

Effectiveness of Honorarium Regulation in Notary Service Operations

Alun Windari Praptonowati¹, Tri Lisiani², Sulistyandari³, Rahadi Wasi Bintoro⁴

Abstract

Introduction: Notary honorarium reflects not only the value of professionalism but also contributes to creating justice in legal services. This honorarium regulation is governed by rules aimed at ensuring transparency and preventing unfair competition among notaries. This research aims to examine the urgency and mechanism of reconstructing notary honorarium regulations, which prioritize minimum and maximum standards based on service complexity. **Methodology:** The research method used is doctrinal research with a normative juridical approach. The study results indicate that the current regulation of notary honorarium is stipulated in Article 36 of the Notary Position Law, which determines the amount of honorarium based on the economic and sociological value of the deed made. The effectiveness of the honorarium regulation is still inadequate, evidenced by weak supervision and the application of sanctions that do not provide a deterrent effect. The reconstruction of more specific notary honorarium regulations, with the establishment of clear minimum and maximum standards, transparent procedures, and a more effective supervision and sanction model, is crucial to prevent unfair competition among notaries. The research purpose is to give an analysis on the effectiveness of honorarium regulation in the notary service operations. The scientific contribution from this research is that it provides the latest information on the effectiveness of honorarium regulation in the notary service operations.

Keywords: *Effectiveness, Notary, And Tariff.*

Introduction

A notary is a public official tasked and obligated to provide legal services and consultations to the public in need (Gunardi, 2007). In carrying out their profession, notaries serve as public servants and are officials appointed by the government. In performing their duties, notaries are required to comply with the provisions of the Notary Position Regulations and the prevailing professional code of ethics. Notaries are a legal profession, and as such, the notary profession is a noble office (*nobile officium*) (Tan, 2007). As a respected profession, a notary is not a position that receives a fixed salary, like a civil servant, but rather obtains income from parties who use their services, which is referred to as an honorarium (Salim, 2015). Law Number 30 of 2004 concerning Notary Positions, which has been amended by Law Number 2 of 2014 concerning Amendments to Law Number 30 of 2004 (hereinafter referred to as the Law on Notary Positions), is one of the regulations that governs the position of a notary in Indonesia. In addition to the Law on Notary Positions, which regulates the implementation of the notary position, there is also a Notary Code of Ethics that functions as a support for the Notary Position Law and serves as a guideline for notaries in carrying out their duties (Sidharta, 2006). In practice, the application of honorariums varies between notaries; some apply honorarium rates in accordance with the provisions of Article 36 of Law Number 2 of 2014 concerning Amendments to Law Number 30 of 2004 concerning Notary Positions, while many notaries apply rates below the standard provisions.

The setting of notary service honorariums below the standard, which can lead to unfair business competition among fellow notaries, certainly creates its own problems, not only among fellow notaries but also for the notary concerned. The notary profession faces serious challenges related to the phenomenon of price wars involving unfair competition among fellow notaries. This phenomenon certainly disrupts the sustainability of the notary profession, as it has a negative impact on the quality

¹ Doctoral Program in Law, Faculty of Law, Jenderal Soedirman University, Emails: alunabrizam@gmail.com, (Corresponding Author)

² Doctoral Program in Law, Faculty of Law, Jenderal Soedirman University, Email: tlisiani@gmail.com

³ Doctoral Program in Law, Faculty of Law, Jenderal Soedirman University, Email: sulistyandari2605@unsoed.ac.id

⁴ Doctoral Program in Law, Faculty of Law, Jenderal Soedirman University, Email: rahadi.bintoro@mhs.unsoed.ac.id

of services, professionalism, and reputation of notaries. Price wars result in low service fees received by notaries. This is certainly widely complained about by several notaries. The increasingly severe price war among notaries in an effort to gain clients to the point of being unreasonable has led to a decline in the quality of deed preparation, as stated by Asbar Imran as a representative of the Southeast Sulawesi Regional Board, at the Plenary Meeting of the Central Board of the Indonesian Notary Association held on March 23, 2015, in Jakarta (Astuti & Endarti, 2021).

