

Reconstruction of Electronic Deed Regulations Based on Legal Certainty and Justice in the Indonesian Notary System

Marsella¹, Rafiqi¹

¹ Universitas Medan Area, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Electronic Deed;
Legal Certainty;
Notary

Article history:

Received 2025-05-08
Revised 2026-06-11
Accepted 2026-07-16

ABSTRACT

The transformation of information technology has driven the digitalization of notarial services, including the growing use of electronic deeds in various legal transactions. However, the regulation of electronic deeds in Indonesia still raises legal certainty issues due to the lack of integration of provisions in the Notary Law with the Electronic Information and Transactions Law. This study aims to examine the regulation of electronic deeds, assess their evidentiary strength, and formulate a regulatory reconstruction model based on legal certainty and justice. The study uses normative legal methods with a statutory, conceptual, and case approach, through a qualitative analysis of primary, secondary, and tertiary legal materials. The results of the study indicate that the regulation of electronic deeds is still scattered and does not clearly regulate the form, procedures for making, and the status of evidence. Therefore, regulatory harmonization, explicit recognition of electronic deeds as authentic deeds under certain conditions, implementation of digital security standards, and affirmation of notary responsibilities are needed to create legal protection and justice for the parties.

This is an open access article under the [CC BY](#) license.



Corresponding Author:

Marsella

Universitas Medan Area, Indonesia; marsela@staff.uma.ac.id

1. INTRODUCTION

The transformation of information and communication technology in the digital era has brought fundamental changes to social, economic, and legal relations in Indonesia. These changes are evident not only in trade and public services but also in legal services, including the notary sector. The use of digital technology enables legal processes to be conducted electronically, from document exchange and agreement signing to digital archive storage. In such a situation, electronic deeds are considered an instrument capable of meeting the public's need for faster, more efficient, and more flexible legal services.

The digitalization of notarial services is part of the modernization of the legal system, aimed at improving service quality and expanding public access to legal services. According to Friedman, the law must adapt to social and technological developments to remain effective in regulating people's lives

(Friedman, 2001). Therefore, the existence of electronic deeds requires regulatory adjustments to provide legal certainty for parties conducting digital transactions.

Normatively, the recognition of electronic documents as legal evidence is regulated in Law Number 11 of 2008 concerning Electronic Information and Transactions, as last amended by Law Number 1 of 2024. This provision states that electronic information and electronic documents, along with their printouts, constitute valid evidence. However, the provisions regarding electronic deeds made by notaries have not been comprehensively regulated in the Notary Law. As a result, differences in interpretation have emerged regarding the legal status, preparation procedures, and evidentiary power of electronic deeds.

This issue becomes even more apparent when linked to the provisions of the Civil Code (KUHPdata). Article 1866 of the Civil Code places written evidence as one of the primary means of evidence in civil cases, while Article 1868 of the Civil Code stipulates that an authentic deed is one made in a form prescribed by law by or before an authorized public official. This provision demonstrates that the formalities of deed preparation are a crucial element in determining the authenticity of a deed. In conventional practice, these formalities are realized through the presence of the parties before a notary, the reading of the deed, and the in-person signing. However, such a mechanism is not entirely in line with the nature of electronic transactions, which allow interactions to take place from different locations.

From the perspective of the law of evidence, an authentic deed has perfect evidentiary power regarding the contents contained therein as long as it cannot be proven otherwise. Subekti explains that an authentic deed is written evidence that has the highest evidentiary value because it is made by or before an authorized public official (Subekti, 2005). However, technological developments require a new interpretation of the concept of evidence. In this case, the theory of evidence put forward by Eddy OS Hiariej is important because it emphasizes that the law of evidence must develop along with advances in science and technology to be able to meet the needs of modern society (Hiariej, 2012). Hiariej states that electronic evidence can have the same evidentiary power as conventional evidence if it meets the elements of authenticity, integrity, and reliability of the electronic system used (Hiariej, 2012).

This view demonstrates that the issue of electronic deeds is not only related to the document's format, but also concerns the procedure for its creation, which must guarantee authenticity and public trust. Therefore, if electronic deeds are to be equated with authentic deeds as referred to in Article 1868 of the Civil Code, the electronic system used must be able to provide guarantees equivalent to conventional procedures. Without clear regulations regarding digital identity verification, the use of certified electronic signatures, and data storage security, the evidentiary power of electronic deeds will continue to raise doubts in judicial practice.

