

## DETERMINATION OF ONE AND THE SAME PERSON AS A SOLUTION TO IDENTITY DISHARMONIES IN POPULATION ADMINISTRATION



**Gunabila Bin'Arya Dwitatama<sup>1</sup>**

**Universitas Islam Negeri Walisongo, Semarang, Indonesia**

[2202056045@student.walisongo.ac.id](mailto:2202056045@student.walisongo.ac.id)

**Mahdaniyal Hasanah Nuriyyatiningrum<sup>2</sup>**

**Universitas Islam Negeri Walisongo, Semarang, Indonesia**

[mahdaniyal@walisongo.ac.id](mailto:mahdaniyal@walisongo.ac.id)

### Abstract

Identity inconsistencies in population administration are legal issues that impact legal certainty and the fulfillment of citizens' civil rights. Differences in the spelling of identities in official documents often hinder the implementation of legal actions, particularly in the administration of land rights. This study aims to analyze the legal considerations of judges in determining "the same person" and to assess the limits of the court's authority in voluntary population administration cases. The Research method used is normative legal Research, with a legislative, case, and conceptual approach, focusing on the Semarang District Court Decision Number 356/Pdt.P/2025/PN Smg. The results of the study show that the determination of "the same person" not only serves as a declaration of legal status but also clarifies the scope of court authority, emphasizing its role in ensuring consistent legal outcomes for population and land rights issues.

**Keywords:** Population Administration; The Same Person; Voluntary Matters; Legal Certainty

## INTRODUCTION

Population administration is a fundamental instrument in the state of law because it serves as a basis for recognizing and protecting citizens' legal status. Population identity has both an administrative and a juridical dimension, determining a person's position as a legal subject under various civil law acts. The accuracy and harmony of population data are the main prerequisites for the realization of the principle of legal certainty (*rechtszekerheid*) and the protection of citizens' civil rights (Asshiddiqie, 2016).

In practice, Indonesia's population administration system still faces inconsistencies in identity, particularly in the spelling of names across official documents. Such discrepancies can take the form of variations in names, the use of nicknames, the addition of certain elements, or differences in identity between documents issued by different agencies and at other times. Several studies show that weak record-keeping systems, low public awareness of the law, and the lack of optimal integration of population data at the national level have generally caused this problem in the past (Siregar, 2021; Wahyuni & Kurniawan, 2022).

The disharmony in population identity cannot be reduced solely to an administrative problem. In the context of civil law, the identity of the legal subject is an essential element that determines the validity of a legal relationship. Differences in identity in official documents can hinder the fulfillment of civil rights, such as the determination of heirs, the transfer of land rights, and the increase in the status of rights to become a Certificate of Property Rights (SHM). This condition presents identity as a legal issue with a direct impact on the certainty and protection of citizens' rights (Harahap, 2017; Wahyuni & Kurniawan, 2022).

Law Number 23 of 2006 concerning Population Administration, as amended by Law Number 24 of 2013, has provided a mechanism for changing population data through court determination. Article 52 of the law emphasizes that name changes in the population administration are carried out at the discretion of the district court. This provision demonstrates the involvement of judicial institutions in resolving population administration issues, which, in principle, fall within the executive's authority (Fahmi, 2021).

In the practice of civil justice, the court's involvement is realized through the application for a determination of "one equal person" in voluntary cases. This designation aims to affirm that several identities listed in population documents and other documents refer to the same legal subject. Factually, the determination provides a solution to the administrative impasse and serves as the legal basis for relevant agencies to update population data (Hidayat & Prasetyo, 2022).

However, the practice of determining "the same person" raises more fundamental legal issues. Court rulings, which are theoretically declaratory—that is, they only confirm existing legal circumstances—often serve as administrative corrective instruments in practice. The court not only declares a person's legal status, but also substantively remedies the ineffectiveness of the population administration system. This situation raises questions about the limits of the court's authority in voluntary cases, especially when such a determination is a key prerequisite for the fulfillment of land rights (R. Arifin, 2020).

The Semarang District Court Decision Number 356/Pdt.P/2025/PN Smg is a concrete example of this practice. In this determination, the judge stated that several variations of identity listed in the population and land documents refer to the same person, allowing the

applicant to continue the process of increasing SHM's land rights. This determination provides legal certainty for the applicant and also demonstrates the court's active role in addressing the gap in the effectiveness of the administrative mechanism.