Price wars in the notary profession have led many notaries to take steps that undermine professionalism, such as providing services using blank forms, implementing a "ball pick-up" system (providing services outside the office), and facilitating the issuance of cover notes without proper procedures (Hasan & Al-Salam, 2025). Consequently, the credibility of notaries as a position and profession with significant responsibility for legal certainty is at stake. This condition not only lowers professional ethical standards but also creates opportunities for practices that potentially violate the law and harm the public. In fact, as public officials and extensions of the state dealing with public affairs, the work of notaries should not be influenced by the amount of honorarium or the influx of clients and should not affect the quality of notary services.

The notary's honorarium fundamentally reflects not only the value of their professionalism but also contributes to the establishment of fairness in legal services. A tariff war, undoubtedly, serves as an indicator of issues concerning the regulations and their effectiveness. Consequently, this study aims to address these dual problems to generate novel ideas and solutions to the phenomenon of tariff wars.

Notary honorariums basically not only reflect the value of professionalism but are also part of efforts to create justice in legal services. The regulation of this honorarium is regulated in regulations that aim to ensure transparency and prevent unfair competition practices among notaries (Moorthygari et al., 2025). However, in practice, the regulation of honorariums often faces various challenges, including lack of compliance with established standards and potential differences in interpretation regarding the effectiveness of these regulations. Therefore, researchers will examine how honorariums are regulated in current notary practice and how effective the regulation of honorariums is in current notary practice in Indonesia. Several previous studies, such as those conducted by Yuhertiana (2020), highlighted that in practice, notary honorariums are often negotiated with clients without strictly referring to applicable regulations, thus potentially creating legal uncertainty (Yuhertiana, 2020). The effectiveness of notary honorarium regulations is also a crucial aspect that needs to be studied further (Kamarulzaman, Ismail, Basher, & Ismail, 2025). A study conducted by Bestari (2021) shows that although regulations related to notary honorariums have been established, many notaries still face obstacles in enforcing reasonable honorarium standards that are in accordance with regulations. Factors such as market dominance by certain notaries, lack of sanctions for tariff violations, and minimal public understanding of notary honorarium regulations also contribute to the low effectiveness of this policy (Bestari, 2021).

Research by Sudirman (2019) revealed that there are still many irregularities in determining honorariums, including the practice of giving excessive discounts that can reduce the professionalism of notaries and lead to unfair competition (Sudirman, 2019). Therefore, efforts are needed to reconstruct and strengthen regulations regarding the regulation of notary honorariums so that their practices can run more effectively and in accordance with the principles of propriety and fairness. A study by Neo and Chen (2017) emphasized that transparency in the notary honorarium regulation system can increase public trust and improve the professionalism of notaries in carrying out their duties (Neo & Chen, 2017). In addition, increasing the role of notary professional organizations in supervising and enforcing sanctions against notaries who violate the provisions of the honorarium tariff is one of the solutions proposed in several studies. Thus, the study of the regulation of honorariums and its effectiveness in current notarial practice is not only relevant from an academic perspective but also has a direct impact on improving the quality of notarial services in Indonesia.

Methodology

This research employs a doctrinal method with a normative juridical approach, which views law as a system of written norms created by authorized institutions, autonomous and closed off from societal life. In analyzing the effectiveness of honorarium regulations in notary service operations, this study applies several approaches, namely the statute approach and the conceptual approach (Fahmi, Azhari, Surbakti, Budiono, & Wula, 2025). The statute approach is used to examine the hierarchy and principles of legislation governing notary honorariums. The statute approach is used to examine the hierarchy and legal principles governing notary honorariums. This approach focuses on the analysis of legal norms

contained in laws and regulations relating to the position of notary, especially regarding the provisions of honorariums (Wardiono, 2019). In this context, the statute approach is carried out by examining Law Number 2 of 2014 concerning amendments to Law Number 30 of 2004 concerning the position of notary, which is the main legal basis for regulating notary honorariums (Filatova, We, Feng, Orozovna, & Kashymbekov, 2024). Meanwhile, the conceptual approach is applied to understand the concept of notary honorariums when there is ambiguity in existing regulations (Marzuki, 2017). Through these approaches, the research seeks to investigate the extent to which notary honorarium regulations are effectively implemented and their implications for professionalism and competition in the notary profession (Jiwanti & Soponyono, 2022).

