

A Juridical Analysis of Mediation in the Resolution of Land Disputes Based on Regulation of the Minister of Agrarian Affairs and Spatial Planning/National Land Agency (ATR/BPN) Number 21 of 2020

Muhammad Farid Hariyanto¹, Muhammad Islahuddin²

¹²Program Studi Hukum, Fakultas Sosial dan Humaniora, Universitas Nurul Jadid, Indonesi

* Correspondence e-mail: faredeboll@gmail.com

Article history

Submitted: 2026/06/01; Revised: 2026/07/11; Accepted: 2026/08/09

Abstract

Land disputes remain a recurring legal issue in Indonesia and require effective resolution mechanisms that promote peaceful settlement while ensuring legal certainty for the parties involved. One available mechanism is mediation, as regulated under Regulation of the Minister of Agrarian Affairs and Spatial Planning/Head of the National Land Agency (ATR/BPN) Number 21 of 2020 concerning the Handling and Resolution of Land Cases. This study aims to analyze the legal framework governing mediation in land dispute resolution under the regulation and to assess the extent to which it provides legal certainty for disputing parties. This research employs a normative juridical method using a statutory and conceptual approach. Primary, secondary, and tertiary legal materials were collected through library research and analyzed qualitatively using a deductive approach. The findings indicate that Regulation Number 21 of 2020 clearly regulates the position of mediation, the parties involved, the mediator, mediation procedures, and the legal consequences of mediation outcomes. The regulation also reflects key principles of Alternative Dispute Resolution, including voluntariness, deliberation, party participation, mediator neutrality, and consensus-based settlement. Therefore, the regulation provides a clear legal framework that supports legal certainty and encourages effective and peaceful resolution of land disputes.

Keywords

Legal Certainty; Mediation; Regulation of the Minister of ATR/BPN Number 21 of 2020; Land Disputes



© 2026 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY SA) license, <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>.

INTRODUCTION

Land is one of the most strategic natural resources in Indonesia and plays a fundamental role in the social and economic life of society. It functions not only as a space for settlement but also as an essential factor of production in agriculture, trade, industry, and infrastructure development (Temaluru & Lay, 2023). Population growth, economic expansion, and the continuous development of infrastructure have significantly increased the demand for land. This situation has made legal relations

concerning land increasingly complex because the interests of individuals, legal entities, communities, and government institutions frequently intersect or overlap (Ihsani & Putra, 2024; Prihatin, 2015). The complexity of these relations requires a comprehensive legal framework capable of regulating the control, ownership, use, and utilization of land in accordance with Article 33 paragraph (3) of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia and Law Number 5 of 1960 concerning Basic Agrarian Principles.

Despite the existence of a comprehensive regulatory framework, land disputes remain a recurring legal problem in Indonesia. Article 1 number 2 of Regulation of the Minister of Agrarian Affairs and Spatial Planning/Head of the National Land Agency (ATR/BPN) Number 21 of 2020 concerning the Handling and Resolution of Land Cases defines a land dispute as a disagreement between individuals, legal entities, or institutions that does not have a broad impact. The persistence of such disputes demonstrates that the availability of legal regulations does not automatically eliminate conflicts arising from competing claims, ownership status, land boundaries, land utilization, or administrative decisions. Data from the Ministry of ATR/BPN indicate that 5,973 land cases were recorded throughout 2024, consisting of 1,664 disputes, 60 conflicts, and 4,249 cases, while 2,161 cases were successfully resolved (Kementerian ATR/BPN, 2024). These figures demonstrate the continuing need for effective and legally reliable mechanisms for resolving land disputes, particularly to prevent prolonged uncertainty and escalation of conflicts (Boboy et al., 2020; Jayadi, 2023).

