PUNGGAWA LAW REVIEW
Punggawa Law Review
Volume 2, Number 1, 2027
E-ISSN: 3125-0580
Open Access: punggawajournal.com/plr

Constructing Notarial Liability for Verifying Spatial Utilization Conformity of Industrial Land

Alfian Faisal[1], Hatta Isnaini Wahyu Utomo[2]
[1] Master of Notary Study Program, Faculty of Law, Universitas Narotama Surabaya, Indonesia
[2] Faculty of Law, Universitas Narotama Surabaya, Indonesia
Correspondence: alfian.faisal91@gmail.com

Article Info
Article history:
Received Oct 4th, 2026
Revised Nov 15th, 2026
Accepted Nov 23th, 2026

Keyword:
Notarial Liability; Spatial Utilization Conformity; Principle of Prudence

ABSTRACT
The intersection between notarial law and spatial planning regulations within Indonesia's risk-based business licensing system creates legal uncertainty regarding notarial responsibilities in industrial land transactions. This study aims to examine the scope of the notarial principle of prudence in verifying Conformity of Spatial Utilization Activities (KKPR) and construct the boundaries of notarial legal liability for industrial land deeds that contravene spatial planning regulations. This study employs normative legal research using statutory, conceptual, and case approaches, with legal materials analyzed through qualitative and prescriptive interpretation. The findings demonstrate that the principle of prudence requires notaries to undertake proportionate formal-administrative verification of relevant KKPR documentation and provide preventive legal counseling without assuming the substantive spatial assessment authority of government agencies. Notarial liability must be differentiated into civil, administrative, and criminal responsibility based on applicable statutory obligations, proven fault, and relevant legal requirements. This study proposes an integrated electronic verification mechanism connecting KKPR records with authorized notarial services and the development of standardized professional verification guidelines. The proposed doctrinal framework contributes to regulatory harmonization, professional accountability, preventive legal protection, and legal certainty in industrial land transactions while supporting compliance with Indonesia's spatial planning regulations.

© 2026 The Authors. Published by Punggawa Legacy Center. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

INTRODUCTION

Notaries play an essential role in ensuring legal certainty through the preparation of authentic deeds in Indonesia. Under Law Number 2 of 2014 concerning the Notary Position (UUJN), notaries are authorized to authenticate legal acts while maintaining professional independence and accountability (Aisyiah & Wisnuwardhani, 2022). Article 16 paragraph (1) letter a of the UUJN requires notaries to act honestly, prudently, and impartially in protecting the parties' interests. Failure to exercise professional prudence may undermine the evidentiary reliability of authentic deeds and generate legal disputes (R. Amalia et al., 2021; Rimawati et al., 2023). This responsibility becomes particularly significant in industrial land transactions involving complex spatial planning requirements.

Industrial land utilization in Indonesia is governed by spatial planning regulations and risk-based business licensing. Law Number 26 of 2007, Government Regulation Number 21 of 2021, and Government Regulation Number 28 of 2025 provide the regulatory framework for spatial conformity. Conformity of Spatial Utilization Activities (KKPR) serves as an essential instrument for ensuring that business activities comply with applicable spatial plans (Adiningsih et al., 2023; Susanti, 2021).

However, administrative obstacles and inconsistencies remain challenges in implementing spatial conformity through the Online Single Submission (OSS) system (Dharmayanti & Yasa, 2022; Kurniawan & Luthfi, 2023).

The intersection between notarial law and spatial planning regulations creates uncertainty regarding the boundaries of notarial verification duties. Although notaries possess authority to prepare authentic deeds, substantive spatial assessment remains within the competence of government institutions. Nevertheless, professional prudence requires careful examination of relevant supporting documents and appropriate legal counseling (Suryadi & Rasji, 2026; Utomo, 2022). Inadequate verification may expose contracting parties to legal disputes and potential financial losses (Setyawan & Mahmudah, 2025; Sulaiman et al., 2026). Therefore, a clear distinction between formal-administrative verification and substantive spatial assessment is necessary.

Previous studies have primarily examined KKPR implementation and administrative licensing procedures (Adiningsih et al., 2023; Setyawan & Mahmudah, 2025). Other studies have focused on notarial negligence, professional prudence, and liability arising from defective authentic deeds (F. Amalia et al., 2025; Darazati et al., 2025; Rimawati et al., 2023). However, limited research has integrated notarial accountability with spatial conformity requirements specifically in industrial land transactions. The research gap concerns the absence of clear verification standards and differentiated boundaries of civil, administrative, and criminal liability.