Although the practice of determining "one person equal" has been widely adopted in the judiciary, academic studies that place such a determination in the context of the limits of judicial authority and population administration are still relatively limited. Some studies emphasize the procedural aspects of population data changes, without critically examining the juridical implications of the court's tendency to function as an administrative corrective mechanism.

Based on the above description, this study focuses on analyzing the judge's legal considerations in determining voluntariness in cases involving identity differences in the Semarang District Court Decision Number 356/Pdt.P/2025/PN Smg. In addition, this study examines, normatively, whether the determination of "the same person" falls within the court's declaratory authority or functions as an administrative correction mechanism that undermines legal certainty by increasing the likelihood that land rights will be issued as a Certificate of Ownership.

## REVIEW OF LITERATURE

### 1. Population Administration and Legal Certainty

Population administration is a fundamental component of a state governed by the rule of law, as it provides the legal basis for recognizing and protecting the legal status of citizens. Population identity has both administrative and juridical dimensions, as it determines a person's position as a legal subject in civil law relations. According to Jimly Asshiddiqie, legal certainty is an essential principle of the legal system that ensures individuals receive clear recognition and protection of their legal status. Therefore, accurate and consistent population data is necessary to ensure legal certainty and protect citizens' civil rights.

In practice, however, Indonesia's population administration system still faces significant challenges, particularly regarding inconsistencies in identity across official documents. Siregar (2021) explains that discrepancies in identity often arise due to weak administrative recording systems, lack of data integration, and limited public awareness of the importance of accurate population registration. Similarly, Wahyuni and Kurniawan (2022) emphasize that inconsistencies in population data can undermine legal certainty and hinder the fulfillment of civil rights because identity is a fundamental element in determining a person's legal status.

From a civil law perspective, identity clarity is essential in determining the validity of legal relationships. Harahap (2017) states that identity serves as the primary basis for identifying legal subjects in civil law transactions, including inheritance, land ownership, and contractual relationships. Any inconsistency in identity documentation may result in legal uncertainty and administrative obstacles, particularly in land registration and civil rights administration.

### 2. Voluntary Cases and the Authority of the Court

Voluntary cases, also known as non-contentious civil matters, are legal proceedings submitted to obtain a legal determination without involving disputes between parties. According to Arifin (2020), voluntary cases serve to establish legal certainty by confirming

a legal status or condition, rather than resolving legal conflicts. In such cases, the court's role is declaratory, meaning that it affirms an existing legal condition rather than creating new legal rights or obligations.

Prasetyo (2020) explains that judicial determinations in voluntary cases function primarily to provide legal validation of factual circumstances that require formal legal recognition. This function is essential in administrative matters where legal certainty cannot be achieved solely through administrative mechanisms. Courts, therefore, play a complementary role in ensuring legal certainty when administrative procedures are insufficient.

Furthermore, Hidayat and Prasetyo (2022) emphasize that court determinations in voluntary cases serve as instruments of civil rights protection. These determinations provide legal authorization for administrative agencies to update or correct official records, ensuring that citizens' legal identities are properly recognized. As a result, voluntary court determinations contribute significantly to maintaining legal certainty and protecting citizens' rights.

### **3. Determination of "One and the Same Person" in Population Administration**

The determination of "one and the same person" is a legal mechanism used to confirm that different identities listed in official documents refer to the same legal subject. Fahmi (2021) explains that this mechanism is authorized under population administration law, which allows courts to issue determinations regarding identity clarification or correction when administrative procedures are insufficient.

In legal theory, court determinations in voluntary cases are declaratory, meaning they only affirm an existing legal situation. However, in practice, such determinations also function as administrative corrective instruments. Nugroho and Wibowo (2021) argue that court determinations play a crucial role in ensuring legal certainty, particularly in land registration processes, where identity verification is essential for validating ownership rights.

Additionally, Saputra (2024) highlights that judges must carefully evaluate documentary evidence, witness testimony, and factual consistency to ensure that identity determination requests are made in good faith. Judicial determinations must balance legal certainty with the protection of civil rights while preventing potential misuse of legal procedures.

Thus, the determination of "one and the same person" serves not only as a legal confirmation but also as an essential mechanism for correcting administrative inconsistencies and ensuring the effective functioning of the legal system.

