

Legal Relationship in The Subsidized Fertilizer Purchase and Sale Contract between CV Prima Tani and Toko Iffah

Widya Cahya Nabila¹, Suarlan Datupalinge¹, Muhammad Iqbal¹

¹ Universitas Tadulako, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

legal relationships;
sales contracts;
subsidized fertilizer

Article history:

Received 2025-04-22

Revised 2026-05-26

Accepted 2026-06-30

ABSTRACT

This study aims to examine the nature of the legal relationship between CV Prima Tani and Toko Iffah regarding the sales contract for subsidized fertilizer. A normative legal research method was employed. The findings indicate that the legal relationship between CV Prima Tani acting as the seller or distributor and Toko Iffah acting as the buyer or authorized retailer of subsidized fertilizer is grounded in a sales contract that establishes rights and obligations for both parties. CV Prima Tani is obligated to supply and deliver subsidized fertilizer in accordance with established stipulations regarding quantity, type, quality, and distribution mechanisms, while Toko Iffah is obligated to make payments and distribute the fertilizer to farmers in compliance with applicable regulations. However, implementation challenges persist, such as distribution delays, limited fertilizer availability, and varying levels of understanding among the parties regarding administrative requirements and regulations governing subsidized fertilizer. The study concludes that the sales contract between CV Prima Tani and Toko Iffah has established a binding legal relationship based on the principles of freedom of contract and good faith, as well as statutory provisions. Consequently, there is a need for improved adherence to distribution procedures and more effective oversight to ensure the contract is executed in an orderly manner and yields benefits for the farming community.

This is an open access article under the [CC BY](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) license.



Corresponding Author:

Widya Cahya Nabila

Universitas Tadulako, Indonesia; _widyacahyanabilaku10@gmail.com

1. INTRODUCTION

An agreement is an obligation born from the consent of the parties; according to Article 1313 of the Indonesian Civil Code, hereinafter referred to as (KUHPPerdata), it explains that an agreement is an act that gives rise to an obligation or performance from one party to another. Agreements can take the form of a gratuitous agreement or an onerous agreement. A gratuitous agreement is an agreement in which one party provides a benefit to another party without receiving any advantage in return. Meanwhile, an onerous agreement obligates each party to give, to do, or not to do something. Article 1233 of the Civil

Code states: "Every obligation is born either by agreement or by law." In other words, obligations can arise from: an agreement (contract), or the law (for instance, due to an unlawful act or without an agreement).

According to Subekti, only written agreements can be considered contracts. Agreements are fundamentally made based on the principle of freedom of contract; the legal aspect of freedom of contract is the "spirit" or "breath" of an agreement, which is based on the belief that only the parties themselves know that they must enter into a contractual relationship. Conflicts or disputes in a commercial (business) contract always occur due to conflicts of interest and the inability of one of the parties to fulfill the contents of the agreement. If the party that feels aggrieved expresses dissatisfaction to the party causing the loss to the other party, the conflict will escalate into a dispute (Nurul Miqat, Rafika Nur, Virgayani Fattah, Susi Sulilawati, 2021).

The principles of freedom of contract contained in the Civil Code fundamentally provide an opportunity for the parties entering into an agreement to determine the agreement they make, whether in terms of form, substance, or the content contained therein. This principle is explicitly stated in Article 1338 paragraph (1) of the Civil Code, which emphasizes that all agreements legally made operate as law for those who made them. In other words, the parties have complete freedom to determine the content, form, and purpose of their agreement as long as it does not conflict with the law, morality, and public order (Sahlan, Nurul Miqat, 2024).

Indonesia is famous for its soil fertility, yet the development of various development sectors in the regions has necessitated the addition of supporting materials to maintain and increase the fertility of agricultural land. One commonly used method is through the utilization of fertilizers. Fertilizer is a substance added to the growing medium or directly to the plant to meet the nutrient requirements necessary for the plant to grow and produce optimally. These fertilizer materials can originate from both organic and inorganic sources.