In addition to the evidentiary aspect, the use of electronic deeds also has implications for criminal law. The use of electronic systems opens up opportunities for identity forgery, data manipulation, hacking, and the misuse of electronic signatures. In criminal law theory, criminal law serves not only to punish perpetrators of crimes but also to prevent violations that could harm society. Barda Nawawi Arief stated that criminal law policy must be directed at protecting society from various forms of crime, including crimes arising from the development of information technology (Arief, 2010). Therefore, the regulation of electronic deeds must be accompanied by a protection mechanism against the risk of cybercrime.

The problems with electronic deeds in Indonesia can be seen from several interrelated aspects. First, there is no clear definition of an electronic deed in the Notary Law. Second, the procedures for creating, reading, and signing electronic deeds have not been regulated in detail. Third, there are no national standards regarding the security of electronic systems used in notarial services. Fourth, notaries' responsibilities in the event of system disruptions, data leaks, or falsification of electronic documents remain unclear. Fifth, the lack of harmonization between notary law, evidence law in the Civil Code, and cyber law creates the potential for normative conflicts in practice.

The lack of clarity in these regulations results in a lack of legal certainty for notaries and users of notarial services. According to Radbruch, legal certainty is one of the fundamental values of law,

alongside justice and expediency (Radbruch, 1973). In the context of electronic deeds, this lack of clarity regarding their legal status and evidentiary validity creates legal risks for the parties in the event of future disputes.

On the other hand, the theory of justice demands that technological developments not hinder public access to legal services. Rawls argued that legal institutions should be designed to provide equitable benefits to all members of society (Rawls, 1999). Therefore, electronic deed regulations cannot simply maintain conventional procedures but must also consider the public's need for more efficient and accessible legal services.

Thus, the need for a reconstruction of the regulation of electronic deeds in Indonesia is becoming increasingly urgent. This reconstruction must include explicit recognition of electronic deeds as authentic under certain conditions, regulation of digital identity verification mechanisms, implementation of cybersecurity standards, and affirmation of notary responsibilities in the use of electronic systems. Furthermore, harmonization of the Notary Law, the Electronic Information and Transactions Law, and the evidentiary provisions in the Civil Code is necessary to avoid overlapping or gaps in norms.

Based on this description, it can be understood that the issue of electronic deeds in Indonesia is not merely a technical issue of document digitization, but also concerns fundamental aspects of the legal system, namely legal certainty, evidentiary power, protection against cybercrime, and justice for the parties. Therefore, research on the reconstruction of electronic deeds regulations based on legal certainty and justice in the Indonesian notarial system is crucial to produce a regulatory model that can accommodate technological developments while upholding the basic principles of notarial law.

should briefly place the study in a broad context and highlight why it is important. It should define the purpose of the work and its significance. The current state of the research field should be reviewed carefully, and key publications cited. Please highlight controversial and diverging hypotheses when necessary. Finally, briefly mention the main aim of the work and highlight the principal conclusions. As far as possible, please keep the introduction comprehensible to scientists outside your particular field of research. References should be cited as (Kamba, 2018) or (Marchlewska et al., 2019) or (Cichocka, 2016; Hidayat & Khalika, 2019; Ikhwan, 2019; Madjid, 2002) or (Miller & Josephs, 2009, p. 12) or Rahmat (1989). See the end of the document for further details on references. Technical terms should be defined. Symbols, abbreviations, and acronyms should be defined the first time they are used. All tables and figures should be cited in numerical order.