### **4. Protection of Civil Rights through Judicial Determinations**

The protection of civil rights is one of the primary objectives of population administration. Putri and Ramadhan (2023) argue that population administration ensures legal recognition of civil status and population events, thereby protecting citizens' rights. When identity inconsistencies occur, judicial determinations provide a legal solution to ensure that citizens can exercise their civil rights without administrative barriers.

Judicial determinations also serve as a bridge between legal norms and administrative practice. Wahyuni and Kurniawan (2022) explain that when administrative mechanisms fail to resolve identity inconsistencies, courts act as legal institutions that guarantee legal certainty and protect civil rights. In this context, judicial intervention is necessary to ensure that citizens' legal identities are accurately recognized.

Furthermore, judicial determinations are particularly important in land administration, where identity verification is a fundamental requirement. Without clear identity confirmation, land ownership rights cannot be legally registered or transferred. Therefore, court determinations play a critical role in ensuring legal certainty in property ownership and civil law transactions.

### **5. Research Position within Existing Literature**

Existing literature has extensively discussed population administration, voluntary court proceedings, and legal certainty. Previous studies have emphasized the importance of judicial determinations in ensuring legal recognition and protecting civil rights. However, limited research specifically examines the determination of “one and the same person” as a judicial corrective mechanism within population administration.

Most prior studies focus on procedural aspects of population data correction and voluntary proceedings without critically analyzing the broader implications of judicial determinations for administrative correction and legal certainty. Therefore, this study contributes to the existing body of knowledge by examining the legal considerations of judges and the implications of identity determinations in voluntary cases.

This research provides a normative legal analysis of judicial authority in identity determination cases and highlights the dual function of judicial determinations as both declaratory legal instruments and administrative corrective mechanisms. By doing so, this study contributes to the development of population administration law and enhances understanding of the role of courts in ensuring legal certainty and protecting civil rights.

## **RESEARCH METHOD**

This Research uses a normative legal Research method, which examines law as a norm or rule that applies in a positive legal system. Normative legal Research focuses on the analysis of laws and regulations, legal principles, doctrines, and court decisions as the main source in finding legal arguments (Soekanto & Madmuji, 2017). This method was chosen because the problems studied concern the role of the court as a legal instrument in population administration, which requires a normative analysis of judicial rules and practices.

The approaches used in this study include the statutory, case, and conceptual approaches. The statutory approach involved examining the legal provisions governing population administration, particularly Law No. 23 of 2006 on Population Administration, as amended by Law No. 24 of 2013. This approach aims to understand the normative basis for the court's authority to decide on changes and confirmations of population identity (Fahmi, 2021).

The case approach was used to conduct an in-depth review of the Semarang District Court Decision Number 356/Pdt.P/2025/PN Smg, which served as the main object of the study. Through this approach, the study analyzed the judge's legal considerations, the legal construction of voluntary cases, and the application of population administration norms in judicial practice. The case approach is important for assessing the consistency between legal norms and their implementation in court decisions (Prasetyo, 2020).

Furthermore, a conceptual approach was used to examine relevant legal concepts, including legal certainty, the identity of legal subjects, and the role of court rulings in the population administration system. This approach aimed to construct a theoretical analytical

framework used in assessing the rationality and legal implications of the ruling on "one and the same person" (Wahyuni & Kurniawan, 2022).

The sources of legal materials in this study consist of primary legal materials, secondary legal materials, and tertiary legal materials. Primary legal materials include laws and regulations in the field of population administration, as well as court decisions under study. Secondary legal materials include scientific journals, legal textbooks, and previous Research on population administration, voluntary cases, and legal certainty. Tertiary legal materials are used as supporting materials, such as legal dictionaries and legal encyclopedias (Nugroho & Wibowo, 2021).

The technique of collecting legal materials is carried out through library Research, which involves searching for, inventorying, and classifying relevant legal materials. All legal materials obtained are then analyzed using qualitative methods, namely by interpreting legal norms, examining the relationship between rules and judicial practices, and drawing systematic conclusions based on legal reasoning (Z. Arifin, 2021).

The results of the analysis are presented in a descriptive-analytical manner, describing the legal facts in the court decision and linking them to relevant normative provisions and legal concepts. Through this method, the study aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of the role of the determination of "one and the same person" as a legal solution to identity inconsistencies in population administration.