Result and Discussion

Honorarium Arrangements in Notary Practice

The term 'notary' fundamentally originates from the Latin word 'notarius, notarius, which was the designation given to Roman individuals tasked with writing or those who kept records at that time (Adjie, 2009). Several other opinions suggest that the name 'Notary' derives from the term 'nota literaria,' meaning something that is said (Notodisoerjo, 1993). A notary is an official who carries out duties for the government and does not serve the public, whereas those who serve the public are called 'tabliones,' officials who perform writing tasks for the general public or those who require their expertise (Notodisoerjo, 1993).

According to R. Soegondo, a notary is a public official authorized to create authentic deeds, provide date guarantees, store deeds, and issue grossess, copies, and excerpts in accordance with statutory regulations or requests from interested parties (Notodisoerjo, 1993). The existence of the notary profession is as a public official authorized to create authentic deeds as stipulated in Article 1868 of the Civil Code (Nico, 2003).

A public official, in Dutch, is referred to as 'openbaar ambtenaar.' 'Openbaar' means related to government, matters open to the public, and public interest, while 'openbaar ambtenaar' means an official tasked with creating public deeds (*openbaar akten*) (Selindeho, 1997). R. Soegondo states that a person becomes a public official when they are appointed and dismissed by the government and given the authority and obligation to serve the public in certain matters, thereby participating in exercising the authority (*gezag*) of the government (Selindeho, 1997).

The provisions in Article 36 paragraph (2) are considered inappropriate because they mandate the determination of both economic and sociological values for each deed, which in practice can complicate matters for notaries. Furthermore, the formulation does not provide clear guidelines regarding the proportions or formulas used to determine the final fee. Instead, a more appropriate formulation would be: "the amount of the fee received by a notary is based on the economic value or sociological value of each deed created." In the explanation of Article 36 paragraph (4), deeds that have sociological value or social function include deeds of establishment of foundations, deeds of waqf land, deeds of establishment of places of worship, deeds of establishment of schools, or deeds of establishment of hospitals. The regulation in Article 36 of the Notary Public Position Law focuses more on the maximum service rates that can be received by notaries, without providing specific details on the mechanism for determining fees based on economic or sociological value

Article 4 paragraph (9) of the Notary Code of Ethics states that: 'Notaries and others who hold and perform duties as Notaries are prohibited from engaging in efforts, either directly or indirectly, that lead to unfair competition with fellow Notaries.'

The notary professional code of ethics aims to prevent unhealthy competition between notaries, especially in terms of determining service fees. Unhealthy competition, such as providing fees below standard, can harm fellow notaries and reduce the image of the profession (Hadar, 2020). Therefore, clear regulations are needed regarding the minimum notary service fee standard as a guideline in determining the lowest fee charged to clients. This aims to prevent fee wars that can damage the integrity of the profession and ensure fairness in the provision of legal services (Tangi, Janssen, Benedetti, & Noci, 2021). With strict standards, it is hoped that notaries can maintain the quality of their services without having to compete on price aspects, which can actually reduce the value of the notary profession in the eyes of the public. Determining minimum fee standards also helps create uniformity in fees for similar services so that there are no significant differences in fees between notaries. This uniformity not only provides legal certainty for clients but also increases public trust in the notary profession (Bonnet, Westerman, & Welch, 2020).