2. METHODS

This study uses a normative legal method by examining legal provisions relating to the regulation of electronic deeds in the Indonesian notarial system. The applied approach includes statutory, conceptual, and case studies to analyze legal norms, the concepts of legal certainty and justice, and their application in practice (Pratama, 2023). Primary legal materials include the Civil Code, the Notary Law, and the Electronic Information and Transactions Law and its amendments, which serve as the basis for regulating electronic deeds (Wulandari, 2024). Secondary legal materials are obtained from books, national journal articles, research results, and expert opinions regarding notarial law, evidence, and electronic transactions (Rahmawati, 2022; Santoso, 2021). In addition, tertiary legal materials in the form of legal dictionaries and encyclopedias are used to clarify relevant technical terms (Yuliana, 2020). All legal materials are analyzed qualitatively through inventory, classification, and interpretation of norms to build systematic legal arguments regarding the reconstruction of electronic deed regulations based on legal certainty and justice (Hidayat, 2023; Putri, 2021).

3. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Regulation of Electronic Deeds in the Indonesian Legal System

The regulations regarding electronic deeds in the Indonesian legal system have not yet been fully integrated into a single specific regulation that regulates their status, procedures for making them, and their evidentiary power. Provisions relating to electronic documents are scattered across various laws and regulations, thus giving rise to problems in their application to notarial practice. Recognition of electronic information and documents as legal evidence is granted through Law Number 11 of 2008 concerning Electronic Information and Transactions, which was last amended by Law Number 1 of 2024. Article 5 paragraph (1) of the law states that electronic information and/or electronic documents and their printouts constitute valid evidence, so that in principle the state has recognized the existence of digital documents in the national evidence system.

Furthermore, Government Regulation Number 71 of 2019 concerning the Implementation of Electronic Systems and Transactions stipulates the obligation of electronic system administrators to ensure the security, integrity, availability, and confidentiality of electronic data. In the context of electronic deeds, this provision is crucial because the evidentiary value of an electronic document depends on maintaining the authenticity and integrity of the data stored in the electronic system (Pratama, 2023).

However, the provisions in the Notary Public Law are still oriented towards conventional mechanisms. Article 16 paragraph (1) letter m of Law Number 30 of 2004 concerning the Notary Public as amended by Law Number 2 of 2014 requires the notary to read the deed before the person appearing in the presence of at least two witnesses, then signed simultaneously by the person appearing, the witness, and the notary. This provision shows that the physical presence of the parties is still seen as a formal requirement for the formation of an authentic deed.

The problem becomes even more apparent when this provision is linked to Article 1868 of the Civil Code, which defines an authentic deed as a deed drawn up in a form prescribed by law by or before an authorized public official at the location where the deed is drawn up. This definition contains three essential elements: a form prescribed by law, drawn up by or before an authorized public official, and drawn up within the official's jurisdiction. These three elements must be simultaneously met for a deed to be authentic. If any one of these elements is not met, the deed no longer holds the status of an authentic deed and only has the force of a private deed (Santoso, 2021).

From the perspective of legal certainty theory, the provisions of Article 1868 of the Civil Code serve to provide clear standards regarding the procedures for creating authentic deeds. Gustav Radbruch places legal certainty as one of the basic legal values alongside justice and expediency. Legal certainty demands clear, consistent, and predictable rules so that the public can understand the legal consequences of actions taken (Radbruch, 1973). In the context of electronic deeds, the lack of certainty regarding the fulfillment of the formal elements of Article 1868 by electronic documents causes notaries and parties to face uncertainty regarding the legal status of digitally created deeds.

On the other hand, the theory of justice requires that the law adapt to societal developments. Rawls stated that legal institutions must provide equitable benefits to all members of society (Rawls, 1999). Therefore, the interpretation of Article 1868 cannot be overly formalistic without considering the public's need for fast, efficient, and technology-based legal services.

From the perspective of the law of evidence, an authentic deed has perfect evidentiary force regarding the contents contained therein as long as it cannot be proven otherwise. Subekti explains that an authentic deed provides certainty regarding the identity of the parties, the date of creation, and the contents of the legal statements contained in the deed (Subekti, 2005). In modern developments, the theory of evidence put forward by Eddy OS Hiariej emphasizes that the law of evidence must develop in line with technological advances. According to Hiariej, electronic evidence can have evidentiary force equal to conventional evidence if it meets the elements of authenticity, integrity, and reliability of the electronic system used (Hiariej, 2012). Thus, the essence of legal protection desired by Article 1868

lies not only in the physical media, but also in guaranteeing the authenticity and security of the deed formation process.