National food security constitutes a fundamental pillar in guaranteeing the economic and political stability of a country. In Indonesia, one of the vital policy instruments used by the Government to support the agricultural sector is through the Subsidized Fertilizer scheme. National food security constitutes a fundamental pillar in guaranteeing the economic and political stability of a country. The subsidized fertilizer policy is a government policy to strengthen food security, which features a scope and target that steadily increase from year to year (Affan Insan Fanady dan H. Zaenal Arifin Dilaga, 2021).

Subsidized fertilizer is fertilizer provided by the government through a special price mechanism that is lower than the market price, so that it can be accessed by eligible farmers according to specific criteria. This program is implemented by various parties, one of which is Pupuk Indonesia, as a State-Owned Enterprise (BUMN) committed to supporting national food security.

Provisions regarding the management of subsidized fertilizers are currently regulated through the Regulation of the Minister of Agriculture (Permentan) Number 15 of 2025 concerning the Implementing Regulations of Presidential Regulation Number 6 of 2025 concerning the Management of Subsidized Fertilizers. This regulation serves as the primary reference in the implementation of the subsidized fertilizer program, encompassing the types of subsidized fertilizer, the allocation system based on the Electronic Group Definitive Requirement Plan hereinafter abbreviated as e-RDKK, up to supervision and guidance. This Permentan also regulates the roles of various parties in the distribution chain, including producers, distributors, retailers/kiosks, as well as payment system support through banking institutions. Its primary objective is to create a distribution system for subsidized fertilizers that is more orderly, accurately targeted, and supports transparency as well as accountability at the field level.

This subsidy is not merely ordinary financial assistance, but rather a strategic intervention to ensure that agricultural production costs remain affordable, which ultimately aims to protect the welfare of millions of farmers while simultaneously guaranteeing the availability of food supply for all Indonesian people. Therefore, the regulations governing the procurement and distribution of subsidized fertilizers, involving Producers, Distributors, Retailers, up to farmers, are extremely strict. According to the Civil Code, rights and obligations are inherent to both parties, including within a purchase and sale agreement.

It is stated in Article 1457 that the definition of a Purchase and Sale Agreement is an agreement by which one party binds themselves to deliver an item, and the other party to pay the promised price (Aptest Arlien Friedrich, Achmad Busro, 2016). A purchase and sale agreement constitutes a contract involving reciprocal obligations, wherein the seller must provide the goods in accordance with the agreement and fulfill the function of said goods. On the other hand, the buyer has the duty to pay the agreed price at the specified time and location. Furthermore, this obligation creates rights and duties that must be fulfilled by both parties so that the purchase and sale transaction becomes legally valid and enforceable. One of the buyer's rights is to receive the goods according to the agreement, provide guarantees for the goods, and provide proof of the transaction. Meanwhile, the seller's obligations are to deliver the goods according to the agreement, provide guarantees for the goods, and possess the possibility to postpone payment if delivery has not yet been carried out. Receiving and paying for the goods, providing proof of transaction, and paying the purchase price according to the agreement are all responsibilities of the buyer (Milkawati B. Daud, Jubair, 2025).

The implementation of the purchase and sale agreement, which usually occurs from the distributor to the retailer and then from the retailer to the farmer as the end consumer, often faces various obstacles. This is caused by differences in interests, a lack of legal understanding, as well as violations of the agreement clauses. Although the legal framework has established high compliance standards for the subsidized fertilizer trade, its implementation in the field frequently faces serious challenges in the form of deviations and illegal practices. This issue arises due to a significant price disparity between subsidized fertilizer and market prices (non-subsidized), creating a strong economic incentive for irresponsible actors to engage in diversion. The forms of this deviation vary, ranging from sales above the Highest Retail Price hereinafter abbreviated as (**HET**), the diversion of fertilizer to unauthorized industrial sectors or large plantations, to hoarding that causes scarcity at the farmer level.

2. METHODS

The type of research used in this writing is normative legal research, which focuses on examining the application of positive legal norms in the form of statutory regulations (Marzuki, 2021), particularly the Law on agreements (Purwati Ani, 2020).

3. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The legal relationship within the subsidized fertilizer distribution system in the SPJB does not create a single agreement that binds third parties simultaneously, but only regulates the legal interaction between the distributor and the retailer as parties to the purchase and sale contract. This complies with the provisions of Article 1457 of the Civil Code, which emphasizes that a purchase and sale contract only involves the seller and the buyer, and is reinforced by Article 1338 of the Civil Code, which states that the agreement binds those who enter into it as law (Susanti, 2024; Umar, 2020). Meanwhile, the farmer is not a party to the SPJB, but is regarded as the end consumer who obtains fertilizer through the retailer in a separate transaction. Accordingly, the resulting legal relationship is hierarchical, namely between the distributor and the retailer through the SPJB, and between the retailer and the farmer through direct sales. In addition to following the provisions of the Civil Code, this reciprocal arrangement is also regulated by government policy through the Regulation of the Minister of Trade Number 4 of 2023, so that this contract possesses a specific character as a private contract within a public supervision framework (Tasya Putri Ramadhani, 2023).

The legal relationship of the subsidized fertilizer purchase and sale agreement between the distributor and the retailer, as explained in the (SPJB), fundamentally reflects a civil legal relationship originating from the general provisions of contract law found in the Civil Code. Particularly regarding the purchase and sale agreement explained in Article 1457 of the Civil Code. However, the nature of this legal relationship cannot be considered an ordinary purchase and sale transaction, because the object of the agreement, namely subsidized fertilizer, is a commodity whose procurement, distribution,

and utilization are under state supervision and control. Therefore, the SPJB does not only reflect a private agreement between the distributor and the retailer, but also functions as a legal instrument that guarantees the implementation of the government's public policy regarding food security and farmer protection.

In this context, the principle of freedom of contract, as regulated in Article 1338 of the Civil Code, is subject to several limitations because the provisions, execution, and legal consequences of the agreement are strictly determined by government regulations that are mandatory for the sake of public interest (Ni Kadek Erika Manggala, Ni Luh Made Mahendrawati, 2023). Legally, the SPJB between the distributor and the retailer satisfies the requirements to be deemed a valid contract in accordance with Article 1320 of the Civil Code, which encompasses mutual consent, the legal capacity to enter into an agreement, a specific object, and a lawful cause. Mutual consent is evident from the signing of the SPJB by both parties without any coercion, mistake, or fraud. The legal capacity of both parties is fulfilled because both the distributor and the retailer are recognized as legal entities authorized in the distribution of subsidized fertilizers. The object of the agreement is clearly specified as subsidized fertilizer, with the type, quantity, and distribution mechanism stipulated, while the cause of the agreement is lawful, as it aims to support the government's subsidy program for the agricultural sector. With all four elements fulfilled, the SPJB binds both parties as if it were law and must be executed in good faith, as emphasized in Article 1338 paragraphs (1) and (3) of the Civil Code.

In this analytical discussion, the author uses the Purchase and Sale Agreement as a direct example to illustrate the legal relationship between the distributor and the retailer within the SPJB concerning the subsidized fertilizer purchase and sale agreement. The complete identity of the parties listed in the SPJB between the subsidized fertilizer distributor and retailer plays a highly crucial role legally, as it serves as the basis for determining who the legal subjects involved in the agreement are, in accordance with Article 1313 of the Civil Code. In addition, this identity also satisfies the agreement's legality requirement regarding the capacity of the parties to perform legal actions as regulated in Article 1320 of the Civil Code. Consequently, there is certainty that the agreement made is binding and must be complied with by all parties involved, in accordance with the provisions of Article 1338 of the Civil Code.