This study aims to examine the scope of notarial prudence in verifying KKPR and construct the boundaries of legal liability in industrial land transactions. It employs normative legal research through statutory, conceptual, and case approaches. The novelty lies in developing a preventive verification framework that distinguishes notarial documentary responsibilities from governmental spatial assessment authority. Furthermore, this study proposes a proportional liability model based on statutory obligations and proven fault. The findings are expected to strengthen regulatory harmonization, professional accountability, and legal certainty in industrial land transactions.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study employed normative legal research with a prescriptive-analytical design to examine the scope of notarial responsibility in verifying Conformity of Spatial Utilization Activities (KKPR) for industrial land transactions. Three research approaches were applied: statutory, conceptual, and case approaches (Marzuki, 2017). The statutory approach examined the UUJN, Law Number 26 of 2007 on Spatial Planning as amended through Law Number 6 of 2023, Government Regulation Number 21 of 2021, Ministerial Regulation of ATR/BPN Number 13 of 2021, and Government Regulation Number 28 of 2025. The conceptual approach explored the principles of prudence, legal certainty, legal authority, and notarial liability. Meanwhile, the case approach examined relevant Supreme Court decisions concerning authentic deeds, contractual validity, and notarial responsibility.

Legal materials were collected through library research and classified into primary, secondary, and tertiary legal materials. Primary materials included legislation and judicial decisions, while secondary materials comprised scholarly journal articles, legal textbooks, and relevant legal doctrines. Tertiary materials were used to clarify legal terminology and concepts supporting the analysis. The collected materials were analyzed qualitatively using grammatical, systematic, and teleological legal interpretation, supported by deductive reasoning. The analysis was directed toward constructing a preventive KKPR verification framework and establishing proportional boundaries of civil, administrative, and criminal liability for notaries involved in industrial land transactions.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The Legal Position of Notaries in Verifying Spatial Utilization Conformity of Industrial Land

The obligation of notaries to verify industrial land conformity sits at the intersection of notarial authority, spatial planning, and risk-based business licensing. Under Law Number 2 of 2014 (UUJN), notaries produce authentic deeds and must act honestly, carefully, and impartially, requiring professional accountability beyond mechanical documentation (Aisyiah & Wisnuwardhani, 2022; Rimawati et al., 2023). Spatial conformity is an essential administrative requirement under Law Number 26 of 2007, Government Regulation Number 21 of 2021, and Government Regulation Number 28 of 2025 (replacing Number 5 of 2021), which together underscore the importance of spatial approval for lawful business development (Adiningsih et al., 2023; Setyawan & Mahmudah, 2025; Susanti, 2021).

However, a key distinction exists between formal verification and substantive regulatory assessment: notaries lack technical authority to determine physical conformity with spatial planning maps, a competence reserved to land administration institutions through the OSS system and KKPR approval (Ayunda et al., 2021; Kurniawan & Luthfi, 2023). Accordingly, the duty of prudence cannot be read as unlimited responsibility for all underlying facts, but must be proportional to the nature of the transaction, the documents required, and the information reasonably accessible to the notary, consistent with the preventive function of notarial counseling (Chita & Putra, 2023; Utomo, 2022). This supports a proportional verification model combining formal administrative diligence with respect for the jurisdiction of spatial planning agencies.

Construction of the Notarial Principle of Prudence as a Preventive Verification Standard

The principle of prudence, commonly associated with *zorgvuldigheidsbeginsel*, provides a normative foundation for determining the extent of a notary's responsibility when preparing deeds involving industrial land. Article 16 paragraph (1) letter a of the UUJN requires notaries to exercise professional care in fulfilling their statutory duties, while Article 15 paragraph (2) letter e recognizes their authority to provide legal counseling in connection with deed preparation. These provisions should be interpreted systematically to establish a preventive verification standard rather than an unlimited obligation to investigate the material truth of every statement made by the parties. The distinction is necessary because an authentic deed may be formally valid even when subsequent investigations reveal defects in the underlying administrative documents or contractual circumstances. Amalia et al. (2021) demonstrate the importance of distinguishing notarial responsibilities from inaccuracies originating in the information provided by appearing parties. Similarly, Rimawati et al. (2023) emphasize that the legal consequences of defects in authentic deeds depend on the nature of the relevant procedural or substantive irregularities.