Furthermore, clear honorarium standards can maintain service quality, avoid a decline in quality due to unhealthy price competition, and strengthen the professionalism and integrity of notaries in carrying out their duties. In addition, with the existence of honorarium standards, the public can more easily understand the costs that must be incurred in every legal transaction involving a notary so that there is no uncertainty that can harm both parties. The regulation of honorariums in notarial practice is regulated in the Notary Law and other provisions that support this profession. The Notary Law regulates that notary honorariums are given based on the legal services provided, without a fixed salary system like civil servants.

This honorarium is obtained from transactions such as making authentic deeds, powers of attorney, or other legal agreements. To maintain professional standards and avoid unhealthy competition, there are regulations that regulate the maximum rates that can be charged by notaries, preventing the setting of rates that are too high or too low that can harm clients. Thus, regulations related to honorariums not only provide legal certainty but also ensure that notarial practice continues to run within the corridor of high professionalism.

Notary fee rates are adjusted to the type of service and complexity of the deed created, but implementation still faces challenges. There are differences in interpretation in setting rates, especially for deeds that require special expertise, causing variations in rates among notaries that sometimes do not comply with applicable regulations. Competition in the notary service market also encourages some notaries to set rates outside the established limits to attract more clients, which potentially reduces service quality. Therefore, continuous supervision and evaluation are needed to ensure that fee regulations remain in accordance with applicable standards, provide fairness for clients, and maintain the integrity and professionalism of notaries.

Effectiveness of Notary Honorarium Arrangements

The regulation of notary fees in Article 36 of the Notary Public Position Law stipulates that the amount of fees must be in accordance with the economic and sociological value of the deed created. This rule aims to maintain a balance between the professional interests of notaries and the protection of the public from fee exploitation while maintaining the dignity of notaries as public officials working based on a code of ethics. However, in practice, this provision still faces various challenges, especially in its application, which is often unclear and opens opportunities for unfair competition.

The phenomenon of fee wars among notaries is increasingly prevalent in several regions, where many notaries offer low fees without considering service quality to attract more clients. This practice damages the integrity and professionalism of the notary institution and shifts the orientation of notary services from the legal interests of the public to mere financial gain. Furthermore, the lack of strict supervision over the implementation of fee rules allows unfair competition to continue, so decisive steps are needed to ensure that ethical and professional standards are maintained in the notary profession (Hernanda et al., 2023).

Unfair competition among notaries not only impacts the economic sector and professional reputation but also affects the quality of services provided to the public. In a fee war situation, notaries who set low fees often find it difficult to maintain service quality. Abdul Manan et al. state that competition among fellow notaries is increasingly leading to unhealthy business competition among the notaries themselves. They go to the market to approach clients, offer services, negotiate fees, and enter into agreements like businesspeople in general (Manan, Tamrin, & Wibawa, 2019).

This is due to the limitations of operational costs that can be allocated to maintain good work standards, ranging from document quality to appropriate consultations for clients. Ultimately, the quality of notary work declines, which can actually create further legal problems for the parties who use their services. This phenomenon is worrying because it erodes public trust in the role of notaries as guardians of legal certainty (A. Budiono et al., 2019).

One of the causes of unhealthy business competition among fellow notaries is the setting of notary service fees or honoraria below the standards established by law and the Code of Ethics. This is in direct contradiction to what is regulated in Law Number 2 of 2014 concerning Notary Positions and the Notary Code of Ethics, because Notaries are prohibited from making efforts to set service fees below the standard to obtain as many clients as possible. However, in practice, there are unscrupulous notaries who do this. This practice is exacerbated by a lack of supervision and the absence of sanctions, so unhealthy business competition among fellow notaries continues to occur (Prayitno & Hutabarat, 2019).