In general, disputes may be resolved through litigation or non-litigation mechanisms. Litigation places dispute resolution within the authority of the courts and generally results in a binding adjudicative decision. Non-litigation mechanisms, by contrast, provide greater opportunities for the parties to participate directly in determining the resolution of their dispute. Mediation is one of the principal forms of non-litigation dispute resolution recognized within Indonesia's legal system. It involves a neutral third party, namely a mediator, who assists the disputing parties in identifying their interests, communicating their positions, and reaching a mutually acceptable agreement without imposing a decision upon them (Puspitaningrum, 2018; Putri et al., 2026). As part of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR), mediation is based on several fundamental principles, including voluntariness, deliberation, active participation of the parties, mediator neutrality, and settlement through mutual agreement (Kusen, 2016; Setiady & Maulina, 2024). These characteristics distinguish mediation from adjudicative dispute resolution and make it particularly

relevant to land disputes, which often involve complex legal, social, economic, and administrative interests.

Within the institutional framework of land administration, Regulation of the Minister of Agrarian Affairs and Spatial Planning/Head of the National Land Agency Number 21 of 2020 constitutes an important legal basis for the handling and resolution of land cases. The regulation establishes provisions concerning the identification and classification of land cases, the parties involved, mediation mechanisms, the role and requirements of mediators, procedures for conducting mediation, and the outcomes of mediation. The existence of these provisions is significant because mediation requires not only procedural flexibility but also sufficient legal certainty to ensure that the process is conducted fairly and that its outcomes can be relied upon by the parties. Legal certainty is particularly important in land disputes because the object of the dispute is directly connected with property rights, economic interests, and social relations. Unclear procedures or uncertain legal consequences may reduce the effectiveness of mediation and potentially generate new disputes even after an agreement has been reached.

Previous studies concerning mediation in land dispute resolution have predominantly focused on empirical dimensions, including the implementation, effectiveness, and obstacles encountered in mediation at particular land offices (Fathoni, 2023; Wahdi, 2024; Pratami, 2018; Attamimi & Yanto, 2025; Adriani et al., 2024). Although these studies provide valuable insights into the practical implementation of mediation, relatively limited attention has been devoted to examining the normative substance of mediation provisions under Regulation Number 21 of 2020, particularly from the perspective of legal certainty. This constitutes an important research gap because the effectiveness of mediation cannot be separated from the adequacy, clarity, and consistency of the legal norms governing its implementation and consequences.

Based on this gap, this study examines mediation in land dispute resolution from a normative juridical perspective. The study specifically addresses two questions: (1) how is mediation regulated in the resolution of land disputes under Regulation of the Minister of ATR/BPN Number 21 of 2020; and (2) to what extent does the regulation provide legal certainty for the parties involved in land disputes? This study is expected to contribute theoretically to the development of agrarian and dispute resolution law, particularly regarding the relationship between mediation and legal certainty. Practically, the findings may provide constructive input for the Ministry of ATR/BPN in strengthening the regulatory framework and

implementation of mediation so that land disputes can be resolved more effectively, fairly, peacefully, and with greater legal certainty for the parties concerned.

METHODS

This study employs a normative juridical research method, which examines law primarily as a normative system through an analysis of legal rules, principles, concepts, and doctrines relevant to the legal issues under investigation (Marzuki, 2017). The normative juridical approach is considered appropriate because the main focus of this study is not the empirical implementation of mediation but the examination of the legal framework governing mediation in the resolution of land disputes. The principal object of analysis is Regulation of the Minister of Agrarian Affairs and Spatial Planning/Head of the National Land Agency (ATR/BPN) Number 21 of 2020 concerning the Handling and Resolution of Land Cases, particularly the provisions regulating mediation as a mechanism for resolving land disputes.

Two complementary approaches are employed in this research: the statutory approach and the conceptual approach. The statutory approach is used to examine and interpret various laws and regulations governing agrarian affairs, land administration, dispute resolution, and mediation. Through this approach, the study identifies the legal basis, scope, procedures, and legal consequences of mediation under the applicable regulatory framework. The conceptual approach is used to examine fundamental legal concepts relevant to the research, particularly mediation, Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR), and legal certainty. This approach enables the analysis to be connected with relevant legal theories, doctrines, and scholarly opinions concerning the function and principles of mediation and the requirements for achieving legal certainty.