In transactions involving industrial land, preventive verification should begin with identifying the legal purpose of the deed and determining whether the proposed transaction requires spatial conformity documentation. Where applicable, the notary should examine the existence of Confirmation of Spatial Utilization Conformity (KKKPR) or Approval of Spatial Utilization Conformity (PKKPR), together with the relevant land certificate, business identification information, and supporting administrative documents. The verification process should focus on the consistency of essential identifiers, including the identity of the business entity, location of the industrial land, proposed business activities, and administrative validity of the documents. When electronic verification facilities are available, the notary should also examine the authenticity of the relevant registration information through authorized government channels. Nevertheless, the presence of a digitally issued KKPR document does not automatically establish that all substantive spatial conditions have been satisfied, particularly when administrative records and actual land utilization are inconsistent. As discussed by Adiningsih et al. (2023) and Setyawan & Mahmudah (2025), the effectiveness of spatial conformity administration depends on the coordination between licensing procedures and substantive land administration requirements.

A second important finding concerns the proportional application of these verification obligations across different categories of authentic deeds. Corporate establishment deeds generally concern the legal formation of business entities, whereas land-related contractual deeds involve specific objects whose utilization may be directly affected by spatial planning restrictions. Consequently, the obligation to inspect parcel-specific KKPR documentation should depend on the legal character of the transaction and the applicable regulatory requirements. When an industrial land transaction is conditional upon the issuance of spatial approval, the notary may reduce contractual uncertainty by explaining the relevant risks and formulating legally appropriate conditions precedent. For example, a Binding Sale and Purchase Agreement (PPJB) may provide that completion of the transaction depends on obtaining the necessary spatial conformity approval. This mechanism is consistent with the protective function of notarial legal counseling described by Pelayanan et al. (2026) and Wulandari et al. (2025), and the importance of valid land transaction documentation discussed by Zaki et al. (2023).

Table 1 Matrix of Notarial KKPR Verification Boundaries Across Industrial Land Deed Typologies

No.	Typology of deed	Formal-administrative verification	Boundary of responsibility and preventive measures

1	Deed of Company Establishment or Amendment of Articles of Association	Verify corporate identity, business purposes, and relevant KBLI classifications; review parcel-specific KKPR only where legally required at that stage.	Spatial conformity generally belongs to the applicable business licensing process. The notary should explain subsequent licensing obligations.
2	Binding Sale and Purchase Agreement (PPJB) for Industrial Land	Examine land ownership documents, available KKKPR/PKKPR records, and relevant location identifiers.	Where approval is pending, use legally appropriate conditions precedent and disclose foreseeable spatial risks.
3	Industrial Land Lease or Land Utilization Cooperation Agreement	Examine the administrative documents required for the intended industrial activity and identify apparent inconsistencies with applicable spatial restrictions.	Substantive spatial assessment remains with competent authorities. The notary should provide legal counseling and avoid knowingly documenting unlawful purposes.
4	Sale and Purchase Deed (AJB) and Deed of Mortgage Grant (APHT) Executed by a PPAT	Examine land documents and any spatial conformity or technical land documents specifically required for the transaction or registration.	Verification must follow the applicable PPAT and land registration requirements; KKPR or PTP should not be assumed mandatory for every transfer or mortgage without examining the governing provisions.

Table 1 demonstrates that the scope of notarial verification is determined primarily by the legal nature of the deed and the regulatory requirements governing the underlying transaction. The differentiation prevents notaries from being assigned obligations that exceed their statutory authority while ensuring that professional diligence remains an integral component of authentic deed preparation. In transactions involving identifiable industrial land, examining relevant administrative documentation can function as an important safeguard against foreseeable regulatory disputes. However, such examination should not be equated with independent geographical measurement, technical zoning assessment, or the issuance of spatial conformity approval. The proposed model therefore establishes a reasonable balance between the protection of contracting parties and the preservation of institutional competence. This approach also provides a doctrinal basis for evaluating subsequent allegations of negligence or professional misconduct.

Civil Liability for Industrial Land Deeds Inconsistent with Spatial Planning Regulations

The construction of civil liability requires distinguishing defects in the underlying transaction from misconduct attributable to the notary. Under Articles 1320, 1335, and 1337 of the Indonesian Civil Code, an industrial land agreement pursuing activities prohibited by spatial planning may face substantive validity problems, yet the mere absence or delay of an administrative license does not automatically void the contract, since the consequences depend on the nature of the obligation and the relevant statutory provisions (Dahlan et al., 2024). Attributing wrongful conduct to the notary individually rests on Article 1365, which requires wrongdoing, fault, actual loss, and a causal link; thus spatial non-conformity discovered after execution does not by itself prove an unlawful act, but rather whether the notary breached an identifiable professional or statutory duty, whether the irregularity was reasonably discoverable, and whether the breach caused compensable harm (R. Amalia et al., 2021; Darazati et al., 2025; Triwanto et al., 2026), supporting a fault-based rather than automatic attribution of liability.