The inclusion of the identity of the distributor, which is a legal entity, is also directly related to the provisions contained in Article 1 point 1 of Law Number 40 of 2007 concerning Limited Liability Companies, which asserts that a company is an independent legal subject, as well as Article 98 of the same Law regarding the authority of the board of directors to represent the company in legal actions. This means that the responsibility for the execution of the agreement and the legal consequences arising from a breach of contract (default) legally rests upon that business entity. On the other hand, the identity of the retailer listed in the agreement proves that they are official business actors who hold a license to distribute subsidized fertilizers. This is aligned with the principle of legality for business actors regulated by statutory regulations concerning licensing, and also supports the state's duty to guarantee the precise distribution of agricultural production inputs, as mandated in Article 7 and Article 15 of Law Number 19 of 2013 concerning the Protection and Empowerment of Farmers. Therefore, it can be concluded that the inclusion of the parties' identities in the SPJB not only satisfies the formal requirements of an agreement under civil law, but also serves as a tool to provide legal certainty, a basis for liability when violations occur, and a means of state supervision to protect the interests of farmers and ensure orderliness in the distribution of subsidized fertilizers (Uswatun Hasanah, M. Wendy Trijaya, Dora Mustika, 2026).

The rights and obligations contained in the SPJB between the subsidized fertilizer distributor and retailer basically reflect the implementation of legal rules governing agreements and the distribution of subsidized fertilizer. According to Article 1313 of the Civil Code, an agreement creates a right for one party and an obligation for the other party, so that once the SPJB is signed, the distributor and retailer are legally bound to execute the agreement. The distributor's responsibility in the SPJB to provide and deliver subsidized fertilizer to the retailer, in accordance with the specified type, quantity, and timing,

is in line with the provisions of Article 1474 of the Civil Code, which requires the seller to deliver the merchandise. Furthermore, the distributor's right to receive payment from the retailer is a consequence of the buyer's obligation to make the price payment in accordance with Article 1457 of the Civil Code (Abdul Rosid, Suparji, 2024).

On the other hand, the retailer's obligation in the SPJB to pay for the fertilizer on time, sell it at the HET, and distribute it only to eligible farmers is not only an agreement within the contract, but also a command of the law, specifically in Article 7 and Article 15 of Law Number 19 of 2013 concerning the Protection and Empowerment of Farmers, which mandates that the distribution of agricultural production inputs must be carried out accurately and be supervisable. Accordingly, if one of the parties fails to fulfill their obligations as regulated in the SPJB, that party can be deemed to have breached the agreement and be held liable based on Article 1239 and Article 1243 of the Civil Code, which demonstrates that the arrangement of rights and obligations in the SPJB aims to provide clarity regarding the roles between the distributor and the retailer, create legal certainty, and ensure that the allocation of subsidized fertilizer proceeds according to regulations and protects the interests of farmers.

The unique characteristics of the agreement's object in the form of subsidized fertilizer exert an important legal impact on the legal relationship between the two parties. Although this fertilizer is bought and sold, its status is not completely equivalent to ordinary goods, as there are elements of public funding and public purpose within it. Therefore, the rights of ownership and control over subsidized fertilizer held by the retailer are limited and conditional. The retailer does not have full freedom to set prices, choose consumers, or determine the distribution method of the fertilizer, because all these aspects have been normatively regulated. This restriction can be theoretically understood through the social function approach of agreements, wherein an agreement is viewed not only as a tool to satisfy the individual interests of the parties, but also as a way to realize the interests of the broader community (Nofiandi Nofiandi, Benni Rusli, 2023).

The rules regarding sanctions and supervision contained in the SPJB between the distributor and the retailer of subsidized fertilizer can be fully viewed within the context of civil law because they stem from an obligatory relationship arising from the agreement. This is affirmed in Article 1313 of the Civil Code, which states that: "An agreement is an act whereby one or more persons bind themselves toward one or more other persons." Consequently, once the SPJB is signed, all parties are legally bound to fulfill all the provisions that have been agreed upon. The clauses concerning sanctions and supervision in the SPJB possess legal force based on Article 1338 paragraph (1) of the Civil Code, which states that: "All agreements legally made operate as law for those who made them," meaning that provisions on supervision in the execution of obligations and the application of sanctions in the event of violations constitute a valid and binding part of the agreement.

