

Ownership of Apartment Unit Ownership Rights Over Building Use Rights by Foreigners in Indonesia

Evita Isretno Israhadi¹, P. Windraji²
{evita_isretno@borobudur.ac.id¹, windraji94@gmail.com²}

Universitas Borobudur^{1,2}

Abstract. This text will examine the ownership of apartment units on Building Use Rights land for foreigners as a strengthening of the principle of horizontal separation. Ownership of such apartment units for foreigners does not include the land. This research uses a normative juridical study strategy. The outcomes show that currently in national land law foreigners are allowed to have ownership rights to apartment units built on Building Use Rights. Such arrangements are based on the principle of land ownership in Indonesia which adopts customary law, namely the principle of horizontal separation. Horizontal separation teaches that land ownership is not necessarily the owner of the plants growing on the land. For foreigners who have ownership rights to apartment units above Building Use Rights, this does not include joint land ownership. Joint land ownership is only given to Indonesian citizens. As a result, there is an imbalance of rights and obligations between Indonesian citizens and foreigners regarding apartment ownership. Foreigners who do not have rights to shared land can enjoy all the facilities of an apartment like Indonesian citizens. There needs to be special regulations regarding ownership rights for apartment units over building use rights for foreigners so that there is a balance of rights and obligations between Indonesian citizens and foreigners.

Keywords: land ownership; apartment units; foreigners.

1 INTRODUCTION

Home is one of the basic elements that must be fulfilled for human welfare, which is a basic need for every individual and their family by their dignity as human beings.[1] The need for housing along with population growth and economic growth is getting bigger day by day. To meet the need for houses as a place to live or live in, to increase the usability and yield of land for housing development, and to further improve the quality of the residential environment, especially in densely populated areas but only limited land area is available, it is felt necessary to building housing with a system of more than one floor or called Flats, which is divided into parts that are jointly owned and units that can each be owned separately for occupancy, taking into account the socio-cultural factors that live in society, paying attention to the preservation of natural resources and creating a complete, harmonious and balanced residential environment.

The primary regulation that manages pads in Indonesia is Regulation Number 16 of 1985. Article 1 point 1 of this regulation expresses that pads are multi-story structures worked in a

climate, which are isolated into parts that are organized practically in flat and vertical headings and are units that can each be claimed and utilized independently, particularly for private premises, which are outfitted with normal parts, normal items, and common land. With respect to of apartment suites, article 8 section (1) of the Law expresses that condo units are possessed by people or legitimate substances who meet the necessities as holders of land freedoms. In the Fundamental Agrarian Regulation (UUPA), Proprietorship Freedoms, Business Privileges, and Building Use Freedoms over land can't be claimed by outsiders. So pads based ashore with proprietorship privileges or building use freedoms can't be possessed by outsiders. Units of pads (Sarusun) that might be possessed by outsiders are those based on Right to Involve land as determined in Article 2 section (2) of Unofficial law Number 41 of 1996 concerning Responsibility for or Private Houses by Outsiders Residing in Indonesia.

Regulation Number 16 of 1985 concerning Pads is presently as of now not substantial in light of the fact that it has been disavowed and announced at this point not legitimate by Regulation Number 20 of 2011 concerning Pads, which in article 118 letter states as follows: "Regulation Number 16 of 1985 concerning Pads (State Newspaper of the Republic of Indonesia of 1985 Number 75, Supplement to the State Periodical of the Republic of Indonesia Number 3318) is renounced and proclaimed invalid." In Regulation Number 20 of 2011, in regards to responsibility for, article 46 passage (1) expresses that responsibility for is discrete individual proprietorship freedoms to pads with joint privileges to shared shares, joint items, and joint land.

Then, at that point, in Article 47 section (1) it is expressed that as verification of responsibility for townhouse ashore with proprietorship privileges, building use freedoms or use privileges on state land, building use freedoms or use privileges ashore with the board freedoms, a Declaration of Sarusun Possession Freedoms is given (SHM). Moreover, passage (2) expresses that SHM Sarusun is given to each individual who meets the prerequisites as a land right holder. Connected to the UUPA, the land privileges that outsiders can have been the Option to Utilize and the Option to Lease, so outsiders can possess pads based on the option to just utilize. This is in accordance with the arrangements in Article 2 Passage (1) related to Article 4 section (2) Unofficial law Number 103 of 2015 concerning Responsibility for or Private Houses by Outsiders Residing in Indonesia, which expresses that outsiders can claim the Pads that are based on the Option to Utilize land plot.