The conceptual approach in this study was also used to assess the limits of court authority in voluntary cases, particularly in determining "the same person." The analysis focuses on the distinction between the declaratory function of court determinations and their potential shift to serve as an administrative correction mechanism. With this approach, the study not only describes the judges' legal considerations but also evaluates the normative implications of these determination practices for the population administration system and for legal certainty in the fulfillment of land rights.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### 1. Identity Mismatch in Population Administration as a Legal Issue

Population administration aims to create order, certainty, and validity in population data as the basis for fulfilling citizens' civil rights. However, in practice, various problems persist, including inconsistencies in identity information in population documents. This inconsistency can take the form of differences in name spelling, the use of nicknames, the addition of bin or binti elements, or differences in identity across documents issued by different agencies at different times.

The phenomenon of identity mismatch is not merely an administrative issue but has serious legal implications. Differences in identity can lead to uncertainty regarding legal subjects, which ultimately has the potential to hinder the implementation of civil law. In the context of civil law, clarity of identity is an essential requirement for determining the subjects of rights and obligations in a legal relationship (Harahap, 2017).

Several studies show that weak record-keeping systems often lead to discrepancies in population data, low public awareness of the law, and differences in administrative practices across regions (Siregar, 2021). This situation becomes even more problematic when

population data is used as the basis for land rights administration, the determination of heirs, or the recording of other legal events that require certainty of identity.

In this context, population administration cannot be separated from the principle of legal certainty. Legal certainty requires that every individual's legal identity be clearly recognized by the state, so that there is no doubt in the exercise of their rights and obligations. Therefore, when administrative mechanisms are unable to resolve identity inconsistencies, judicial intervention through court rulings is necessary (Wahyuni & Kurniawan, 2022).

## **2. Determination of “One and the Same Person” as a Voluntary Matter**

The determination of “the same person” is part of a voluntary case in civil procedure law. A voluntary case is one filed without any dispute between the parties, but rather to obtain a legal determination or ratification of a particular situation. In this case, the court does not resolve the conflict but provides legal certainty regarding the petition filed (Prasetyo, 2020).

In judicial practice, a request for a “same person” determination is filed when there are differences in identity in official documents referring to the same legal subject. This determination serves to confirm the unity of identity, enabling it to serve as a legal basis for various administrative and civil purposes. Thus, the determination of “one and the same person” does not create a new legal status, but rather confirms the legal situation that already exists in fact.

Previous studies have shown that voluntary cases exhibit flexible evidentiary characteristics, in which judges place greater emphasis on the good faith of the applicant, the consistency of the facts, and the absence of potential abuse of the law (Arifin 2020). This is in line with the function of the court as the guardian of legal certainty and protector of the legal interests of citizens.

In the context of population administration, court rulings in voluntary cases play a strategic role as a judicial corrective mechanism. When population data cannot be corrected through normal administrative procedures, court rulings become the legal basis for civil registration agencies to update data (Hidayat and Prasetyo, 2022).

## **3. Determination of “One and the Same Person” between Declarative Function and Administrative Correction**

In civil procedure law theory, court rulings in voluntary cases are, in principle, declarative in nature, i.e., they merely confirm a legal situation without creating new rights or obligations. The ruling is not intended to resolve disputes, but rather to provide legal certainty regarding the status or legal situation required by the petitioner (Harahap 2017). Therefore, the judge's authority in voluntary cases is conceptually limited to confirming legal status.

However, in the practice of population administration in Indonesia, the determination of “one and the same person” indicates a broader development of function. This determination not only confirms that several identities refer to the same legal subject, but also serves as the main legal basis for population and land administration agencies to correct data. In this context, the courts effectively play a corrective role in response to the ineffectiveness of the population administration system (Fahmi 2021).

The Semarang District Court Decision Number 356/Pdt.P/2025/PN Smg clearly shows this shift. The judge not only considered the conformity of the applicant's identity based on population evidence, but also made the determination of “the same person” a legal prerequisite for the applicant to continue the process of upgrading land rights to a Certificate

of Ownership. Thus, this determination has operational legal consequences, not merely declarative ones.

Normatively, this condition raises questions about the limits of court authority in voluntary cases. When a court ruling is the only way to correct identity discrepancies, the judicial function may encroach on the administrative domain. A number of studies show that this practice is a pragmatic response to the weakness of internal correction mechanisms in the population administration system, particularly regarding old data that is not digitally integrated (Wahyuni and Kurniawan 2022; Siregar 2021).