Tariff wars between notaries have a negative impact on the quality of services, where pressure to lower prices leads to a reduction in important aspects such as document examination, thorough verification, and provision of adequate legal advice, thereby increasing the risk of legal errors (Hartotok, Absori, Dimiyati, Santoso, & Budiono, 2021). Furthermore, unhealthy price competition damages the integrity of the notary profession, as some notaries ignore ethical principles to attract clients (Santoso, 2018). Weak supervision by the Notary Supervisory Board also worsens the situation, as the sanctions imposed are often not sufficient to provide a deterrent effect (Absori Absori, Hernanda, Fitriadi, Wardiono, & Budiono, 2023). Therefore, reforms in the supervision mechanism and the application of stricter sanctions, such as revocation of licenses or heavy fines, are needed to maintain professionalism and fairness in notarial practice (Rahardjo, 2020). To overcome the problem of tariff wars and increase the effectiveness of tariff regulation in notarial practice, stricter regulations are needed regarding the minimum tariff limits for notarial services (Yuspin, Wardiono, Nurrahman, & Budiono, 2020). Determining the minimum tariff will provide legal certainty for all parties and prevent unfair competition practices that can damage the professionalism of notaries (Putri, 2019). Furthermore, clear honorarium limits will strengthen the position of notaries as public officials who carry out their duties by prioritizing legal aspects and codes of ethics, not only as service providers oriented towards the free market (Izziyana et al., 2019).

Stricter supervision by the Notary Supervisory Board also needs to be strengthened to ensure compliance with the established honorarium provisions (A Absori, Hernanda, Fitriadi, Wardiono, & Budiono, 2023). Stricter sanction mechanisms, including revocation of licenses for notaries who are proven to have committed serious honorarium violations (Arief Budiono, Absori, Wardiono, Yuspin, & Gulyamov, 2023), must be implemented to provide a deterrent effect. With these steps, it is hoped that notarial practices in Indonesia can run more professionally, ethically, and provide better legal protection for the community (Arief Budiono, Absori, Ngestiningrum, & Nugroho, 2018).

With these steps, it is hoped that the regulation of notary honorariums can be more effective in practice, not only in terms of compliance with honorarium provisions but also in maintaining the professionalism and quality of notary services to the community. As stated in the Notary Law, notaries are not only business actors but also officials who play an important role in maintaining legal certainty in society (Wardiono et al., 2021)

Conclusion

It can be concluded that the regulation on Notary fees is stipulated in Article 36 of the Notary Public Position Law, which grants Notaries the right to receive remuneration for legal services provided within their authority. The fee amount is determined based on the economic value and sociological value of each deed, with specific percentage limits based on the transaction's value. While economic value is calculated from the deed's object, sociological value considers its social function, with a maximum fee of Rp. 5,000,000.00.

The regulation of notary honorariums in Article 36 of the Notary Position Law has not been fully effective in preventing unhealthy tariff competition due to insufficiently detailed provisions, particularly concerning high-value objects. The uncertainty in tariff determination leads to unfair competition among notaries, while weak supervision and non-deterrent sanctions exacerbate the situation. Suboptimal rule implementation also impacts service quality, where tariff wars can drive down professionalism standards. Therefore, a reconstruction of clearer honorarium regulations, strict supervision, and more effective sanctions is needed to create a fair and transparent system.

It is suggested that stronger regulations regarding the minimum limit of notary honorariums, as well as enhanced supervision and enforcement of the code of ethics, are necessary to ensure that notarial practices adhere to just legal principles.

Acknowledgment

The authors would like to thank Universitas Jendral Soedirman.

References

- [1] Absori, A, Hernanda, T., Fitriadi, A., Wardiono, K., & Budiono, A. (2023). Analysis of the Issues on Bengawan Solo River Basin Management Policies. *WSEAS Transactions on Environment and Development*, 19, 25–32. <https://doi.org/10.37394/232015.2023.19.3>