In relation to legal principles, the regulation of electronic deeds is related to the principle of *lex specialis derogat legi generali*, which means that special regulations override general regulations. The Electronic Information and Transactions Law as a special regulation regarding electronic documents can be the basis for recognizing electronic evidence, but does not automatically eliminate the formal requirements for authentic deeds regulated in the Civil Code and the Notary Law. In addition, the principle of *pacta sunt servanda* remains valid in electronic transactions as long as the consent of the parties is given legally and can be proven. The principle of good faith as reflected in Article 1338 paragraph (3) of the Civil Code also requires the parties and notaries to act honestly and not to misuse electronic technology in making deeds (Rahmawati, 2022).

The regulation of electronic documents also relates to protection against cybercrime. The Electronic Information and Transactions Law prohibits unauthorized access, manipulation of electronic data, falsification of electronic information, and destruction of electronic systems. If the security system for electronic documents is inadequate, the document has the potential to be misused through identity forgery, alteration of document content, or misuse of electronic signatures. In criminal law doctrine, criminal law serves not only to punish perpetrators of crimes but also to prevent violations that could harm society (Putri, 2021).

The lack of clear regulations regarding electronic deeds places notaries at risk when creating deeds electronically without a clear legal basis. These risks relate not only to the deed formation procedure but also to its validity, evidentiary value, and potential legal liability in the event of a future dispute. From a civil law perspective, deeds that fail to meet the formal requirements stipulated in Article 1868 of the Civil Code may lose their authenticity and be treated only as private deeds, thus limiting their evidentiary value in court (Santoso, 2021).

Based on the theory of legal responsibility, public officials are obligated to account for every action taken based on the authority granted by law. Hans Kelsen stated that legal responsibility arises when there is a connection between an act and a violation of applicable legal norms. Therefore, when a notary creates an electronic deed without an adequate regulatory basis, issues arise regarding the limits of authority and the basis for assigning responsibility for the action (Hidayat, 2023).

The consequences that a notary may face include administrative liability if they are deemed to have violated the provisions of the Notary Law, for example, regarding the obligation to read the deed and the presence of the parties. Furthermore, a notary may also be held civilly liable if the electronic deed they create causes harm to one of the parties because it is deemed not to meet the requirements for validity or does not have the proper evidentiary force. In certain circumstances, criminal liability may arise if there is an element of intent or negligence that results in the falsification, data manipulation, or misuse of electronic documents, as stipulated in the Electronic Information and Transactions Law (Putri, 2021).

This situation indicates a regulatory gap that has not kept pace with technological developments in notarial practice. Barda Nawawi Arief emphasized that legal policy must be directed toward establishing regulations that provide protection, certainty, and benefit to the public. Therefore, regulations regarding electronic deeds need to be updated to not only recognize electronic documents as evidence but also to detail the mechanisms for creation, identity verification, use of certified electronic signatures, and electronic system security standards (Rahmawati, 2022).

Several legal principles also serve as an important basis for assessing a notary's responsibility for electronic deeds. The principle of *lex specialis derogat legi generali* requires harmony between the Electronic Information and Transactions Law as a specific regulation and the Civil Code and the Notary Law as general and sectoral regulations. The principle of prudence requires notaries to ensure the authenticity of the parties' identities and the security of the electronic system before making a deed, while the principle of legal certainty requires clear rules regarding the procedures and legal

consequences of making electronic deeds so that notaries are not burdened with legal risks due to unclear regulations (Radbruch, 1973).

Thus, the unclear regulations regarding electronic deeds not only create technical issues in the deed-making process but also impact the administrative, civil, and criminal liability of notaries. This situation demonstrates the importance of reconstructing legal policies that can provide legal certainty, guarantee justice, and protect notaries and parties using electronic-based notarial services.

The Evidential Power of Electronic Deeds

In Indonesian evidence law, an authentic deed is written evidence with the highest evidentiary value. This relates to the provisions of Article 1866 of the Civil Code, which places written evidence as one of the primary forms of evidence. Meanwhile, Article 1868 of the Civil Code stipulates that an authentic deed must be drawn up by or before an authorized public official. Therefore, an authentic deed provides certainty regarding the identity of the parties, the time of its creation, and the content of the legal statements contained therein (Lestari, 2022).