The legal materials analyzed in this study consist of primary, secondary, and tertiary legal materials. Primary legal materials include the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, Law Number 5 of 1960 concerning Basic Agrarian Principles, Law Number 30 of 1999 concerning Arbitration and Alternative Dispute Resolution, and Regulation of the Minister of ATR/BPN Number 21 of 2020 concerning the Handling and Resolution of Land Cases. These instruments constitute the principal normative sources for examining the legal basis and regulatory framework of mediation in land dispute resolution. Secondary legal materials consist of legal textbooks, scholarly journals, theses, dissertations, and other academic publications discussing land law, mediation, ADR, dispute resolution, and legal certainty. Tertiary legal materials include legal dictionaries, the *Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia*,

legal encyclopedias, and other reference materials used to clarify legal terminology and concepts.

Legal materials were collected through library research. The collection process involved identifying, selecting, reviewing, and classifying relevant legal materials according to their respective categories and their relevance to the research questions. Particular attention was given to provisions directly regulating mediation, the roles and responsibilities of the parties and mediators, the procedures for conducting mediation, and the legal status and consequences of mediation outcomes.

The collected legal materials were analyzed qualitatively using deductive legal reasoning. The analysis proceeded from general legal norms and theoretical principles toward specific issues concerning mediation in land dispute resolution. The regulatory framework was examined through the perspective of Alternative Dispute Resolution theory, particularly the principles of voluntariness, deliberation, party participation, consensus, and mediator neutrality. Furthermore, Jan Michiel Otto's theory of legal certainty was employed to assess whether the existing regulatory framework provides sufficient clarity, consistency, predictability, and enforceability for the parties involved. The findings are presented through a descriptive-argumentative analysis that systematically connects statutory provisions, legal concepts, and theoretical perspectives to answer the research questions and formulate conclusions regarding the adequacy of mediation regulation under Regulation Number 21 of 2020.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Mediation Regulation in Land Dispute Resolution Based on Regulation of the Minister of ATR/BPN Number 21 of 2020

The analysis demonstrates that mediation occupies an important position within the legal framework for handling and resolving land cases in Indonesia. Regulation of the Minister of Agrarian Affairs and Spatial Planning/Head of the National Land Agency (ATR/BPN) Number 21 of 2020 places mediation as one of the available mechanisms for resolving land cases and provides a normative framework concerning the parties, mediator, mediation procedures, and outcomes. This regulatory construction demonstrates an attempt to provide a structured non-litigation mechanism that can accommodate the interests of disputing parties while maintaining the authority of land administration institutions. From the perspective of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR), such an arrangement is relevant because mediation is fundamentally designed to facilitate communication and negotiation

rather than impose an adjudicative decision upon the parties (Achmad, 2024; Krisna & Harahap, 2026).

Article 43 of Regulation Number 21 of 2020 expressly provides that the resolution of land cases may be pursued through mediation. Mediation may be initiated by the Ministry of ATR/BPN, the Regional Office of the National Land Agency, or the Land Office, as well as upon the request of the disputing parties. This provision is significant because it recognizes mediation as an institutionalized mechanism within the land administration system rather than merely an informal settlement practice. At the same time, the regulation provides flexibility regarding who may initiate the process, allowing both the competent land administration authorities and the disputing parties to trigger mediation. Such flexibility is consistent with the ADR principle that disputes should be given an opportunity to be resolved through consensual mechanisms before the parties proceed to more adversarial forms of dispute resolution.

The position of the disputing parties is further regulated in Article 44 paragraphs (1) to (4). The provision requires the parties or principals to attend the mediation directly. Representation may be permitted through an authorized representative who has the authority to make decisions where legitimate reasons prevent the principal from attending. The regulation also provides that mediation may be declared unsuccessful when the parties have been properly invited on three occasions but fail to attend. In addition, experts and/or relevant institutions may be involved with the consent of the parties. These provisions demonstrate that the parties remain the central actors in the mediation process. The mediator does not replace the parties in determining the resolution; rather, the mediator facilitates the process through which the parties formulate and agree upon their own settlement. This arrangement reflects the principle of party participation, which constitutes one of the essential characteristics of ADR.