- [2] Absori, Absori, Hernanda, T., Fitriadi, A., Wardiono, K., & Budiono, A. (2023). Analysis of the Issues on Bengawan Solo River Basin Management Policies. *WSEAS Transactions on Environment and Development*, 19(November 2022), 25–32. <https://doi.org/10.37394/232015.2023.19.3>
- [3] Adjie, H. (2009). *Observing the Treasury of Indonesian Notaries and PPAT*. Bandung: PT Citra Aditya Bakti.
- [4] Astuti, S., & Endarti, E. (2021). The Rights of Nursing Mothers at the Workplace in the Perspective of Public Service and Its Effect on Job Performance. *Spirit Publik: Jurnal Administrasi Publik*, 16(1), 25–41. <https://doi.org/10.20961/sp.v16i1.45820>
- [5] Bestari, N. P. (2021). Effectiveness of Notary Honorarium Regulations in Legal Practice in Indonesia. *Journal of Business Law*, 14(2).
- [6] Bonnet, D., Westerman, G., & Welch, M. (2020). The New Elements of Digital Transformation: A Focus on Professions and Services. *Harvard Business Review*.
- [7] Budiono, A., Absori, Harun, H., Nugroho, H. S. W., Dimiyati, K., Ngestiningrum, A. H., & Izziyana, W. V. (2019). The anachronism of the Indonesian social security policy in health. *Medico-Legal Update*, 19(1). <https://doi.org/10.5958/0974-1283.2019.00046.X>
- [8] Budiono, Arief, Absori, A., Ngestiningrum, A. H., & Nugroho, H. S. W. (2018). Pseudo National Security System of Health in Indonesia. *Indian Journal of Public Health Research & Development*, 9(10), 556–560. <https://doi.org/10.5958/0976-5506.2018.01404.3>
- [9] Budiono, Arief, Absori, Wardiono, K., Yuspin, W., & Gulyamov, S. S. (2023). Cyber Indoctrination Victims in Indonesia and Uzbekistan: Victim Protection and Indoctrination in Practice. *Journal of Human Rights, Culture and Legal System*, 3(3), 441–475. <https://doi.org/10.53955/jhcls.v3i3.127>
- [10] Fahmi, M. A., Azhari, A. F., Surbakti, N., Budiono, A., & Wula, Z. (2025). Election Crimes and the Architect of Restorative Justice to Achieve Electoral Justice. *Architecture Image Studies*, 6(3).
- [11] Filatova, T., We, M., Feng, H., Orozonova, A., & Kashymbekov, A. (2024). Concepts and Methods of Research on the Visual Image of the City. *Architecture Image Studies*, 5, 18–33.
- [12] Gunardi, M. G. (2007). *Notary Law Code*. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada.
- [13] Hadar, L. L. (2020). Professional Ethics in Notarial Practice: Maintaining Standards and Integrity. *Journal of Legal Studies*, 45(2).
- [14] Hartotok, H., Absori, A., Dimiyati, K., Santoso, H., & Budiono, A. (2021). Stunting prevention policy as a form of child health rights legal protection. *Open Access Macedonian Journal Medical Sciences*, 9, 1218–1223. <https://doi.org/10.3889/oamjms.2021.7254>
- [15] Hasan, I., & Al-Salam, N. A. (2025). Green Buildings as a Cornerstone of Green Cities: A Comparative Analytical Study of (Msheireb, Masdar, and NEOM). *Architecture Image Studies*, 6(4), 45–57.
- [16] Hernanda, T., Absori, Wardiono, K., Azhari, A. F., Azizah, N., & Budiono, A. (2023). The Impact of Environmental Regulation Implementation: A Meta-Analysis. *International Journal of Sustainable Development and Planning*, 18(10), 3235–3242. <https://doi.org/10.18280/ijstdp.181023>
- [17] Izziyana, W. V., Harun, Absori, Wardiono, K., Nugroho, H. S. W., & Budiono, A. (2019). Health insurance for Indonesian migrant workers. *Medico-Legal Update*, 19(1), 188–192. <https://doi.org/10.5958/0974-1283.2019.00038.0>
- [18] Jiwanti, A., & Soponyono, E. (2022). The Urgency of Judge's Legal Reasoning in Deciding on an Environmental Crime Case Based on an Ecocentric Approach (Review of Case Decision No. 640/PID.B/LH/2021/PT PBR). *Jurnal Jurisprudence*, 12(2), 71–91.
- [19] Kamarulzaman, N., Ismail, M., Basher, H. S. B., & Ismail, A. (2025). Field-Based Assessment of Vegetation Structure and Configuration (VSC) For Thermal Regulation in Tropical Residential Environments. *Architecture Image Studies*, 6(3), 402–418.
- [20] Manan, A., Tamrin, A., & Wibawa, M. N. (2019). Review of Law Number 2 of 2014 on the Practice of Notary Honorarium Implementation. *Journal of Legal Research*, 55(3).
- [21] Marzuki, P. M. (2017). *Penelitian Hukum Edisi Revisi*. Jakarta: Kencana Prenada Media Group. Retrieved from <https://opac.perpusnas.go.id/DetailOpac.aspx?id=1409842>
- [22] Moorthygari, S. L., Jakka, S. R., Rajendran, J., Dasari, K., Santhi, V. J., Gandham, R., & Bommiseti, R. K. (2025). Environmental Maintenance and Ecotourism: An Analysis into the Observation of Tourists and Maintenance Agencies in India Article Sidebar. *Architecture Image Studies*, 6(3).
- [23] Neo, B. S., & Chen, G. (2017). Transparency and Fairness in Notary Fee Regulations: A Comparative Study. *Singapore Legal Journal*, 25(1).
- [24] Nico. (2003). *Responsibilities of Notaries as Public Officials*. Yogyakarta: Center for Documentation and Studies of Business Law.
- [25] Notodisoerjo, R. S. (1993). *Notary Law in Indonesia: An Explanation*. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada.
- [26] Prayitno, I. S., & Hutabarat, E. A. (2019). Legal Consequences of Violation of the Provisions on Notarial Deed Honorarium. *Res Judicata*, 2(1).
- [27] Putri, A. (2019). *Notary Professionalism and Regulatory Challenges*. Bandung: Pustaka Hukum.
- [28] Rahardjo, A. (2020). *Notary Ethics and Regulation in a Legal Perspective*. Jakarta: Gramedia.
- [29] Salim, H. (2015). *One Deed Making Technique (Theoretical Concept, Notary Authority, Form and Minutes of Deed)*. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada.
- [30] Santoso, B. (2018). *Healthy Competition in Notary Practice*. Yogyakarta: UII Press.
- [31] Selindeho, J. (1997). *Land Problems in Development*. Jakarta: Sinar Grafika.