From an administrative law perspective, ideally, the correction of population data is the authority of the executive branch through effective and accountable administrative mechanisms. However, when these mechanisms fail to provide legal certainty, the courts become the last resort for citizens seeking recognition of their identity. In this context, the determination of “one and the same person” can be understood as a form of judicial protection of citizens' civil rights (Hidayat and Prasetyo 2022).

The legal implications of such determinations become significant when linked to the fulfillment of land rights. The identity of legal subjects is an essential element in land law, as it determines the validity of ownership and registration of rights. Inconsistencies in identity can hinder improvements in land rights status, so court determinations serve as instruments that guarantee legal certainty in land registration (Nugroho and Wibowo 2021).

Thus, the determination of “the same person” in Semarang District Court Decision Number 356/Pdt.P/2025/PN Smg reflects the duality of the voluntary determination function. On the one hand, the determination remains within the declarative framework because it only affirms the unity of the legal subject's identity. On the other hand, the determination functions as an administrative correction mechanism that directly affects the fulfillment of civil rights. This duality indicates the need to strengthen the population administration system so that it does not rely entirely on judicial intervention.

#### **4. Analysis of the Judge's Legal Considerations in Semarang District Court Decision Number 356/Pdt.P/2025/PN Smg**

The Semarang District Court Decision Number 356/Pdt.P/2025/PN Smg shows how judges use a normative and factual approach in assessing requests for the determination of “one and the same person.” In their considerations, judges assess the authority of the court, the legal position of the applicant, and the relevance of the evidence submitted.

The judge based his authority on the provisions of Law No. 23 of 2006 in conjunction with Law No. 24 of 2013 concerning Population Administration, specifically Article 52, which stipulates that changes to names in population administration must be based on a district court decision. This consideration shows that the determination of “the same person” is positioned as part of a legally valid mechanism for changing population data.

In addition, the judge considered documentary evidence and witness testimony indicating that the names SARIMAN, SUHARJO SARIMAN, and SARIMAN BIN AMAT SARI referred to the same person. The consistency of the facts, family relationships, and the administrative nature of the petition formed the basis for the judge's assessment of the

petitioner's good faith. This approach is in line with the view that judges in voluntary cases must ensure that there is no potential for abuse of the law (Saputra, 2024).

Thus, the judge's legal considerations are not only formalistic but also substantive, ensuring that the ruling provides legal benefits and does not conflict with public order, morality, or legislation.

### **5. Implications of the Decision on Legal Certainty and the Fulfillment of Civil Rights**

The determination of "one and the same person" in Semarang District Court Decision Number 356/Pdt.P/2025/PN Smg has significant implications for legal certainty. This determination provides clarity regarding the identity of legal subjects, thereby eliminating doubts regarding the use of population documents as the basis for the exercise of civil rights and obligations.

One important implication is the ease with which land rights can be administered. In many cases, differences in identity in population and land documents are a major obstacle in the land certification process. With the court's determination, this obstacle can be overcome because there is a binding legal basis for the relevant agencies (Nugroho and Wibowo 2021).

In addition, this determination serves as legal protection for the applicant and their family. Identity certainty prevents future disputes and ensures that civil rights can be legally exercised. This aligns with the objective of population administration to provide legal protection and recognition for every population event (Putri & Ramadhan, 2023). From a broader perspective, the determination of "the same person" underscores the court's active role in ensuring the effectiveness of the population administration system. The court not only functions as a dispute resolver but also as an institution that ensures the legal system adapts to social realities.

### **6. Relevance of Findings to Previous Research**

The findings in this study are in line with previous Research results that emphasize the importance of court decisions in ensuring legal certainty in population administration. Wibowo and Nugroho (2021) stated that court rulings serve as a bridge between legal norms and administrative practices, which are often out of sync.

However, this study makes an additional contribution by specifically positioning the designation of "the same person" as a strategic judicial corrective instrument. Unlike previous studies that tended to discuss name changes in general, this study emphasizes the implications of such determination on the fulfillment of civil rights, particularly in the administration of land rights. Thus, this study enriches the body of knowledge on population administration law from the perspective of judicial practice.