If one of the parties fails to execute their obligations in accordance with the provisions in the SPJB, whether due to non-performance, delay in performance, or performance that does not comply with the contents of the agreement, such action is categorized as a breach of contract (default) according to Article 1329/1239 of the Civil Code, which states: "Every obligation to do something, or not to do something, if the debtor fails to fulfill their obligation, shall be resolved with the obligation to pay costs, damages, and interest," so that the aggrieved party is entitled to demand the legal consequences of that violation. Furthermore, the basis for claiming damages in the sanction clause of the SPJB complies with Article 1243 of the Civil Code, which states: "Compensation for costs, damages, and interest due to the non-fulfillment of an obligation only begins to apply after the debtor is declared in default of fulfilling their obligation and continues to neglect it." Accordingly, the sanction provisions in the SPJB function as a means of civil law enforcement to guarantee the certainty of agreement execution and provide legal protection for the party aggrieved as a result of the other party's non-compliance with contractual obligations (Supianto dan Nanang Tri Budiman, 2017).

In its implementation, the SPJB clearly establishes prohibitions and sanctions for control and supervision. Potential violations or errors by the retailer include selling fertilizer at a price above the

HET, distributing fertilizer to unauthorized parties, hoarding, or falsifying distribution reports. For these violations, the SPJB authorizes the distributor to impose administrative sanctions, such as terminating the partnership and halting fertilizer distribution, and allows for further legal action in accordance with the applicable regulations. This indicates that the legal liability of the retailer is not limited to civil liability due to breach of contract, but can also result in administrative and even criminal liability if the violation causes detriment to state finances or the public interest.

The inclusion of the signature of each party in the Purchase and Sale Agreement holds a highly significant legal meaning because it serves as proof of consent that creates a relationship between the distributor and the retailer, as regulated in Article 1320 of the Civil Code which states that one of the requirements for the validity of an agreement is the consent of the parties bound, so that by signing the agreement, it can be ensured that all parties have consciously, freely, and without coercion agreed to the entire contents of the agreement (Adittia Karyana dan Sri Ratna Suminar, 2022). In addition to being a sign of consent, the signature also establishes the position of the contract as written evidence under civil law. Article 1867 of the Civil Code states that "Written evidence may consist of authentic writings or private writings," and the agreement falls into the category of private writing. For this private document to possess evidentiary value, it must satisfy the provisions of Article 1874 of the Civil Code, which states that "As a private document, it is deemed to be a deed signed privately by the parties involved," so that the signature in the SPJB plays a role in directly linking the contents of the agreement with the party responsible for its execution. From a legal perspective, the signature in the SPJB is not merely an administrative formality, but is also an element that constitutes the agreement and functions as valid evidence, which provides legal certainty that the agreement has been made, consented to, and binds each party to perform the rights and obligations contained therein (Novia Safitri, Ahmad Zazili, Elly Nurlaili, 2026).

The legal relationship between the distributor and the retailer in the SPJB is interconnected, wherein both parties possess reciprocal rights and responsibilities. The distributor has an obligation to provide and distribute subsidized fertilizer to the retailer in accordance with the allocation determined by the government and to ensure that the fertilizer is available in the appropriate condition and quantity. On the other hand, the retailer is obligated to purchase fertilizer from the distributor and distribute it to eligible farmers or farmer groups based on the Group Definitive Requirement Plan (RDKK) at a price not exceeding the HET. This responsibility of the retailer demonstrates that their role is not merely as a profit-oriented businessman, but also as part of the subsidized fertilizer distribution system regulated by the state. Therefore, the legal position of the retailer can be regarded as an intermediary, namely an entity that executes a certain function based on a private agreement yet within the context of public policy.

The legal relationship between the distributor and the retailer in the distribution of subsidized fertilizer cannot be separated from the nature of the subsidized fertilizer itself, which is a commodity under government supervision. Therefore, this relationship is not only bound by civil law but is also relevant to the public law regime specifically regulated by legislation in the fields of trade and agriculture. In this context, the Kios Iffah Purchase and Sale Agreement (SPJB) functions as a legal instrument that connects the private interests of the parties with government policy regarding the distribution of subsidized fertilizer.