The regulatory position of the mediator is also consistent with the facilitative nature of mediation. Article 1 number 11 defines mediation as a negotiation process aimed at achieving an agreement facilitated by the Ministry of ATR/BPN, Regional Offices, Land Offices, and/or land mediators. The mediator may facilitate the presence of experts and relevant institutions and participates in documenting the mediation process through the signing of the mediation minutes together with the authorized official or the Settlement Team Chair. The mediator's authority is therefore primarily facilitative and administrative rather than adjudicative. The mediator does not possess the authority to determine which party is legally correct or

to impose a settlement. This is consistent with Moore's (2014) view that the mediator's central function is to facilitate communication, identify disputed issues, and assist parties in exploring possible solutions without imposing a particular outcome. Rahmadi (2019) similarly emphasizes that the final decision in mediation remains with the disputing parties. Accordingly, the provisions governing the mediator under Regulation Number 21 of 2020 reflect the principles of neutrality, voluntariness, and party autonomy that characterize ADR.

The mediation mechanism established by Regulation Number 21 of 2020 is also structured through identifiable procedural stages. The process begins either through institutional initiative or a request from the disputing parties, followed by the proper summoning of the parties and the implementation of negotiations. During the process, the mediator may involve experts or relevant institutions when their participation is considered necessary and has been approved by the parties. The results are subsequently documented in official mediation minutes. The existence of these procedural stages is important from the perspective of legal certainty because mediation requires sufficient procedural clarity to ensure that parties understand their rights, responsibilities, and the consequences of participating in the process. At the same time, the relatively flexible nature of mediation is maintained because the regulation does not transform the mediator into an adjudicator. The procedure therefore combines institutional formality with the consensual character of ADR.

The legal consequences of mediation outcomes constitute another important aspect of the regulation. Article 44 paragraphs (8) to (10) distinguishes between mediation that results in an agreement and mediation that fails to produce an agreement. Where the parties reach an agreement, the settlement is recorded in a peace agreement or deed of settlement and may be registered with the District Court to obtain a judgment of peace. Where the agreement concerns administrative land matters, its implementation is submitted to the Ministry, Regional Office, or Land Office according to the respective authority. This arrangement demonstrates that the regulation does not treat a mediated agreement merely as a private understanding between the parties. Instead, it provides a pathway for the agreement to obtain further legal and administrative recognition. Such a mechanism strengthens the practical value of mediation because an agreement can be connected to the formal land administration system and, where appropriate, reinforced through judicial recognition.

Conversely, where mediation fails to produce an agreement, the competent land administration authority proceeds with the resolution of the land case in

accordance with its authority, while the mediation process remains documented in the official minutes. This distinction is important because it prevents mediation from becoming an obstacle to the continued handling of unresolved land cases. Mediation functions as an opportunity for consensual settlement, not as an exclusive mechanism that eliminates other forms of legal resolution. The regulatory framework therefore provides a clear transition between consensual settlement and subsequent institutional resolution when consensus cannot be achieved.

Viewed through ADR theory, the overall construction of Regulation Number 21 of 2020 reflects several fundamental principles. First, voluntariness is reflected in the opportunity provided to parties to pursue settlement through mediation rather than immediately relying upon an adversarial mechanism. Second, party autonomy is demonstrated by the requirement that the substantive settlement ultimately depends upon the agreement of the parties. Third, participation is strengthened through the requirement that the principals attend the mediation and through the possibility of involving experts or relevant institutions with the parties' approval. Fourth, mediator neutrality is reflected in the mediator's facilitative rather than adjudicative authority. Fifth, consensus is placed at the center of the process because the successful outcome of mediation depends upon the parties reaching an agreement.

Nevertheless, the normative construction of mediation should not be understood as guaranteeing settlement in every land dispute. Land disputes frequently involve complex questions concerning ownership, certificates, boundaries, administrative decisions, overlapping claims, and historical land rights. Consequently, the effectiveness of mediation remains dependent upon the willingness of the parties to negotiate, the quality and neutrality of the mediator, the clarity of the disputed legal and factual issues, and the institutional capacity of the relevant land office. The regulation provides the legal framework for these processes, but its practical effectiveness may still vary depending on the circumstances of individual disputes.