Advances in information technology have given rise to electronic documents as a new form of written evidence. Through the Electronic Information and Transactions Law, the state recognizes electronic information and documents, along with their printed copies, as valid evidence. However, this recognition does not automatically equate electronic documents with authentic deeds, as there are still differences regarding the formal requirements for their formation.

The evidentiary power of an authentic deed stems from the authority granted by the state to public officials. As long as the deed's creation process complies with formal requirements, its contents must be presumed true until proven otherwise (Kusuma, 2021). In the context of electronic deeds, the primary issue lies in whether electronic mechanisms can meet the formalities previously designed for paper-based documents and the physical presence of the parties.

According to Marzuki, the assessment of electronic evidence should not only be based on its physical form, but also on the electronic system's ability to guarantee the authenticity, integrity, and reliability of the stored data (Marzuki, 2023). Thus, the evidentiary strength of electronic documents depends heavily on the authentication mechanisms and integrity of the system used.

A similar view has developed in Western evidentiary law theory through the concept of functional equivalents formulated in the UNCITRAL Model Law on Electronic Commerce. This concept asserts that electronic documents can be equated with conventional written documents if they are capable of performing the same legal functions, namely identifying parties, recording statements, and maintaining information integrity. Furthermore, the development of the best evidence rule theory also indicates that electronic copies whose authenticity can be verified can be accepted as evidence with high probative value (Nugroho, 2024).

Problems arise when electronic deeds do not meet the formal requirements of the Notary Law. Article 16 paragraph (1) letter m requires the notary to read the deed in front of the person appearing and witnesses and to sign it simultaneously. If this process is carried out electronically without a clear legal basis, doubts arise regarding the deed's status as an authentic deed. In practice, such conditions have the potential to result in its evidentiary force being treated the same as a private deed (Saputra, 2022).

From a legal certainty perspective, the unclear evidentiary status of electronic deeds can lead to differing interpretations in judicial practice. Atmadja stated that legal certainty requires clear rules regarding the requirements, procedures, and legal consequences of an act so that they can be applied consistently (Atmadja, 2020). Therefore, regulations regarding the evidentiary power of electronic deeds need to be formulated explicitly.

In addition to legal certainty, the aspect of justice also needs to be considered. According to Sembiring, the law must provide balanced protection for the state, public officials, and the public using digital legal services (Sembiring, 2023). If electronic deeds created through secure and verifiable

procedures are still considered to have less evidentiary power than conventional deeds, the use of technology in legal services will be hampered.

Based on this description, the evidentiary power of electronic deeds is essentially determined by two main elements: fulfillment of formal requirements under notarial law and guaranteed authenticity, integrity, and reliability of the electronic system used. With the support of clear regulations and adequate digital security standards, electronic deeds have the potential to attain the same evidentiary status and strength as conventional authentic deeds.

Reconstruction of Electronic Deed Arrangements

Reforming regulations regarding electronic deeds in the Indonesian notarial system has become an urgent need along with the development of information technology and the increasing use of digital transactions in various aspects of life. These regulations must be formulated based on the principles of legal certainty, justice, utility, and legal protection so that electronic deeds are not only viewed as ordinary electronic documents, but can also obtain equal status with authentic deeds under certain conditions. In the theory of legal certainty, Gustav Radbruch emphasized that the law must provide clear, consistent, and predictable rules so that every legal subject knows their rights and obligations with certainty (Radbruch, 1973). Therefore, regulations regarding electronic deeds need to be formulated firmly to avoid different interpretations regarding their legal status and evidentiary power.

The current situation indicates a partial regulatory vacuum due to the lack of harmonization between Article 1868 of the Civil Code, the Notary Law, and the Electronic Information and Transactions Law. According to Lawrence M. Friedman's legal system theory, the effectiveness of a legal system is greatly influenced by legal substance, legal structure, and legal culture. If the legal substance is incomplete, the application of norms by law enforcement officials and notaries will be difficult and potentially lead to uncertainty (Friedman, 2001).