A further distinction separates evidentiary defects from substantive invalidity: failure to satisfy notarial formalities may affect evidentiary status or give rise to claims under the UUJN, but substantive unlawfulness of the agreement does not necessarily strip the instrument of its authentic character. Accordingly, a notary who performed reasonable verification and did not knowingly participate in an unlawful transaction should not be held automatically responsible for defects arising from government administration or deliberate misrepresentation, whereas failure to verify despite clear indications of

irregularity may evidence negligence. The degree of fault must likewise be evaluated proportionally, since Article 1365 does not limit liability to gross negligence (*culpa lata*) but also encompasses ordinary negligence, requiring a graduated distinction among reasonable administrative diligence, ordinary and gross negligence, and intentional misconduct, with verification records, correspondence, and counseling notes serving as key evidence—thereby protecting the legitimate interests of injured parties without converting notaries into guarantors of all substantive circumstances associated with industrial land.

Administrative and Ethical Liability in the Performance of Notarial Duties

Administrative liability stems from the regulatory and disciplinary obligations imposed on notaries as public officials, primarily Article 16 paragraph (1) letter a of the UUJN, which demands careful, honest, independent, and impartial performance; failure to examine documentation required for an industrial land deed may thus constitute professional non-compliance even absent proven civil damages, since disciplinary responsibility safeguards standards and public confidence while civil responsibility addresses compensable private loss (Sihotang & Siagian, 2026). Sanctions must be assessed under the amended UUJN rather than the now-deleted Articles 84 and 85 of Law Number 30 of 2004, with Article 16 paragraph (11) providing the current basis for administrative sanctions—ranging from written warnings to temporary suspension and honorable or dishonorable dismissal—applied only through the legally prescribed supervisory and disciplinary procedures.

Professional ethics further require notaries to preserve independence against commercial pressure to execute deeds before administrative requirements are complete, communicating the legal implications of incomplete documentation and, where necessary, refusing execution, since parties may wrongly assume that an authentic deed itself confers governmental approval (Ali & Utama, 2026; Utama & Johan, 2026). Accordingly, exoneration or self-protection clauses cannot displace statutory duties, excuse deliberate misconduct, or bar supervisory review, and their significance depends on whether the notary performed the applicable verification obligations and adequately informed the parties (Budiman et al., 2022); documenting verification steps therefore offers a more effective safeguard than contractual disclaimers, supporting standardized procedures of document inspection, administrative verification, legal counseling, and record preservation to promote both preventive compliance and accountability.

Criminal Liability for Falsification and Intentional Participation in Spatial Planning Violations

Criminal responsibility, the gravest consequence of misconduct involving authentic deeds, must be distinguished from administrative negligence and civil liability and grounded in the principle of legality, which requires a clearly applicable statutory offense together with the relevant mental elements and prohibited conduct. The entry into force of Law Number 1 of 2023 concerning the Criminal Code on 2 January 2026 updates this framework, with Articles 391 and 392 addressing document falsification and its aggravated forms and Article 394 covering the procurement of false statements in authentic deeds, providing reference points when notarial documentation is alleged to have falsified the legal status of industrial land (Leonardo et al., 2025). Yet false information in a deed does not automatically establish the notary's culpability: liability must be assessed against the specific offense, the notary's conduct, the requisite mental element, and the rules on participation, so a notary who records party-submitted information through legally required procedures is not necessarily responsible when it later proves inaccurate, whereas intentional fabrication, knowing participation in a falsification scheme, or deliberate manipulation of administrative records may satisfy the elements—circumstances that must be kept distinct from review mistakes, licensing misunderstandings, or reliance on apparently valid records issued by competent authorities.