In Regulation Number 6 of 2023 concerning the Assurance of Perpu Number 2 of 2022 concerning Position Creation into Regulation, which has repudiated Regulation Number 11 of 2020 concerning Position Creation, it is resolved that outsiders or Far off Nationals can have possession privileges to Level units based on building use freedoms as expressed in article 144 section (1) letter c. This is different from the provisions in Law Number 20 of 2011.

With the background that has been described, the author will raise the following problems:

1. Is the responsibility for privileges to loft units based on building use freedoms for outsiders after the sanctioning of the Gig Creation Regulation in opposition to the UUPA?
2. What is the impact of proprietorship freedoms over loft units based on building use privileges by outsiders against possession by Indonesian residents after the authorization of the Gig Creation Regulation?

The research method used in this writing is normative juridical, namely normative legal research that uses secondary data or library materials.[2]

2 LIBRARY REVIEW

2.1 Flats

2.1.1 Understanding Flats and Flats Units

The meaning of pads is expressed in article 1 number 1 of Regulation Number 20 of 2011, to be specific multi-story structures worked in a climate that is partitioned into practically organized parts, both in level and vertical headings, and are units that are separately - each can be possessed and utilized independently, particularly for private premises, which are outfitted with shared parts, shared protests and shared land. In a loft, a few sections can be possessed and utilized independently, which are called condo units.[3]

The meaning of a loft unit (Sarusun) is expressed in Article 1 number 2 of Regulation Number 20 of 2011, in particular a condo whose principal design is to be involved independently with the primary capability as a home and has a method for associating with a public street.

Rights arising from an apartment unit are called Ownership Rights over an Apartment Unit.[4] Proprietorship Freedoms over a Loft Unit are Possession Privileges over an individual and separate unit, including joint privileges over shared shares, joint items, and joint land. The meaning of shared part is contained in Article 1 number 5 of Regulation Number 20 of 2011, to be specific the piece of a loft that is possessed indistinguishably for joint use in a utilitarian solidarity with the condo unit. The meaning of joint items is contained in Article 1 point 6 of Regulation Number 20 of 2011, specifically protests that are not piece of the loft, but rather are parts that are mutually possessed indistinguishably for joint use. The meaning of joint land is contained in Article 1 number 4 5 of Regulation Number 20 of 2011, namely a plot of land or leased land for buildings that are used based on undivided joint rights on which an apartment stands, and the boundaries are determined in the building construction permit requirements.

2.1.2 Shared Rights in Flats

The collective rights in an apartment are as follows:

- 1) Joint Land, in Article 1 point 4 of Law Number 20 of 2011, it is stated that joint land is a plot of private land or leased land for buildings which are used based on undivided joint rights on which an apartment stands and whose boundaries are determined by the requirements building permit. Land owned jointly in an apartment can be in the form of Proprietorship Privileges, Building Use Freedoms on state land, Building Use Freedoms on Administration Freedoms land, Use Freedoms on state land, or Use Freedoms on Administration Privileges land.
- 2) Shared Parts, in article 1 point 5 of Law Number 20 of 2011, it is stated that common parts are parts of an apartment that are owned inseparably for joint use in a functional unity with the apartment units. What is meant by common parts include, among other things, foundations,

walls, floors, gutters, stairs, lifts, electricity, and telecommunications networks.

- 3) Shared objects, In Article 1 number 6 of Law Number 20 of 2011, it is stated that these are objects that are not part of the apartment but are parts that are jointly owned inseparably for joint use. What is meant by shared objects include, among other things, meeting rooms, plants, landscaping buildings, social facility buildings, places of worship, playgrounds, and parking lots that are separate or integrated with the building.

2.2 Land Rights

In the UUPA different kinds of land privileges are super durable as directed in Article 16 section (1) and some are transitory as managed in Article 53 passage (1). Super durable land privileges are:

- a. Property Privileges, which are managed in articles 20 to 27 of the UUPA. Property privileges are genetic, the most grounded and fullest freedoms that individuals can have over land, remembering the arrangements of Article 6, specifically in regards to the social capability of land. Possession freedoms must be claimed by Indonesian residents.
- b. Cultivation Privileges, which are controlled in articles 28 to 34 of the UUPA. Development Freedoms are the option to develop land that is straightforwardly constrained by the state for a time of 25 to 35 years and can be stretched out for a limit of 25 years, for rural, fishing, and animals organizations. Development Freedoms can be claimed by Indonesian Residents and Legitimate Substances laid out as per Indonesian regulation and domiciled in Indonesia.
- c. Building Use Privileges, which are directed in articles 35 to 40 of the UUPA. Building Use Privileges are the option to develop and possess structures ashore that isn't one's own, with a greatest time of 30 years. Building use freedoms can be possessed by Indonesian residents and legitimate elements laid out as per Indonesian regulation and domiciled in Indonesia.
- d. Use Privileges, which are directed in articles 41 to 43 of the UUPA. Right, to Utilize is the option to utilize as well as gather the returns from land controlled straight by the state or land having a place with someone else, which gives authority and commitments determined in the choice to concede it by the authority approved to allow it or by concurrence with the land proprietor, which isn't a rent understanding, or on the other hand a land the board understanding, as long as it doesn't struggle with the soul and arrangements of the UUPA. Use Privileges can be possessed by Indonesian residents, outsiders domiciled in Indonesia, legitimate elements laid out as per Indonesian regulation and domiciled in Indonesia, and unfamiliar lawful substances that have agents in Indonesia.
- e. Rental Freedoms for Structures, which are controlled in Article 44 and Article 45 of the UUPA. The option to lease a structure is the right of an individual or legitimate element to utilize land having a place with someone else for the end goal of working, by paying the proprietor a specific measure of cash as lease. Equivalent to One side to Utilize, the Option to Lease for Structures can be claimed by Indonesian residents, outsiders domiciled in Indonesia, legitimate

elements laid out as per Indonesian regulation and domiciled in Indonesia, and unfamiliar lawful substances that have delegates in Indonesia.

3 DISCUSSION

3.1 Ownership of ownership rights over apartment units built on building use rights for foreigners after the enactment of the Job Creation Law does not conflict with the UUPA

3.1.1 The Applicable Agrarian Law Is Customary Law

Article 5 of the UUPA confirms that the Agrarian Regulation that applies to earth, water, and space is Standard Regulation, the same length as it doesn't struggle with public and State interests, which depend on public solidarity, with Indonesian communism and with the guidelines contained in this regulation on other legal guidelines, everything considers components that depend on strict regulation.

Then in General Explanation III/ (1) UUPA it is explained that agrarian law must be under the legal awareness of the people at large and since most of Indonesian individuals are dependent upon standard regulation, agrarian regulation depends on the arrangements of that standard regulation.

The applicable agrarian law is not pure customary law, but customary law which is accompanied by conditions or according to the term used by Boedi Harsono "customary law which has been sanitized" or which has been cleared of its defects; The conditions referred to are:[5]

- 1) It should not struggle with public and state interests, which depend on public solidarity;
- 2) Must not conflict with Indonesian socialism;
- 3) Must not conflict with the regulations contained in the UUPA;
- 4) Must not conflict with other laws.

In Customary land law, foreigners (people outside the legal Association) may only use land within the area of the legal Association with the permission of the head of the Association or the Customary authority and by paying income (recognitie). Furthermore, Boedi Harsono stated:

"With the permission of the traditional authority, he can open the land for farming or to use as a garden for young plants; namely gardens planted with plants that don't take long to harvest. Because foreigners can only control or work on the land they clear for one harvest. He controls the land he has owned with use rights, because foreigners cannot (cannot) have rights with ownership rights."[2]

It is clear that in principle, in customary land law, foreigners (people outside the legal community) may not have land rights; with the permission of the head of the law association or traditional ruler, they may only have land rights which gives limited authority, namely he may only control it with the right to use, and even then it must be accompanied by payment of income; Here foreigners are distinguished from citizens of legal partnerships.

The provisions that only allow residents of a legal partnership to have rights to land are so strict that if any of the residents of a legal partnership use their land for the needs of a foreigner (a person outside the legal partnership), that resident is seen as a foreigner and he or she must obtain permission first, from the head of the Guild and pay income (recognitie).

By making customary law the basis for agrarian law through Article 5 of the UUPA, it has the consequence or effect that the principle that only allows members of the association to have ownership rights to land is also made a principle adopted by the UUPA, namely by elevating it to the highest level at the state level. Thus, only Indonesian citizens can in principle have ownership rights to land in Indonesia.