To address these issues, regulations regarding electronic deeds need to explicitly recognize that electronic deeds made by or before a notary through an electronic system that meets certain authentication, integrity, and security requirements have the status of an authentic deed. This recognition can be achieved through amendments to Article 1868 of the Civil Code and adjustments to the provisions of the Notary Law. With clear norms, notaries have a definite basis for their authority to create deeds electronically, and the parties obtain certainty regarding the legal status of the deed (Lestari, 2022).

From the perspective of modern evidentiary theory, Eddy OS Hiariej states that evidentiary law must keep pace with developments in science and technology. According to him, electronic evidence can have the same evidentiary power as conventional evidence if it can guarantee the authenticity, integrity, and reliability of the electronic system used (Hiariej, 2012). Thus, recognizing electronic deeds as authentic deeds is not a deviation from the principles of evidentiary law, but rather an adjustment to technological developments while maintaining the guarantee of the document's validity.

In addition to recognizing the status of electronic deeds, reconstruction must also regulate the presence of the parties. The provisions of Article 16 paragraph (1) letter m of the Notary Law, which has emphasized physical presence, need to be interpreted more progressively. In the progressive legal theory put forward by Satjipto Rahardjo, the law must be positioned as a means to serve human needs and the development of society (Rahardjo, 2009). Therefore, the presence of the parties can be carried out through electronic means as long as their identities can be verified directly and the process is well documented.

To ensure legal certainty, these regulations must require the use of digital identities linked to the national population administration system, the implementation of permanently recorded video conferences, and the retention of recordings as an integral part of the electronic minutes of the deed. The legal benchmark is the system's ability to verify the identity of the parties, the time of execution, and the legal intent expressed electronically.

Electronic deed regulations must also include strict digital security standards. In Philipus M. Hadjon's theory of legal protection, the state has an obligation to provide preventive and repressive protection for the rights of the people. Preventive protection is realized through setting security standards before a dispute arises, while repressive protection is provided through law enforcement mechanisms in the event of a violation (Hadjon, 1987). Therefore, the use of certified electronic signatures, document encryption, data storage in data centers that meet national security standards, and recording an audit trail of every access and change to documents must be mandatory requirements in the creation of electronic deeds.

From the perspective of Hans Kelsen's theory of legal responsibility, a person can only be held accountable if there is a relationship between the act committed and the legal norm violated. In the context of electronic deeds, notaries must be responsible for the identity verification process, the validity of documents, and the security of the electronic system used, but cannot be burdened with responsibility for system disruptions that are beyond their control as long as they have met the standards of prudence stipulated by law (Kelsen, 1961). Therefore, it is necessary to add special provisions to the Notary Law that explicitly regulate the scope of notary responsibilities in the use of electronic systems.

Harmonization between the Notary Law and the Electronic Information and Transactions Law is also a crucial part of regulatory reconstruction. Based on the principle of *lex specialis derogat legi generali*, specific regulations regarding electronic documents must be aligned with specific regulations regarding notarial deeds to avoid any conflict of norms. One form of harmonization that can be implemented is the addition of a provision to the ITE Law stating that electronic documents created by a notary in accordance with the provisions of the Notary Law have the evidentiary force of an authentic deed.

By strengthening the reconstruction of electronic deed regulations through Radbruch's legal certainty theory, Friedman's legal system theory, Hiarij's evidentiary theory, Rahardjo's progressive legal theory, Hadjon's legal protection theory, and Kelsen's legal liability theory, the resulting regulations will have a strong theoretical basis and be able to provide legal certainty. This certainty is reflected in the existence of clear norms regarding the status of electronic deeds, the procedures for their creation, the security standards that must be met, the limits of notary responsibility, and the recognition of their evidentiary power as authentic deeds. Thus, the reconstruction of electronic deed regulations not only supports the modernization of notarial services but also guarantees fair and certain legal protection for all parties involved in electronic transactions.

4. CONCLUSION

The current regulation of electronic deeds within the Indonesian notarial system has not yet provided sufficient legal certainty due to the lack of harmonization between the legal provisions governing authentic deeds and those regulating electronic documents. In addition, the evidentiary value of an electronic deed cannot be considered equivalent to that of an authentic deed when the formal requirements stipulated in the Law on Notarial Office are not fulfilled. Therefore, a comprehensive reconstruction of the regulatory framework is required, including explicit recognition of electronic deeds as authentic deeds under specific conditions, regulation of the electronic presence of the parties, implementation of digital security standards, clarification of notarial responsibility, and synchronization of relevant legislation. Through such reforms, the Indonesian notarial system will be better equipped to accommodate the development of information technology while maintaining the fundamental principles of legal certainty, legal protection, and justice for all parties involved in electronic transactions.