From the perspective of legal certainty, Regulation Number 21 of 2020 provides relatively clear norms concerning who may initiate mediation, who must participate, the role of the mediator, the circumstances under which mediation may be declared unsuccessful, the documentation of the process, and the consequences of successful or unsuccessful mediation. These elements are important when examined through Jan Michiel Otto's concept of legal certainty, which emphasizes the existence of clear rules, consistency in their application, accessibility to the parties, and the ability of individuals to reasonably anticipate the legal consequences of their actions. The

regulation provides a normative basis that allows disputing parties to understand the general procedural framework and the possible consequences of mediation.

However, legal certainty should also be assessed in terms of the enforceability of mediated outcomes. The provision allowing a successful settlement to be registered with the District Court for recognition as a judgment of peace strengthens the legal position of the agreement. Similarly, the provision concerning the implementation of agreements involving land administration provides a procedural pathway for translating the settlement into administrative action. These mechanisms reduce the risk that an agreement will remain merely declarative and demonstrate that the regulation attempts to connect consensual dispute resolution with formal legal and administrative consequences.

Overall, the findings indicate that Regulation Number 21 of 2020 has established a relatively comprehensive normative framework for mediation in land dispute resolution. The regulation accommodates the essential principles of ADR while simultaneously providing procedural structure and legal consequences for the outcomes of mediation. Its strength lies in balancing consensual dispute resolution and institutional legal authority: the parties retain autonomy to determine the substance of settlement, while the Ministry of ATR/BPN and its regional offices retain authority to facilitate and follow up on the legal and administrative consequences. Therefore, mediation under Regulation Number 21 of 2020 can be understood not merely as an alternative to litigation but as an institutionalized mechanism that seeks to achieve peaceful settlement while supporting legal certainty in land dispute resolution.

Legal Certainty in the Regulation of Mediation for Land Dispute Resolution

Legal certainty constitutes one of the fundamental objectives of legal regulation because legal rules must provide clear standards concerning the rights and obligations of legal subjects, procedures for exercising those rights and obligations, and the legal consequences arising from particular actions. In the context of land dispute resolution, legal certainty becomes particularly important because land disputes frequently involve property rights, administrative decisions, economic interests, and social relationships. Unclear regulations may therefore not only complicate the settlement process but also create new uncertainty after a dispute has ostensibly been resolved. From this perspective, the regulation of mediation under Regulation of the Minister of Agrarian Affairs and Spatial Planning/Head of the National Land Agency (ATR/BPN) Number 21 of 2020 can be examined through Jan Michiel Otto's theory of legal certainty, which emphasizes clarity of rules,

consistency of application, accessibility, and the ability of legal subjects to reasonably anticipate the consequences of legal actions (Otto, 2003; Otto et al., 2012).

The first indicator of legal certainty is the clarity of legal norms. Regulation Number 21 of 2020 establishes a relatively systematic framework for mediation, beginning with the recognition of mediation as a mechanism for resolving land cases, followed by provisions concerning the parties, mediators, mediation procedures, documentation, outcomes, and subsequent actions. The systematic arrangement of these provisions provides a normative sequence that can be used by both disputing parties and land administration officials in conducting mediation. Such clarity is important because legal certainty cannot be achieved merely through the existence of written regulations; the substance of the rules must also be sufficiently understandable to enable legal subjects to determine what is permitted, required, or prohibited (Putri & Arifin, 2018; Rahim et al., 2023).

The clarity of the regulation is also reflected in the position and participation of the disputing parties. The regulation requires the parties or principals to participate directly in mediation, while allowing authorized representatives under certain circumstances. The parties are given an opportunity to express their interests, negotiate, and determine the substance of a settlement. At the same time, their attendance and participation constitute an important element of the mediation process. This arrangement creates a clearer distribution of roles between the parties and the mediator. The parties retain authority over the substantive settlement, whereas the mediator facilitates the communication and negotiation process. Such a distinction reduces the possibility of misunderstanding concerning the authority of the mediator and the autonomy of the parties.