From a legal perspective, the Kios Iffah Purchase and Sale Agreement (SPJB) is a valid agreement as regulated under Article 1313 of the Civil Code, meaning it constitutes a legal action that binds both parties. The validity of the SPJB also satisfies the requirements of a valid agreement as regulated in Article 1320 of the Civil Code, due to the existence of an agreement between the distributor and the kiosk, the capacity of the parties to perform legal actions, a clear purpose of the agreement, namely the purchase and sale of subsidized fertilizer, and a lawful cause for the agreement, as it was made to implement a legally recognized fertilizer distribution policy. If all these requirements are fulfilled, then, in accordance with Article 1338 paragraph (1) of the Civil Code, the SPJB binds those who sign it like law (Finiria Elindra, Kartika Dewi Irianto, 2023).

In the context of trade law, the existence of the Kios Iffah SPJB is aligned with the objectives of trade organization as regulated in Law Number 7 of 2014 concerning Trade. Article 3 letters b and c of this law emphasize that trade organization aims to ensure the smooth distribution of goods, realize orderly trade, and protect national interests. In this matter, the SPJB functions as a tool to ensure that the distribution of subsidized fertilizer is carried out in an orderly, monitored manner, and in accordance with the targets set by the government.

The appointment of the distributor in the Kios Iffah SPJB complies with the provisions contained in Government Regulation Number 29 of 2021 concerning the Implementation of the Trade Sector. Article 1 point 16 of this regulation defines a distributor as a business actor that distributes goods to other business actors. In the SPJB, the distributor acts as the authorized party to distribute subsidized fertilizer to the kiosk as an official retailer. Furthermore, Article 12 of Government Regulation Number 29 of 2021 requires every business actor in the trade sector to possess a business license, while Article 36 emphasizes the distributor's obligation to have distribution facilities and carry out distribution activities in accordance with the applicable law.

Additionally, the designation of Kios Iffah as a retailer in the SPJB is also aligned with the retailer selection mechanism regulated under the applicable regulations. Article 1, point 8 of Government Regulation Number 29 of 2021 states that a business actor in the trade sector is any individual or business entity that carries out trading activities. In the SPJB, Kios Iffah is positioned as a trading business actor at the retail level, distributing subsidized fertilizer directly to farmers. This designation is conducted through a written contract, in accordance with the provisions regulated in Article 3 paragraph (1) of the Regulation of the Minister of Trade Number 24 of 2021 concerning Goods Distribution Agreements by Distributors or Agents, which states that the distribution of goods must be carried out through a valid agreement. Furthermore, Article 8 of the same regulation emphasizes that the distribution of goods can only be carried out by officially appointed business actors.

The compliance of the SPJB with specific regulations regarding subsidized fertilizer is also evident from the responsibilities imposed on the retailer. The Kios Iffah SPJB obligates the kiosk to distribute subsidized fertilizer only to eligible farmers, sell fertilizer at the HET, and not misuse subsidized fertilizer outside the applicable regulations. This responsibility is in line with the Regulation of the Minister of Agriculture Number 10 of 2022, which states that subsidized fertilizer can only be distributed by recognized distributors and retailers, to registered farmers, and at prices set by the government. Therefore, the SPJB does not only function as an ordinary sales contract but also as an instrument to implement state policy in maintaining national food security.

Based on this analysis, it can be concluded that the Kios Iffah SPJB conforms with the distributor and retailer appointment system according to Indonesian positive law. The SPJB is valid under civil law, aligned with the provisions of the Trade Law, and consistent with implementing regulations in the field of fertilizer distribution and subsidies. The juridical consequence of this conformity is that any violation of the provisions of the SPJB can not only be qualified as a breach of contract (default) under civil law, but also potentially give rise to administrative sanctions as it relates directly to the implementation of public policy.