Such principles, seen from the perspective of international law, can be accounted for; According to Sudargo Gautama, provisions like this also exist in the land laws of various countries and the international law currently in force does not recognize any principles or principles that determine that foreigners should naturally be allowed to own land in other countries where they live. For this reason, he quoted the opinion of Andreas H. Roth from the book "The Minimum Standard of International Law Applied to Aliens, Leiden, p. 165", as follows:[6]

As per general global regulation, the outsider's honor of support in the monetary existence of his condition of home doesn't venture to such an extreme as to permit him to gain private property. The condition of home is allowed to ban him from responsibility for or certain property, whether versatile or realty.[7]

Free translation:

By international law in general, the priority rights of foreigners in the economic life of the country where they live do not go so far as to allow them to obtain property rights, both movable and fixed objects.

Then in International Civil Law, there is a principle known as "lex rei sitae"[3], namely that the law of the place where the fixed object is located is what is used for legal relations relating to that object. Thus, the law for legal relations relating to land in Indonesia, for example, also applies to land law in Indonesia.

So in International Law, a country is free to prohibit foreigners from having all or some of the various rights to land, this depends on the land politics of the country concerned. Thus, Indonesia's determination that foreigners may only have use rights and rental rights and are prohibited from having ownership rights, business use rights and building use rights in the UUPA can be justified; and for foreigners who have legal relations with land in Indonesia, the provisions of the UUPA apply.

3.1.2 Relationship between Land and Building Rights

Regarding the relationship between rights to land and buildings, in the legal system that has been in force, we are familiar with the principle of attachment and the principle of horizontal separation.

1) Principles of Attachment

Buildings on West Rights land adhere to the principle of attachment, this can be seen from Article 500 BW which states that the building and plants

are part of the land. Because they are part of the land, the land and buildings are subject to the same law, namely the law of the land. Buildings that are erected and built on a plot of land by law become the property of the owner of the land unless there is another agreement as stated in Article 571 BW.[4]

Land law adopted by countries that use the principle of attachment or the principle of access, buildings on land are part of the land in question. Therefore, the right to land by law also includes buildings on the land that is owned, unless there is another agreement with the party building the building.[5]

2) Horizontal Separation Principle

For buildings that stand on customary land, the principle of horizontal separation applies. By this principle, there is a separation between land and buildings. The land is subject to Land Law and the building is subject to Land Law.

In this principle of horizontal separation, the person who owns the land does not automatically become the owner of the building that someone else built on his land. Whoever builds it is the owner of the building unless there is another agreement.

The UUPA which is currently in force adheres to the principle of customary law that the relationship of rights to land and buildings which is in force now is based on the principle of horizontal separation. This means that having rights to the land does not automatically mean you are the owner of the building erected on it. In the case of flats, the land owner does not automatically become the owner of the flat built by another party on his land. Legal acts regarding land do not necessarily cover the buildings on it. However, in practice it is possible for a legal act regarding land to also include buildings on it in the case of:

- 1) the building is physically one unit with the land,
- 2) the building belongs to the owner of the land,
- 3) expressly stated in the deed which proves the legal action has been carried out.[8]

3.1.3 Ownership of Flat Units by Foreigners

Before the authorization of the Gig Creation Regulation, outsiders living in Indonesia could have possession privileges to loft units based ashore with the option to utilize. This should be visible in the arrangements of Regulation No. 16 of 1985 Article 8 section (1) of the Law which expresses that condo units are claimed by people or legitimate elements who meet the necessities as holders of land privileges. This is additionally affirmed by article 2 section (2) of Unofficial law Number 41 of 1996 concerning Responsibility for or private houses by outsiders residing in Indonesia which expresses that condo units that might be claimed by outsiders are those based on Right to Utilize land.

Regulation Number 16 of 1985 and Unofficial law Number 41 of 1996 were disavowed and announced as of now not legitimate and afterward supplanted with Regulation Number 20 of 2011 concerning Pads and Unofficial law 103 of 2015 concerning Responsibility for or private houses by outsiders who live in Indonesia.

With respect to of pads in Regulation No. 20 of 2011 article 47 section (1) expresses that as evidence of responsibility for ashore with possession freedoms, building use privileges or use privileges on state land, building use

privileges or use freedoms on the land the executives privileges are given SHM Sarusun. Moreover, section (2) expresses that the SHM Sarusun as alluded to in passage (1) is given to each individual who meets the necessities as a land rights holder. This is in accordance with the arrangements in Article 2 passage (1) related to Article 4 section (2) Unofficial law Number 103 of 2015 concerning the Responsibility for or private houses by outsiders residing in Indonesia which establishes that outsiders can claim pads based on Use Freedoms land bundles.

