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The purpose of this internship report is to fulfill the requirement for the undergraduate degree of Faculty of Law Pelita Harapan University. This report describes the comparison between theories, concepts, skills, and knowledge. Based on the Regulation of Agrarian Law Number 5/1960, section 9 which stated that to create the rule of law on a land matter, government should conduct a land registry process. The land that has officially be registered will get a certificate which given the land an exact evidence which can be used as a strong evidence to prove the land’s ownership. In land registry, girik as a ground tax payment evidence cannot be used as land right property evidence, but only just indicated the payment taxes of the soil. The aim of this research from the district court decision number 17/Pdt/G/1991/PN.Jak.Ut has been reviewed from the law aspect of national soil and the rule of law about the land ownership that hold the right property evidence (certificate) from the government’s institution. The purpose of this report is to analyze about how effective the regulation in order to solve this dispute problem. From the research it can be seen that: 1) the district court decision number 17/Pdt/G/1991/PN.Jak.Ut has been reviewed from the law aspect of national soil and the main regulation about agrarian law. PT Summarecon Agung Tbk should not quarrel the land ownership because it does not has the condition as an owner of the subject property. 2) The decisions from the district court apparently not according to intact because most of the part circle perception which has been considered as a court decision does not reflect justice basis for the owner of the right evidence. 3) The government institution is fully responsible to publish the certificate soil as a requirement of civil responsibility. The result of this legal research can be pulled a conclusion that the certificate can be identified as a strong and valid prove.
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