A further doctrinal limitation concerns *medeplegen* or joint participation, since mere professional involvement in preparing an authentic deed does not independently prove joint criminal participation; the prosecution must establish the factual and legal elements linking the notary's conduct to the offense, so knowledge of a transaction, instrument preparation, and participation in a criminal plan are not interchangeable—deliberate cooperation with business actors in falsifying records may engage the participation rules, but reasonable diligence without culpable participation means spatial non-conformity alone cannot justify punishment. This construction likewise requires separating the responsibilities of business actors (submitting accurate information and meeting statutory requirements), government agencies (evaluating and administering spatial conformity instruments), and notaries (fulfilling deed-preparation requirements and refraining from intentional unlawful

participation), whose intersecting actions in a single transaction nonetheless arise from different sources of authority and substantive obligations, thereby supporting a differentiated model of criminal accountability based on proven conduct rather than institutional proximity to an unlawful industrial land transaction.

A Graduated Model of Notarial Legal Liability for Industrial Land Transactions

The preceding analysis establishes that legal responsibility for spatially non-conforming industrial land deeds should be determined through a differentiated assessment of statutory obligations, professional conduct, and the resulting legal consequences. Three principal regimes of liability may arise: civil liability, administrative and ethical liability, and criminal liability. Although these regimes may concern the same factual circumstances, they operate through distinct legal requirements and should not be applied interchangeably. Civil liability requires an appropriate basis for compensation, administrative responsibility concerns compliance with professional obligations, and criminal responsibility requires satisfaction of the elements of a statutory offense. The proposed analytical model therefore rejects the assumption that the subsequent discovery of a spatial planning violation necessarily results in personal liability for the notary. Instead, liability must be evaluated according to the applicable legal duties, established fault, and the causal significance of the notary's conduct.

Table 2 Typology and Boundaries of Notarial Legal Liability for Industrial Land Spatial Non-Conformity

Legal regime	Threshold of notarial fault	Legal consequences	Conditions relevant to excluding liability
Civil liability (Article 1365 of the Civil Code and relevant UUJN provisions)	Proven breach of an applicable legal duty, fault, compensable damage, and causation.	Compensation for proven losses; the underlying agreement may separately be challenged for substantive invalidity.	Reasonable compliance with applicable verification duties; absence of attributable fault or causal connection with the loss.
Administrative and ethical liability (Article 16(1)(a) and Article 16(11) of the amended UUJN)	Established violation of applicable professional duties, including the statutory duty to act carefully.	Written warning, temporary suspension, honorable dismissal, or dishonorable dismissal, subject to statutory procedures.	Compliance with applicable professional standards, supporting records of verification, and proper legal counseling.
Criminal liability (relevant provisions of Law No. 1 of 2023, as applicable)	Proof of conduct satisfying the elements of a criminal offense, including the requisite culpability and participation where alleged.	Criminal penalties prescribed for the proven offense, including document falsification or legally established participation in criminal conduct.	Absence of the statutory elements of the offense; no proven intentional falsification or culpable participation where those elements are required.

Table 2 illustrates the differentiated legal consequences associated with notarial involvement in industrial land transactions that subsequently reveal spatial planning irregularities. The matrix shows that the validity of an underlying agreement, the evidentiary status of an authentic deed, and the personal liability of the notary require separate legal evaluations. It further demonstrates that compliance with professional verification requirements is particularly important when determining whether alleged misconduct is attributable to the notary or originates from the parties or administrative authorities. By distinguishing civil, administrative, and criminal responsibility, the proposed framework avoids excessive attribution of liability while preserving meaningful professional accountability. The model therefore provides a coherent basis for interpreting the interaction between the UUJN, spatial planning regulations, and general principles of legal responsibility.

Normative Reconstruction of Preventive KKPR Verification in Notarial Practice

The principal normative implication is the need for clearer administrative verification standards for notarial transactions involving industrial land, because although the UUJN imposes a general duty of care it does not prescribe a comprehensive KKPR-specific procedure, leaving uncertainty over the minimum documentation to examine, the appropriate use of electronic licensing information, and when

incomplete spatial conformity should bar deed execution—uncertainty that intensifies as licensing integrates through the OSS system under Government Regulation Number 28 of 2025 (Adiningsih et al., 2023; Setyawan & Mahmudah, 2025). The first proposed reform responds with a secure verification interface linking authorized notarial and PPAT services to KKPR status, permitting confirmation of registration information, document status, and business identifiers without independent substantive spatial assessment, with access confined to transaction-necessary data under confidentiality, data-protection, and accountability safeguards, thereby strengthening documentary reliability while preserving spatial agencies' competence (Ayunda et al., 2021; Lestariningtyas & Roqib, 2021), integration that must be accompanied by clear legal authorization rather than treated as a substitute for statutory competence.