Therefore, on the whole, the author is of the opinion that the legal relationship in the subsidized fertilizer purchase and sale agreement between the distributor and the retailer, as regulated under the Law on the Purchase and Sale of Subsidized Fertilizer, is not a simple relationship. Fundamentally, this relationship is based on an agreement between the two parties, in accordance with the provisions of the Civil Code relating to purchase and sale agreements. This means that both the distributor and the retailer are obliged to exercise their rights and fulfill their obligations in accordance with the provisions of the agreement.

The distributor is responsible for providing and distributing subsidized fertilizer in the specified quantity and condition. In return, the retailer is obliged to pay for the fertilizer at the agreed price and distribute it to eligible farmers. If either party violates their obligations, that party will bear legal liability in accordance with the provisions of the agreement and the applicable regulations. However,

this agreement differs from a standard purchase and sale agreement because subsidized fertilizer is a commodity whose purchase is subject to government regulation and supervision. Therefore, the implementation of the agricultural fertilizer subsidy agreement must comply not only with the Civil Code but also with government regulations, such as maximum retail prices, fertilizer allocations, and distribution methods. This highlights the important role of the government in ensuring that the implementation of this agreement aligns with the objectives of the support program.

Therefore, the agricultural fertilizer support agreement cannot be viewed merely as a commercial contract. This agreement also functions as a mechanism to ensure the orderly, transparent, and accurate distribution of subsidized fertilizer. Through this agreement, the government ensures that the fertilizer reaches the farmers who need it, thereby effectively achieving the objectives of its agricultural support policy.

4. CONCLUSION

The arrangement of agreements between distributors and retailers in the distribution of subsidized fertilizer is regulated through purchase and sale agreements. Although this agreement fundamentally follows the legal requirements regulated in Articles 1313 and 1320 of the Civil Code, in practice, the principle of freedom of contract does not fully apply. This is because the goods that constitute the object of the agreement are under state control and are directly related to public needs and national food security. Therefore, the Purchase and Sale Agreement (SPJB) here functions not only as a profit-generating agreement but also as a public law instrument that obliges the parties to comply with government regulations, particularly regarding the determination of maximum retail prices and distribution requirements.

In response to these findings, there are several strategic steps that need to be taken to strengthen the subsidized fertilizer distribution system in the future. The government, through relevant agencies, needs to enhance the integration of data on farmers' needs by strengthening a transparent digital system, so that there is no loophole for the occurrence of a breach of contract (default) resulting from imbalances between supply and demand in the field. Broader steps must be taken by local governments and producers to conduct routine socialization and legal education for distributors and retailers regarding the importance of compliance with agreements or contracts. This socialization is not limited to the technical aspects of distribution, but also provides a legal understanding that the Purchase and Sale Agreement (SPJB) they sign carries serious legal consequences, so that they genuinely comprehend the rights, obligations, and inherent legal effects from the very outset.

REFERENCES

- Abdul Rosid, Suparji, F. F. (2024). Perjanjian Distributor dengan Pedagang Kelontong (Studi Kasus Perjanjian Distributor Pemasok Snack ke Pedagang Kelontong di Pasar Cipete Utara Jakarta Selatan). *UNES Law Review*, 6(4).
- Adittia Karyana dan Sri Ratna Suminar. (2022). Akibat Hukum Pelanggaran Asas Pacta Sunt Servanda oleh Pembeli dalam Perjanjian Jual Beli Ditinjau dari Buku ke III KUHPerduta. *Bandung Conference Series: Law Studies*, 2(1).
- Affan Insan Fanady dan H. Zaenal Arifin Dilaga. (2021). TINJAUAN YURIDIS PERJANJIAN PENGADAAN PUPUK ANTARA DINAS PERTANIAN TANAMAN PANGAN DAN HORTIKULTURA PROVINSI NTB DENGAN PT. FAJAR JAYA SENTOSA. *Private Law Universitas Mataram*, 1(2).
- Aptest Arlien Friedrich, Achmad Busro, E. A. P. (2016). ANALISIS TERHADAP KESEPAKATAN DAN PERJANJIAN KERJASAMA ANTARA PT. INTAN SEJATI ANDALAN DENGAN SUPLIER TENTANG JUAL BELI TANDAN BUAH SEGAR KELAPA SAWIT (TBS). *Diponegoro Law Journal*, 5(3), 1–13.
- Finiria Elindra, Kartika Dewi Irianto, M. A. (2023). PERLINDUNGAN HUKUM DALAM