## **CONCLUSION**

This study shows that identity inconsistencies in population administration are legal issues that cannot be viewed solely as administrative matters. Differences in identity in official documents have direct implications for the legal certainty of legal subjects and have the potential to hinder the fulfillment of citizens' civil rights. Therefore, a legal mechanism is needed that can provide effective legal certainty and protection. The determination of "the same person" in the Semarang District Court Decision Number 356/Pdt.P/2025/PN Smg demonstrates that the court plays a strategic role as a judicial corrective mechanism within the population administration system. Through voluntary cases, the court not only affirms

the unity of legal subject identity but also provides a legal basis for relevant agencies to update and adjust population data. This determination provides legal certainty while ensuring the smooth fulfillment of civil rights, particularly in the administration of land ownership rights. The legal implications of determining "one and the same person" indicate that the court's function is not limited to resolving disputes but also includes protecting citizens' civil rights by confirming their legal status. Thus, court determinations serve as an important instrument for bridging the disharmony between society's social reality and the prevailing population administration system. Based on these findings, this study recommends that the mechanism of determining "one and the same person" be understood and utilized optimally as a legal solution to identity inconsistencies. In addition, improved coordination between the courts and population administration agencies is needed to prevent similar problems from recurring. Further Research is expected to conduct a comparative study of similar decisions to enrich the understanding of the consistency of judicial practices in ensuring the certainty of population administration law.

## REFERENCES

- Arifin, R. (2020). Perkara Voluntair dan Kewenangan Hakim dalam Penetapan Pengadilan. *Jurnal Yudisial*, 13(1), 1–18.
- Arifin, Z. (2021). Penelitian Hukum Normatif dan Implikasinya dalam Penulisan Karya Ilmiah. *Jurnal Ilmu Hukum Legal Opinion*, 8(2), 45–56.
- Asshiddiqie, J. (2016). *Pengantar Ilmu Hukum Tata Negara*. Rajawali Press.
- District Court of Semarang. 2025. *Decision of the Semarang District Court Number 356/Pdt.P/2025/PN Smg*.
- Fahmi, A. (2021). Peran Pengadilan dalam Perubahan Data Administrasi Kependudukan Pasca Undang-Undang Administrasi Kependudukan. *Jurnal Hukum Dan Peradilan*, 10(3), 389–408.
- Harahap, M. Y. (2017). *Hukum Acara Perdata*. Sinar Grafika.
- Hidayat, A., & Prasetyo, T. (2022). Perlindungan hak sipil melalui penetapan pengadilan dalam perkara voluntair. *Jurnal RechtsVinding*, 11(2), 251–267. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.33331/rechtsvinding.v11i2.923>
- Indonesia. 2006. *Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 23 of 2006 on Population Administration*.
- Indonesia. 2013. *Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 24 of 2013 concerning the Amendment to Law Number 23 of 2006 on Population Administration*.
- Isbahi, M. B., Zuana, M. M. M., & Toha, M. (2024). The Multi-Social Relation of the Cattle Industry in the Plaosan Subdistrict Animal Market of Magetan Regency. *Malacca: Journal of Management and Business Development*, 1(1), 31–46. <https://doi.org/10.69965/malacca.v1i1.51>
- Nugroho, S. A., & Wibowo, B. A. (2021). Kepastian Hukum Identitas Subjek Hukum dalam Pendaftaran Tanah. *Jurnal Arena Hukum*, 14(1), 85–104. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.21776/ub.arenahukum.2021.01401.5>
- Prasetyo, T. (2020). Hakim dan Penetapan Voluntair dalam Perspektif Hukum Acara Perdata. *Jurnal Yudisial*, 13(1), 1–18. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.29123/jy.v13i1.347>

- Putri, D. A., & Ramadhan, F. (2023). Perlindungan Hukum dalam Administrasi Kependudukan sebagai Pemenuhan Hak Sipil Warga Negara. *Jurnal Hukum IUS QUIA IUSTUM*, 30(2), 312–330.
- Saputra, R. (2024). Pertimbangan Hakim dalam Perkara Voluntair: Antara Kepastian Hukum dan Perlindungan Hak Sipil. *Jurnal Hukum Dan Pembangunan*, 54(1), 45–62.
- Siregar, R. A. (2021). Problematika Ketidakselarasan Identitas dalam Sistem Administrasi Kependudukan Indonesia. *Jurnal Administrasi Publik*, 18(2), 173–189.
- Soekanto, S., & Madmuji, S. (2017). *Penelitian Hukum Normatif: Suatu Tinjauan Singkat*. Rajawali Press.
- Wahyuni, S., & Kurniawan, R. (2022). Integrasi Data Kependudukan dan Tantangan Perlindungan Hak Sipil Warga Negara. *Jurnal Ilmu Hukum*, 18(2), 45–63.