From Otto's perspective, legal certainty requires more than the formal existence of legal provisions. Individuals must be able to understand their legal position and anticipate how the relevant authorities will act in a particular situation (Otto, 2003). The provisions of Regulation Number 21 of 2020 concerning the parties, mediator, and mediation procedure contribute to this requirement because they establish a relatively identifiable framework for the conduct of mediation. Similarly, the existence of provisions concerning the circumstances under which mediation may be declared unsuccessful provides a clear procedural consequence when the parties fail to participate or cannot reach an agreement. Consequently, the regulation reduces the possibility that the continuation of a land case will depend entirely upon the discretion of individual officials.

The second indicator is procedural certainty. Legal certainty requires procedures that are sufficiently clear to guide both citizens and government officials in carrying out legal processes. Regulation Number 21 of 2020 provides a sequence for mediation that includes the initiation of the process, summoning of the parties, participation in negotiations, facilitation by the mediator, involvement of experts or relevant institutions where necessary, documentation of the process, and determination of the mediation outcome. This procedural structure provides a predictable framework for the parties and limits uncertainty concerning what will occur during the mediation process.

Procedural certainty is particularly important in land disputes because the parties often face unequal access to legal information and administrative procedures. A clear mediation procedure can reduce informational uncertainty by establishing the stages through which a dispute must pass. It also provides an administrative reference for officials of the Ministry of ATR/BPN, Regional Offices, and Land Offices when facilitating the resolution of cases. In this respect, the regulation performs not only a dispute-resolution function but also an administrative governance function by establishing procedural standards for the handling of land disputes.

The third indicator concerns certainty regarding the outcome and its legal consequences. Regulation Number 21 of 2020 distinguishes between mediation that produces an agreement and mediation that does not produce an agreement. Where the parties reach an agreement, the settlement is documented through a Peace Agreement/Deed of Settlement and may be registered with the District Court to obtain a judgment of peace. Where the agreement concerns matters within land administration, its implementation may be submitted to the Ministry, Regional Office, or Land Office according to their respective authorities. These provisions are important because they establish a legal pathway through which the substantive agreement reached by the parties can obtain formal recognition and be followed by the necessary administrative action.

The regulation also provides consequences where mediation fails to produce an agreement. The mediation process remains documented in an official mediation report, while the competent land administration institution may continue the resolution of the land case in accordance with its authority. This arrangement provides certainty because failure to reach an agreement does not leave the parties in a legal vacuum. There remains a defined institutional mechanism for further handling of the dispute. Thus, the regulation recognizes both possible outcomes of mediation and establishes corresponding procedural consequences.

The distinction between successful and unsuccessful mediation is consistent with Otto's understanding that legal certainty requires rules capable of providing reasonable predictability regarding institutional action and legal consequences (Otto et al., 2012). Parties entering mediation should be able to anticipate not only the process itself but also what will happen if an agreement is reached or if negotiations fail. Regulation Number 21 of 2020 provides such a framework by connecting the outcome of mediation with subsequent judicial or administrative mechanisms. This connection strengthens the normative position of mediation within the broader Indonesian land dispute resolution system.

Nevertheless, legal certainty should not be interpreted solely as the existence of detailed procedural provisions. The actual realization of legal certainty also depends upon consistent implementation by the authorities responsible for administering the regulation. Otto's theory emphasizes that certainty in law involves the practical capacity of institutions to apply legal rules consistently and reliably, rather than merely having formally valid rules (Otto, 2003). Therefore, although Regulation Number 21 of 2020 provides a relatively clear normative framework, differences in institutional practice, mediator competence, interpretation of provisions, or administrative follow-up may affect the degree of certainty experienced by the parties.

From this perspective, the regulation can be considered to satisfy the principal normative elements of legal certainty. It establishes relatively clear rules concerning the parties and mediator, provides identifiable mediation procedures, regulates documentation of the process, and determines the legal and administrative consequences of both successful and unsuccessful mediation. These elements allow disputing parties to understand their position and anticipate the general course and consequences of the mediation process. The regulation therefore provides a substantial normative foundation for legal certainty in land dispute resolution.