The second reform calls for standardized professional guidance on spatial conformity documentation, formulated through coordination among relevant government institutions, the Indonesian Notary Association (INI), and the Association of Land Deed Officials (IPPAT), applying a proportional verification standard that distinguishes corporate establishment deeds, preliminary contractual instruments, industrial land utilization agreements, and PPAT-executed instruments, and addressing inconsistencies, pending approvals, appropriate contractual conditions, and record preservation so that the general principle of prudence becomes a predictable standard without extending notarial authority beyond statutory boundaries. The third reform strengthens preventive legal counseling, requiring notaries to explain that executing an authentic deed does not replace administrative licensing, to inform parties of legal consequences when documentation is incomplete or regulatory risks are identifiable, and to use contractual conditions to allocate risk where appropriate—while acknowledging that contracts cannot legalize prohibited activities or remove mandatory administrative obligations (Budiman et al., 2022; Utomo, 2022) .

Theoretical Contributions and Implications for Legal Certainty

The findings contribute to the development of Indonesian notarial legal doctrine by clarifying the relationship between attributive authority, professional prudence, and the differentiated allocation of legal responsibility. From the perspective of administrative authority, the statutory competence of notaries should not be conflated with the specialized regulatory powers of spatial planning institutions. At the same time, the principle of prudence requires notaries to exercise reasonable diligence when examining documents that are legally relevant to the authentic instruments they prepare. This interpretation reconciles the protective function of authentic deeds with the institutional limitations of notarial authority. It also avoids interpreting formal notarial responsibility so narrowly that obvious documentary irregularities become irrelevant to professional conduct. The resulting framework advances a balanced understanding of legal certainty that incorporates both authentic documentation and respect for the applicable administrative regulatory system.

The study also contributes to discussions concerning the digital transformation of legal services. The integration of OSS-based licensing information into professional documentary verification creates opportunities to improve administrative transparency, reduce information asymmetry, and strengthen preventive legal protection. Nevertheless, technological accessibility should not automatically expand the scope of professional liability beyond what legislation and applicable standards reasonably require. The legal significance of electronic verification must remain connected to authorized access, identifiable obligations, and the reliability of available administrative records. This concern is particularly important in transactions involving industrial land because spatial conformity information may depend on technical assessments and administrative determinations beyond the expertise of notaries. Accordingly, digital verification should be understood as an instrument supporting professional care rather than transferring governmental spatial planning authority to the notarial profession.

Finally, the proposed doctrinal construction offers implications for legal practitioners, supervisory institutions, policymakers, and business actors. Notaries and PPATs may use a transaction-specific verification approach to identify the supporting documents relevant to industrial land deeds and reduce foreseeable legal risks. Supervisory bodies may benefit from clearer professional standards that distinguish documentary negligence from conduct beyond the scope of notarial authority. Policymakers may consider establishing more coherent institutional arrangements for accessing spatial conformity records and clarifying the relationship between licensing administration and authentic deed preparation. Business actors may also obtain greater contractual certainty through improved explanations of the legal

consequences associated with industrial land utilization. Collectively, these implications demonstrate that preventive verification, proportional liability, and regulatory coordination are essential components of a more coherent framework for industrial land transactions in Indonesia.

CONCLUSION

This study concludes that the notarial principle of prudence stipulated in Article 16 paragraph (1) letter a of the UUJN provides a normative foundation for preventive verification of Conformity of Spatial Utilization Activities (KKPR) in industrial land transactions. The scope of this responsibility should be proportionate to the legal nature of the deed, applicable statutory requirements, and the administrative information reasonably accessible to the notary. Notaries should examine relevant supporting documents, verify their administrative validity through authorized electronic systems where available, and provide appropriate legal counseling to the contracting parties. However, substantive spatial assessment remains within the statutory competence of authorized spatial planning and land administration agencies. Accordingly, notarial liability for industrial land spatial non-conformity must be differentiated into civil, administrative, and criminal responsibility based on established legal obligations, proven fault, and the applicable statutory requirements rather than automatically attributed to the notary upon the discovery of regulatory violations.