From the two Laws on Condominiums mentioned above, it can be seen that the ownership of ownership rights to condominium units is always stated for owners who can own those who fulfill the requirements as holders of land rights so outsiders can claim pads based ashore with use freedoms. since in light of the arrangements of the UUPA, outsiders can't have freedoms to land in that frame of mind of Possession Privileges, Business Privileges, and Building Use Freedoms.

In Regulation Number 6 of 2023 concerning the Assurance of Perpu Number 2 of 2022 concerning Position Creation into Regulation, which has denied Regulation Number 11 of 2020 concerning Position Creation, it is resolved that outsiders can have proprietorship privileges to the lofts being assembled. on building use privileges. This should be visible in Article 144 section (1) letter c which expresses that possession privileges to loft units can be given to unfamiliar residents who have grants by legal arrangements. Moreover, in the arrangements of Article 145 section (1) of Regulation Number 6 of 2023, it is expressed that pads can be based on Building Use Freedoms or Use Privileges on state land or Building Use Privileges or Use Freedoms on Administration Freedoms land. This arrangement is reaffirmed and, surprisingly, extended in Unofficial law Number 18 of 2021 concerning The board Freedoms, land privileges, loft units, and land enrollment; Article 71 states that a home or staying that can be claimed by an outsider as a loft is based on a plot of land: 1) use rights or building use privileges on state land, 2) use rights or building use freedoms ashore with the executives freedoms, what's more, 3) use rights or building use privileges on restrictive land.

With the enactment of the Law on Job Creation, ownership of ownership rights to apartment units built on building use rights does not conflict with the provisions on ownership of land rights in the UUPA. This can be understood because the UUPA itself adheres to the principle of horizontal separation in land and building ownership relations. That the land owner is not automatically the owner of the building erected on his land. So the enactment of the Law on Job Creation strengthens the principle of horizontal separation contained in the UUPA and corrects the Law on Condominiums which previously always linked the ownership of an apartment unit with the condition that the owner who can owns it meets the requirements as the holder of the rights to the land.

The presence of the rule of level detachment can be reflected in the attributes of land privileges authentications and possession freedoms testaments for loft units. Authentications of Proprietorship Freedoms for condo units have extraordinary traits when contrasted and endorsements of land privileges overall. On an endorsement of land privileges, the name of the testament relies upon the sort of right to the land, for example, a Declaration of Proprietorship Freedoms on the off chance that the land is Freehold, an Endorsement of

Development Freedoms assuming the land is Development Freedoms, an Endorsement of Building Use Freedoms assuming the land is Building Use Freedoms, Endorsement of Purpose Freedoms in the event that the land is More right than wrong to Utilize. The unique qualities of a declaration of proprietorship freedoms over a loft unit were expressed by R. Soeprapto, in particular: " An endorsement of confirmation of proprietorship privileges over a condo unit isn't attached to the sort of land freedoms.[1]

3.2 The Effect of Ownership of Ownership Rights on Flat Units Built on Building Use Rights by Foreigners on Ownership by Indonesian Citizens.

Foreign ownership of apartment units is limited to certain areas. These limitations are contained in the Clarification of Regulation NO 6 of 2023 which expresses that responsibility for by far off nationals is just allowed in Unique Financial Zones, Streamlined commerce and Free Port Zones, Modern Zones, and other monetary zones. This is in line with Article 71 paragraph (2) PP Number 18 of 2021 Flats Built on Right to Use Land

or then again Building Use Privileges as alluded to in section (1) letter b is Loft Units worked in exceptional monetary zones, deregulation and free port regions, modern regions, and other financial regions.

Even though it is limited to special areas, ownership in one flat is likely not only owned by foreigners but also owned by Indonesian citizens. So, foreigners or foreign citizens and Indonesian citizens have ownership rights to apartment units in the same apartment.[9]

In the event that a loft is based ashore with Building Use Freedoms, the responsibility for condo unit is claimed by people of different nationalities, such as Indonesian citizens and foreign citizens, then we will see the conditions that occur as follows: 1) Differences: For foreign citizens, they cannot own their land, which is called joint land, because the flat is built on Building Use Rights land, so they only own the building, that is, they own the flat, whereas for Indonesian citizens, they can own their land, which is called joint land, and has a flat unit. 2) Equality: Both foreign citizens and Indonesian citizens enjoy all the facilities of an apartment, including shared land, because the apartment building stands on shared land.

