concerning the Ombudsman of the Republic of Indonesia, which includes unlawful conduct, abuse of authority, negligence, or disregard of legal obligations in the provision of public services. Thus, if the National Land Agency issues land rights over nationalization assets that have not been verified, this act can be categorized as a state administrative fault.

On the other hand, legal responsibility can also be imposed on State-Owned Enterprises if they are not proactive in registering and regulating assets resulting from nationalization, which are state property, as stipulated in Article 4 paragraph (2) letter f of the Regulation of the Ministry of Finance Number 120/PMK.06/2007 concerning the Management of State Property. *Eigendom* rights resulting from the nationalization that have been transferred to PT Pertamina (Persero) should be converted into Management Rights because its legal subject is the State-Owned Enterprise (not an individual). This is based on Article II of the Conversion Provisions of Basic Agrarian Law and the Regulation of the Minister of Home Affairs No. 1 of 1997 concerning the Procedures for Applying for Management Rights over Land for Government Agencies and State-Owned Enterprises. In this case, administrative fault is reciprocal between State-Owned Enterprises, which do not regulate their assets, and the National Land Agency, which neglects to conduct verification before the issuance of new rights.

Emphasized in the Verdict of Supreme Court Number 342 K/Pdt/2013, where the Court declares that "land resulting from nationalization is never registered as state asset, the issuance of Freehold Title Certificate to the community cannot be considered to violate the law." This verdict emphasizes that the State cannot prosecute communities that have acted in good faith and obtained rights through legal procedure, if the administrative fault is from the state agency itself. Thus, conflicts between claims of State-Owned Enterprise nationalized assets and community land rights are more often from the weakness of the national land administration system rather than legal substance fault. In the framework of State's Rights to Control (Article 2 of Basic Agrarian Law), the State is required to ensure that land occupation by State-Owned Enterprises or communities continues to fulfill the social function of land (Article 6 of Basic Agrarian Law). Therefore, the resolution for this kind of case should not be pursued solely through a civil lawsuit, but through the administrative regulation by the National Land Agency with a mechanism of asset mediation involving the State-Owned Enterprise, the Ministry of Finance, and landholding communities who have good faith.

CONCLUSION

Eigendom rights, as rights over colonial land, have been abolished since the enactment of the Basic Agrarian Law in 1960. According to Articles I and II of the Conversion Provisions of the Basic Agrarian Law, all western land rights must be converted into new rights, such as Freehold Rights, Building Rights, Rights to Cultivate, or Management Rights, in accordance with the legal subject. Therefore, *eigendom verponding* documents only have value as evidence for historical record, not legal evidence of rights. If a State-Owned Enterprise, such as PT Pertamina (Persero), bases its claim on *eigendom* documents that have not been converted and never been re-registered, then the basis for the claim does not have binding legal force against land rights that have been certified by the community under the Basic Agrarian Law.

Assets resulting from nationalization that are not immediately converted and re-registered do not automatically have the status of state land or State-Owned Enterprise Management Rights, even though under public law these assets are included in State Property as regulated in Article 4 paragraph (2) letter f of the Regulation of the Minister of Finance No. 120/PMK.06/2007. Without the determination of status and registration in the National Land Agency, land resulting from nationalization is not administratively recognized as state land, so that the State-Owned Enterprise cannot use it as a basis for ownership claim against the community. This negligence also causes reciprocal administrative liability between the State-Owned Enterprise, which does not regulate its assets, and the National Land Agency, which neglects to conduct verification regarding the origin of land before issuing new rights. As a result, communities that have good faith and obtain a certificate legally cannot be blamed, as stated in the Verdict of the Supreme Court No. 342 K/Pdt/2013**.**

REFERENCES

Antara Jatim. (2025, October 15). Penundaan pelayanan pertanahan terkait klaim aset Pertamina [Postponement of land services related to Pertamina's asset claims]. Retrieved from https://jatim.antaranews.com

Antara News. (2024). Status tanah nasionalisasi dan pengelolaan oleh BUMN [Status of nationalized land and management by State-Owned Enterprises]. Retrieved from https://www.antaranews.com

Boedi, H. (2008). Hukum Agraria Indonesia: Sejarah pembentukan Undang-Undang Pokok Agraria, isi dan pelaksanaannya [Indonesian Agrarian Law: History of the formation of the Basic Agrarian Law, contents, and implementation]. Djambatan.

Handayani, D. (2018). Penguasaan tanah bekas hak eigendom oleh instansi negara dan perlindungan hukum masyarakat [Mastery of former eigendom right land by state agencies and community legal protection] [Master's thesis, Diponegoro University]. Diponegoro University Repository.