The analysis ultimately shows that mediation under Regulation Number 21 of 2020 is not merely an alternative mechanism for achieving peaceful settlement but also an instrument for strengthening predictability within land dispute resolution. Its regulatory structure combines the consensual character of mediation with formal administrative procedures and potential judicial recognition of settlement agreements. Accordingly, from the perspective of Jan Michiel Otto's theory, the regulation has fulfilled the principal normative requirements of legal certainty, particularly in terms of clarity of norms, procedural predictability, and certainty regarding the consequences of mediation outcomes. Further strengthening, however,

remains necessary at the implementation level to ensure that the certainty provided by the regulation is consistently realized in practice.

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings and discussion, two main conclusions can be drawn. First, the regulation of mediation in land dispute resolution under Regulation of the Minister of Agrarian Affairs and Spatial Planning/Head of the National Land Agency (ATR/BPN) Number 21 of 2020 provides a relatively clear legal framework concerning the position of mediation, the disputing parties, the mediator, the mediation procedure, and the outcomes of mediation. Viewed through the perspective of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) theory, the regulatory framework reflects the fundamental principles of mediation, particularly deliberation, voluntariness, party autonomy and participation, mediator neutrality, and settlement based on mutual agreement. Mediation is therefore positioned as a consensual mechanism that enables the parties to resolve their dispute without relying exclusively on adversarial litigation.

Second, Regulation Number 21 of 2020 provides a normative foundation for legal certainty in the resolution of land disputes through mediation. The regulation establishes relatively clear provisions concerning the rights and responsibilities of the parties, the stages and procedures of mediation, the role of the mediator, and the legal and administrative consequences of mediation outcomes. Based on Jan Michiel Otto's theory of legal certainty, these provisions contribute to clarity, procedural predictability, and reasonable certainty regarding the consequences of the parties' actions. Nevertheless, the realization of legal certainty ultimately depends not only on the clarity of the regulation but also on its consistent implementation by the competent land administration authorities. Overall, Regulation Number 21 of 2020 provides a substantial legal basis for peaceful, structured, and legally certain resolution of land disputes through mediation.

REFERENCES

- Achmad, W. (2024). Konflik sengketa lahan dan strategi penyelesaian di Indonesia. *Jurnal Kolaborasi Resolusi Konflik*, 6(1), 8–18.
- Adriani, S., Nur, F., Putri, A., & Indri, D. R. (2024). Mediasi di Kantor Pertanahan Kota Batu. *Reform Jurnal*, 4(3), 289–299.
- Attamimi, Z. F., & Yanto, Y. D. (2025). Efektivitas mediasi dalam penyelesaian sengketa di Kantor Agraria dan Tata Ruang/Badan Pertanahan Nasional Kabupaten Banyumas. *Jurnal Hukum dan Kebijakan Publik*, 8(2), 1–18.
- Boboy, J. T., Santoso, B., & Irawati, I. (2020). Penyelesaian sengketa pertanahan melalui mediasi berdasarkan Teori Dean G. Pruitt dan Jeffrey Z. Rubin.