This study recommends strengthening regulatory harmonization between notarial law, spatial planning regulations, and risk-based business licensing to establish greater legal certainty and professional accountability. The Ministry of Law, the Ministry of Agrarian Affairs and Spatial Planning/National Land Agency, and relevant licensing authorities should develop an integrated and secure electronic verification mechanism connecting KKPR records with authorized notarial and PPAT services. Furthermore, the Indonesian Notary Association (INI) and the Association of Land Deed Officials (IPPAT) should develop standardized preventive verification guidelines that clarify documentary requirements, legal counseling procedures, and professional responsibility across different categories of industrial land transactions. These measures would reduce regulatory uncertainty, prevent foreseeable legal disputes, and protect the legitimate interests of notaries and contracting parties. Ultimately, the proposed doctrinal framework contributes to a more coherent, proportionate, and preventive system of notarial accountability while supporting sustainable industrial development and compliance with Indonesia's spatial planning regulations.

REFERENCES

Adiningsih, D. F., Sutaryono, & Wahyuni. (2023). Penyelenggaraan Perizinan Kesesuaian Kegiatan Pemanfaatan Ruang pada Sektor Berusaha di Kabupaten Pati Jawa Tengah. *Tunas Agraria*, *6*(1), 12–29. https://doi.org/10.31292/jta.v6i1.198

Aisyiah, C., & Wisnuwardhani, D. A. (2022). Notary, Public Official or Public Official: Implications for the Position of Notary. *Jurnal Cakrawala Hukum*, *13*(3), 242–252. https://doi.org/10.26905/idjch.v13i3.9012

Ali, M. S., & Utama, Y. J. (2026). Reformulation of notary ethical supervision patterns in an effort to maintain the dignity of notary positions in Indonesia. *LEGAL BRIEF*, *15*(1), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.35335/legal.v15i1.1607

Amalia, F., Pratomo, E., & Deni, F. (2025). The Principle of Notary Negligence in Drafting Sale and Purchase Agreements (PPJB) Containing Elements of Criminal Conspiracy. *International Journal of Humanities Education and Social Sciences*. https://scispace.com/papers/the-principle-of-notary-negligence-in-drafting-sale-and-ftsp06ebphnm

Amalia, R., Musakkir, & Muchtar, S. (2021). Pertanggungjawaban Notaris terhadap Isi Akta Autentik yang Tidak Sesuai dengan Fakta. *Al-Ishlah: Jurnal Ilmiah Hukum*, *24*(1), 188–206. https://doi.org/10.56087/aijih.v24i1.77

Ayunda, R., Silviani, N. Z., Purwaningtyas, F. D., & Sari, P. K. (2021). Kebijakan Online Single Submission sebagai E-Government dalam Mewujudkan Good Governance di Indonesia. *Journal of Judicial Review*, *23*(1), 71–84. https://doi.org/10.37253/jjr.v23i1.4359

Budiman, N., Santoso, B., & Priyono, F. X. J. (2022). The Validity of the Notary's Self-Safety Clause in the Notary Deed. *Jurnal Cakrawala Hukum*, *13*(3), 300–307. https://doi.org/10.26905/idjch.v13i3.8616

Chita, L. E., & Putra, M. F. M. (2023). Tanggung Jawab Notaris untuk Memberikan Penyuluhan Hukum dalam Pembuatan Akta Relaas. *Gorontalo Law Review*, *6*(1), 20–35.

Dahlan, M. K., Syakura, F. P., & Ridwan, R. (2024). Analisis Tanggung Jawab Hukum Para Pihak terhadap Perjanjian Pengikatan Jual Beli Hak Milik Atas Tanah yang Dibuat oleh Notaris Dibatalkan oleh Pengadilan. *SENTRI: Jurnal Riset Ilmiah*, *3*(8), 101–118.

Darazati, S., Tista, A., & Rahman, Y. S. (2025). Pertanggungjawaban Perdata oleh Notaris dalam Pembuatan Akta yang Diajukan oleh Para Pihak. *Al-Adl: Jurnal Hukum*, *17*(1), 45–60.

Dharmayanti, I. A. K. F., & Yasa, P. G. A. S. (2022). Penerapan Sistem Perizinan Berusaha Online Single Submission Risk-Based Approach (OSS-RBA) di Bidang Industri Pasca UU Cipta Kerja. *Jurnal Komunikasi Hukum*. https://scispace.com/papers/penerapan-sistem-perizinan-berusaha-online-single-submission-1fcu6uxy

Kurniawan, K. D., & Luthfi, M. (2023). Pendampingan Pemenuhan Persetujuan Kegiatan Pemanfaatan Ruang bagi Pelaku Usaha. *Jurnal Dedikasi Hukum*, *3*(2), 133–141. https://doi.org/10.22219/jdh.v3i2.29189

Leonardo, M. W. A., Nuh, M. K., & Setyawan, C. Y. (2025). Akibat Hukum Keterangan Palsu oleh Notaris dalam Akta Otentik: Analisis Pasal 394 UU No. 1 Tahun 2023 dan Pasal 15 UUJN. *Jurnal Hukum Lex Generalis*, *6*(7), 1–15.