Harsono, B. (2005). Hukum Agraria Indonesia: Sejarah pembentukan Undang-Undang Pokok Agraria, isi, dan pelaksanaannya [Indonesian Agrarian Law: History of the formation of the Basic Agrarian Law, contents, and implementation]. Djambatan.

JatimNow. (2025, October 15). Warga terdampak sengketa tanah eigendom di Dukuh Pakis [Residents affected by eigendom land disputes in Dukuh Pakis]. Retrieved from https://jatimnow.com

Kompas.com. (2023). Sejarah nasionalisasi perusahaan Belanda di Indonesia [History of the nationalization of Dutch companies in Indonesia]. Retrieved from https://www.kompas.com

Mahkamah Agung Republik Indonesia. (2012). Decision Number 1234 K/Pdt/2012.

Mahkamah Agung Republik Indonesia. (2013). Decision Number 342 K/Pdt/2013.

Pawarta Jatim. (2025, October 7). BPN tunda administrasi pertanahan di kawasan klaim Pertamina [BPN postpones land administration in Pertamina's claim areas]. Retrieved from https://pawartajatim.com

Pengadilan Negeri Surabaya. (2024). Decision Number 194/Pdt.G/2024/PN Sby.

Pratama, A. (2017). Kekuatan pembuktian hak eigendom verponding dalam sengketa Hak Guna Bangunan [The evidentiary strength of eigendom verponding rights in Building Use Rights disputes] [Undergraduate thesis, Airlangga University]. Airlangga University Repository.

Rahmawati, S. (2019). Analisis yuridis sengketa hak eigendom dengan sertifikat hak milik [Juridical analysis of eigendom rights disputes with ownership certificates] [Master's thesis, University of Indonesia]. Ulana.

Republic of Indonesia. (1958). Law Number 86 of 1958 concerning Nationalization of Dutch-Owned Companies. State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia of 1958 Number 162.

Republic of Indonesia. (1960). Law Number 5 of 1960 concerning Basic Regulations on Agrarian Principles. State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia of 1960 Number 104.

Republic of Indonesia. (1965). Decision of the Presidium of the Dwikora Cabinet Number Aa/D/161/1965 concerning Approval of the Head of Agreement and Additional Agreement with PT Shell Indonesia.

Republic of Indonesia. (1968). Government Regulation Number 27 of 1968 concerning the Merger of PN Permina and PN Pertamin into PN Pertamina.

Republic of Indonesia. (1971). Law Number 8 of 1971 concerning State Oil and Natural Gas Mining Companies.

Republic of Indonesia. (1977). Regulation of the Minister of Home Affairs Number 1 of 1977 concerning Procedures for Application for Land Management Rights for Government Agencies and State-Owned Enterprises.

Republic of Indonesia. (1997). Government Regulation Number 24 of 1997 concerning Land Registration. State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia of 1997 Number 59.

Republic of Indonesia. (2001). Law Number 22 of 2001 concerning Oil and Natural Gas. State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia of 2001 Number 136.

Republic of Indonesia. (2003a). Government Regulation Number 31 of 2003 concerning the Transformation of Pertamina into a Limited Liability Company (Persero).

Republic of Indonesia. (2003b). Law Number 19 of 2003 concerning State-Owned Enterprises. State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia of 2003 Number 70.

Republic of Indonesia. (2007). Regulation of the Minister of Finance Number 120/PMK.06/2007 concerning the Management of State-Owned Property.

Republic of Indonesia. (2008). Law Number 37 of 2008 concerning the Ombudsman of the Republic of Indonesia. State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia of 2008 Number 139.

Rifai, A. (2020). Pertimbangan hukum hakim dalam sengketa hak eigendom [Judges' legal considerations in eigendom rights disputes]. Jurnal Yudisial, 13(1), 101–103.

Santoso, U. (2016). Hukum agraria: Kajian komprehensif [Agrarian law: A comprehensive study]. Kencana Prenada Media Group.

Soerprapto, R. (2014). Kedudukan hukum eigendom verponding pasca berlakunya UUPA [The legal status of eigendom verponding after the enactment of the Basic Agrarian Law]. Jurnal Hukum Agraria, 9(2), 87–88.

Suara Surabaya. (2025, September 22). Klaim Pertamina atas tanah Darmo Hill menghambat proses sertifikasi masyarakat [Pertamina's claim on Darmo Hill land hampers the community certification process]. Retrieved from https://www.suarasurabaya.net

Sumardjono, M. S. W. (2017). Tanah dalam perspektif hak ekonomi, sosial, dan budaya [Land in the perspective of economic, social, and cultural rights]. Kompas.