REFERENCES

- Arief, BN (2010). *Anthology of Criminal Law Policy*. Jakarta: Kencana.
- Atmadja, IG (2020). Legal certainty in electronic document evidence in Indonesia. *Journal of Modern Law*, 6(2), 101–116.
- Friedman, L. M. (2001). *American Law: An Introduction*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Government Regulation Number 71 of 2019 concerning the Implementation of Electronic Systems and Transactions.
- Hadjon, PM (1987). *Legal Protection for the Indonesian People*. Surabaya: Bina Ilmu.
- Hiariej, EOS (2012). *Theory and Law of Evidence*. Jakarta: Erlangga.
- Kelsen, H. (1961). *General Theory of Law and State*. New York: Russell & Russell.
- Kusuma, RA (2021). The evidentiary power of authentic deeds from a civil law perspective. *Jurnal Yustisia Indonesia*, 8(1), 55–70.
- Law Number 1 of 2024 concerning the Second Amendment to Law Number 11 of 2008 concerning Electronic Information and Transactions.
- Law Number 11 of 2008 concerning Electronic Information and Transactions.
- Law Number 2 of 2014 concerning Amendments to Law Number 30 of 2004 concerning the Position of Notary.
- Law Number 30 of 2004 concerning the Position of Notary.
- Lestari, PD (2022). The position of written evidence in the Indonesian civil evidence system. *National Legality Journal*, 10(3), 211–226.
- Marzuki, F. (2023). Authentication and integrity of electronic documents as legal evidence. *Journal of Technology and Law*, 5(1), 34–49.
- Nugroho, T. (2024). Application of the best evidence rule to electronic documents in civil evidence. *Journal of Contemporary Law*, 7(1), 77–92.
- Pratama, A. (2023). The position of electronic deeds in the Indonesian civil law evidence system. *Journal of Digital Law and Justice*, 4(1), 45–60.
- Putri, SA (2021). Notary responsibilities in the use of certified electronic signatures. *Jurnal Kenotariatan Nusantara*, 3(2), 87–102.
- Radbruch, G. (1973). *Legal Philosophy*. New York: Greenwood Press.
- Rafiqi, R., & Marsella, M. (2020). Legal satisfaction of electronic authentic diction made notary in facing Industrial Revolution 4.0. *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute (BIRCI-Journal): Humanities and Social Sciences*, 3(1).
- Rafiqi, R., & Marsella, M. (2020). Legal satisfaction of electronic authentic diction made notary in facing Industrial Revolution 4.0. *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute (BIRCI-Journal): Humanities and Social Sciences*, 3(1).
- Rafiqi, R., Kartika, A., & Marsella, M. (2021). Property rights theory reviewed from the perspective of Malay customary land rights. *Mercatoria Journal*, 14(2), 71–76.
- Rahardjo, S. (2009). *Progressive Law: A Synthesis of Indonesian Law*. Yogyakarta: Genta Publishing.
- Rahmawati, D. (2022). Harmonization of notary law and electronic transactions in Indonesia. *Journal of Legislation and Legal Reform*, 7(1), 66–81.
- Rawls, J. (1999). *A Theory of Justice*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Santoso, B. (2021). The validity of electronic deeds from the perspective of Indonesian civil law. *National Jurisprudence Journal*, 9(3), 201–218.
- Saputra, H. (2022). The validity of electronic deeds in Indonesian notarial practice. *Journal of Notary and Regulation*, 4(2), 123–139.
- Sembiring, M. (2023). Justice and legal protection in the use of electronic deeds. *Journal of Legal Reform*, 9(2), 145–160.
- Subekti. (2005). *Law of Evidence*. Jakarta: Pradnya Paramita.
- UNCITRAL. (1996). *Model Law on Electronic Commerce*. Vienna: United Nations.