- [32] Sidharta. (2006). *Morality of the Legal Profession: An Offering of a Framework for Thinking*. Bandung: Refika Aditama.
- [33] Sudirman, R. W. (2019). The Impact of Notary Competition on Professionalism in Determining Honorarium. *Journal of Legal Studies*, 10(3).
- [34] Tan, T. K. (2007). *Notary Studies & Miscellaneous Notary Practices*. Jakarta: PT Ictiar Baru Van Hoeve.
- [35] Tangi, L., Janssen, M., Benedetti, M., & Noci, G. (2021). Regulating Professional Fees in Legal Services: Challenges and Implications. *International Journal of Law and Policy*, 37(4).
- [36] Wardiono, K. (2019). Prophetic: An Epistemological Offer for Legal Studies. *Journal of Law and Justice*, 1(1), 17–41. <https://doi.org/10.23917/jtl.v1i1.8797>
- [37] Wardiono, K., Dimiyati, K., Nugroho, S. S., Nugroho, H., Jacob, R., & Budiono, A. (2021). Philosophy, law, and ethics of handling covid-19 pandemic in Indonesia. *Open Access Macedonian Journal of Medical Sciences*, 9(E), 1104–1108.
- [38] Yuhertiana, I. (2020). Honorarium Negotiation in Notary Practice: Between Propriety and Market Competition. *Journal of Notary Law*, 17(1).
- [39] Yuspin, W., Wardiono, K., Nurrahman, A., & Budiono, A. (2020). The ideal management of health insurance for Indonesia according to constitution. *Quality - Access to Success*, 21(176), 48 – 50.