Such circumstances make a hole or lopsidedness between the freedoms and commitments of Indonesian residents and unfamiliar residents in the responsibility for privileges to loft units based ashore with building use privileges. For Indonesian citizens who have rights and obligations over joint land, they have rights according to their share of the joint land because they are part of the joint land owners so they have obligations, for example, to pay land tax, besides that, they have rights to the building because they own the apartment unit, and must pay building taxes.[10] Foreign citizens, do not have rights to their land because foreigners cannot own land with building use rights, so legally there is no obligation for them to pay land tax, besides that, they have rights to buildings because they are owners of apartment units and own obligation to pay building tax. Therefore, to create a balance between Indonesian citizens and foreign citizens, the author considers that there needs to be special regulations regarding the use of ownership rights for apartment units built on building property rights in Ministerial regulations or the Articles of Association and Bylaws of the Owners' Association. and Residents of Sarusun/PPP SRS.

4 CLOSING

From the discussion described above, the author draws the following conclusions:

1. Ownership of apartment units on Building Use Rights land for foreigners regulated in the Job Creation Law does not conflict with the UUPA which prohibits foreigners from having rights to land with building use rights, but this strengthens the principle of horizontal separation adopted in the UUPA where ownership of land rights is differentiated from rights to buildings in the area. on his land.
2. Ownership of license rights to apartment units on Building Use Rights land for foreigners does not include joint land ownership which is only given to Indonesian citizens, resulting in an imbalance of rights and obligations between Indonesian citizens and foreigners regarding ownership of apartments. Foreigners do not have rights to shared land but can enjoy all the facilities of an apartment like Indonesian citizens. There needs to be special regulations regarding the use of ownership rights for apartment units over building use privileges for foreigners so that there is a balance of rights and obligations between Indonesian citizens and foreigners.

References

- [1] J. M. S. Sagala and F. Santiago, "Evidence in Civil Action Procedures against the Law by Controlling and Owning Land without Legal Rights," 2022, doi: 10.4108/eai.30-10-2021.2315849.
- [2] Ahmad Zuhdi, "Perkembangan Metodologi Penelitian Hukum," *J. Huk. dan Perad.*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 189–206, 2012.
- [3] M. Pardede, "Implikasi Hukum Kontrak Karya Pertambangan terhadap Kedaulatan Negara," *J. Penelit. Huk. Jure*, vol. 18, no. 1, p. 1, 2018, doi: 10.30641/dejure.2018.v18.1-21.
- [4] S. L. Anindita and R. Agustina, "Research report on the knowledge, experience, and attitude of consumers towards counterfeit medicine in Jakarta: A legal analysis," in *Law and Justice in a Globalized World*, 2017, p. 71.
- [5] N. Setyawan and E. Israhadi, "Implementation of Basic Agrarian Law No. 5/1960 in Indigenous Land Disputes in Malinau District," in *ICLSSEE 2021*, 2021, no. 1, pp. 1–6, doi: 10.4108/eai.6-3-2021.2306466.
- [6] I. Si. Chandranegara, "Perbandingan Fungsi dan Kedudukan Mahkamah Konstitusi dan Lembaga Sejenisnya di Tiga Negara (Indonesia, Austria, dan Perancis)," *Socio Justitia*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 1–17, 2017, doi: 10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004.
- [7] D. M. Kemme, B. Parikh, and T. Steigner, "Tax Morale and International Tax Evasion," *J. World Bus.*, vol. 55, no. 3, p. 101052, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.jwb.2019.101052.
- [8] Z. Mohammadi, M. Ahmadvand, M. Sharifzadeh, and I. Shahbazi, "The lived-experience of land-use among Northern Iranian farmers in land risk areas: A phenomenology study," *Land use policy*, vol. 108, no. April, p. 105534, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.landusepol.2021.105534.
- [9] R. Romadhoni and D. B. Kharisma, "Aspek Hukum Kontrak Elektronik (E-Contract) Dalam Transaksi E-Commerce yang Menggunakan Bitcoin Sebagai Alat Pembayaran," *J. Priv. Law*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 49–54, 2019.
- [10] A. Uyar, A. Bani-Mustafa, K. Nimer, F. Schneider, and A. Hasnaoui, "Does innovation capacity reduce tax evasion? Moderating effect of intellectual property rights," *Technol. Forecast. Soc. Change*, vol. 173, no. September 2020, p. 121125, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.techfore.2021.121125.