Lestariningtyas, T., & Roqib, M. (2021). Perlindungan Data Pribadi Pengguna Sistem Layanan Perizinan Berusaha Terintegrasi secara Elektronik OSS 1.1 dan OSS RBA (Risk Basic Approach). *Jurnal Jendela Hukum*, *8*(2), 25–30. https://doi.org/10.24929/fh.v8i2.1576

Pelayanan, D., Teori, P., & Alfath, M. (2026). Legal Protection Of Clients' Personal Data In Notarial Services: A Legal Protection Theory Perspective And The Personal Data Protection Law. *Jurnal Hukum Lex Generalis*, *7*(12). https://doi.org/10.56370/JHLG.V7I12.4637

Rimawati, E. R., Sulistyorini, R., & Laila, F. (2023). Legal Consequences of Notary Deeds Due to Comparison Error. *Jurnal Cakrawala Hukum*, *14*(1), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.26905/idjch.v14i1.9906

Setyawan, M. N., & Mahmudah, S. (2025). Analisis Izin PKKPR Berusaha di Darat dalam Proses Peralihan Hak atas Tanah. *Notarius*, *18*(2), 573–592. https://doi.org/10.14710/nts.v18i2.64883

Sihotang, A., & Siagian, A. (2026). Pertanggungjawaban Hukum Notaris Selaku Pejabat Umum yang Melakukan Perbuatan Melawan Hukum dalam Membuat Akta Autentik (Studi Putusan Pengadilan Negeri Medan Nomor 619/Pdt.G/2023/Pn Medan). *Repository Universitas Pembangunan Panca Budi*.

Sulaiman, Hasbi, Y., Said, M. H. M., & Faisal. (2026). Reconstructing Notarial Liability in Sale and Purchase Binding Agreements in Indonesia. *Sriwijaya Law Review*, *10*(1), 90–108. https://doi.org/10.28946/slrev.v10i1.5078

Suryadi, A. F., & Rasji, R. (2026). Prudential Land Deed Officials Prevent Defective Indonesian Land Transactions. *Academia Open*. https://scispace.com/papers/prudential-land-deed-officials-prevent-defective-indonesian-z61f4l5yuhbw

Susanti, A. D. (2021). Kajian Izin Lokasi dan Kesesuaian Kegiatan Pemanfaatan Ruang di Daratan bagi Perizinan Berusaha. *Jurnal Riset Ekonomi Dan Bisnis*, *14*(3), 179–191. https://doi.org/10.26623/jreb.v14i3.4408

Triwanto, T., Rahayu, A. M. K., Laksito, FX. H. B., & Primadani, L. C. (2026). Notary Responsibility for Legally Defective Deeds: Analysis of the Principle of Due Diligence in the Performance of Public Official Duties. *Hukum Inovatif : Jurnal Ilmu Hukum Sosial Dan Humaniora*, *3*(1), 134–145. https://doi.org/10.62383/HUMIF.V3I1.2822

Utama, N. F., & Johan, Y. (2026). Etika Profesi Notaris Sebagai Landasan Moral dan Perlindungan Hukum Preventif-Represif: Studi Kasus Pemalsuan Akta Jual Beli. *Inovasi Pembangunan : Jurnal Kelitbangan*, *14*(1). https://doi.org/10.35450/JIP.V14I1.1770

Utomo, H. I. W. (2022). Legal Counseling by a Notary as a Means to Produce a Balanced Agreement. *Notariil: Jurnal Kenotariatan*, *7*(1), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.22225/jn.7.1.2022.1-8

Wulandari, J., Djaja, B., & Sudirman, M. (2025). Legal Protection for the Notarial Office when Designated as a Suspect In a Criminal Case. *Ranah Research : Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Development*, *7*(5), 3854–3861. https://doi.org/10.38035/RRJ.V7I5.1733

Zaki, M., Warman, K., & Syofiarti. (2023). Pendaftaran Peralihan Hak Milik atas Tanah Berdasarkan Akta Jual Beli yang Sudah Lewat Waktu di Kota Padang. *Unnes Law Review*, *6*(1), 3638–3652. https://doi.org/10.31933/unesrev.v6i1.1164