- WANPRESTASI PERJANJIAN JUAL BELI ANTARA DISTRIBUTOR DENGAN PEDAGANG. *SAKATO LAW JOURNAL*, 1(1).
- Marzuki, P. M. (2021). *Penelitian Hukum (Edisi Revisi)*. Jakarta: Kencana.
- Milkawati B. Daud, Jubair, K. M. (2025). Faktor penyebab terjadinya konflik kemitraan antara petani plasma dan perusahaan perkebunan kelapa sawit di kabupaten Buol. *Legal Opinion: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum*, 13(3).
- Ni Kadek Erika Manggala, Ni Luh Made Mahendrawati, I. W. K. J. U. (2023). Pelaksanaan Perjanjian Kerjasama Antara Ud.Citra Batu Bulan dengan Restoran Nebula Kuta dalam Bidang Supplier Buah dan Sayur. *Jurnal Konstruksi Hukum*, 4(2).
- Nofiandi Nofiandi, Benni Rusli, Kartika Dewi I. (2023). PERJANJIAN ANTARA DISTRIBUTOR DAN PEDAGANG GROSIR TERKAIT PRODUK MAKANAN DAN MINUMAN PADA CV. PURNAMA JAYA GADUT. *SAKATO LAW JOURNAL*, 1(2).
- Novia Safitri, Ahmad Zazili, Elly Nurlaili, et al. (2026). Analisis Kesesuaian Perjanjian Kerjasama Pengelolaan Pasar Pekon Ampai di Kecamatan Limau Kabupaten Tanggamus. *Al -Zayn: Jurnal Ilmu Sosial & Hukum*, 4(1).
- Nurul Miqat, Rafika Nur, Virgayani Fattah, Susi Sulilawati, I. P. (2021). Local Wisdom of Customary Law Community to Realize Food Sovereignty in Central Sulawesi. *Jambura Law Review*, 3(2).
- Purwati Ani. (2020). *Metode Penelitian Hukum Teori & Praktek*. Surabaya: CV. Jakad Media Publishing.
- Sahlan, Nurul Miqat, S. S. (2024). Realizing “Deconstructional” Justice Through Agrarian Civil Law Reform: A Review Of Jacques Derrida’s Theory. *Jurnal IUS Kajian Hukum Dan Keadilan*, 12(3), 588–606.
- Supianto dan Nanang Tri Budiman. (2017). Analisis Yuridis terhadap Perjanjian Kerjasama antara Petani Tembakau di Kabupaten Jember dengan PT. Adi Sampoerna. *Jurnal Rechtsens*, 6(2), 41–59.
- Susanti, N. (2024). Kepastian Hukum Penerapan Asas Kebebasan Berkontrak Dalam Sebuah Perjanjian Baku Ditinjau Berdasarkan Pasal 1338 Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Perdata. *Indragiri Law Review*, 2(2), 33–39.
- Tasya Putri Ramadhani. (2023). Tinjauan Hukum Terhadap Sistem Praktik Jual Beli Pupuk Bersubsidi (Studi di Desa Ngemplak Kecamatan Kartasura Kabupaten Sukoharjo). *Jurnal Bevinding*, 1(2).
- Umar, D. U. (2020). Penerapan Asas Konsensualisme Dalam Perjanjian Jual Beli Menurut Perspektif Hukum Perdata. *Lex Privatum*, VIII(1), 1.
- Uswatun Hasanah, M. Wendy Trijaya, Dora Mustika, et al. (2026). Pelaksanaan Perjanjian Promosi Produk PT. Tirta Fresindo Jaya Dengan KOPMA UNILA Ditinjau Dari Persektif Hukum Perdata Indonesia. *Al -Zayn: Jurnal Ilmu Sosial & Hukum*, 4(3).