- Notaris, 13(2), 803–818.
- Devi, N. K. C. N., & Mahadewi, K. J. (2022). Skema penyelesaian melalui proses mediasi berdasarkan Perma No. 1 Tahun 2016. *Jurnal Kewarganegaraan*, 6(2), 5213–5220.
- Fathoni, A. R. (2023). Penyelesaian sengketa pertanahan melalui mediasi di Kantor Pertanahan Kota Jambi [Skripsi, Universitas Jambi].
- Ihsani, F. A. N., & Putra, G. P. (2024). Praktik mediasi sebagai alternatif penyelesaian penetapan batas di Kantor Pertanahan Kota Kediri. *Birokrasi: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum dan Tata Negara*, 2(4), 252–262.
- Jayadi, H. (2023). Penyelesaian sengketa tanah berdasarkan hukum positif tentang penyelesaian sengketa di Indonesia. *Jurnal Comunità Servizio*, 5(1), 1050–1069.
- Kementerian Agraria dan Tata Ruang/Badan Pertanahan Nasional. (2024). Kementerian ATR/BPN ungkap tangani 2.161 kasus tanah sepanjang 2024. <https://kab-kuningan.atrbpn.go.id/berita/kementerian-atrbpn-ungkap-tangani-2161-kasus-tanah-sepanjang-2024>
- Krisna, C. A., & Harahap, M. A. (2026). Peran mediator dalam meningkatkan keberhasilan penyelesaian sengketa melalui mediasi. *Al-Ikhtiar: Jurnal Studi Islam*, 3(3), 651–664.
- Kusen, S. A. (2016). Hakekat keberadaan mediasi sebagai alternatif penyelesaian sengketa perdata di pengadilan negeri. *Lex Crimen*, 5(6), 145–316.
- Lazuardi, L., Widyanti, A. N., & Syakura, F. P. (2024). Kepastian hukum jual beli dan pendaftaran tanah yang dilakukan tanpa akta Pejabat Pembuat Akta Tanah (PPAT). *Sinergi: Jurnal Riset Ilmiah*, 1(12), 1346–1355.
- Marzuki, P. M. (2017). *Penelitian hukum* (Rev. ed.). Kencana.
- Moore, C. W. (2014). *The mediation process: Practical strategies for resolving conflict* (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- Otto, J. M. (2003). *Kepastian hukum di negara berkembang*. Komisi Hukum Nasional Republik Indonesia.
- Otto, J. M., Bedner, A. W., Irianto, S., & Wirastris, T. D. (2012). *Kepastian hukum yang nyata di negara berkembang*. *Kajian Sosio-Legal*, 115–156.
- Peraturan Menteri Agraria dan Tata Ruang/Kepala Badan Pertanahan Nasional Nomor 21 Tahun 2020 tentang Penanganan dan Penyelesaian Kasus Pertanahan. (2020). <https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/details/210603/permen-agrariakepala-bpn-no-21-tahun-2020>
- Pratami, B. D. (2018). Penyelesaian sengketa pertanahan melalui mediasi (Studi di Kantor Pertanahan Wilayah Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta) [Tesis magister,

Universitas Islam Indonesia].

- Prihatin, R. B. (2015). Alih fungsi lahan di perkotaan (Studi kasus di Kota Bandung dan Yogyakarta). *Jurnal Aspirasi*, 6(2), 105–118.
- Puspitaningrum, S. (2018). Mediasi sebagai upaya penyelesaian sengketa perdata di pengadilan. *Spektrum Hukum*, 15(2), 275–299.
- Putri, J. T., Makkah, H. M., Mustika, D. A., & Siswanto, M. (2026). Mediasi sebagai instrumen penyelesaian sengketa perdata yang efektif dan berkeadilan. *Jurnal Kolaboratif Sains*, 9(2), 2243–2251.
- Putri, K. D. A., & Arifin, R. (2018). Tinjauan teoritis keadilan dan kepastian dalam hukum di Indonesia. *Mimbar Yustitia: Jurnal Hukum dan Hak Asasi Manusia*, 2(2), 142–158.
- Radbruch, G. (1950). *Legal philosophy* (K. Wilk, Trans.). Harvard University Press.
- Rahim, A., Aulia, S., Susanti, S., Arifin, M., & Riyadi, S. (2023). Relevansi asas kepastian hukum dalam sistem penyelenggaraan administrasi negara Indonesia. *JIIP-Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Pendidikan*, 6(8), 5806–5811.
- Rahmadi, T. (2019). *Mediasi: Penyelesaian sengketa melalui pendekatan mufakat* (2nd ed.). Rajawali Pers.
- Setiady, T., & Maulina, Y. P. (2024). Kekuatan mengikat hukum mediasi sebagai upaya penyelesaian sengketa waris ditinjau berdasarkan Undang-Undang No. 30 Tahun 1999 tentang Arbitrase dan ADR. *Jurnal Darma Agung*, 32(4), 423–434.
- Temaluru, H. M., & Lay, B. P. (2023). Peran hukum kepemilikan dan penguasaan hak atas tanah dalam penyelesaian sengketa tanah di Desa Boneana. *Jurnal Ilmiah dan Karya Mahasiswa*, 1(3), 292–307.
- Undang-Undang Dasar Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 1945.
- Undang-Undang Nomor 5 Tahun 1960 tentang Peraturan Dasar Pokok-Pokok Agraria. (1960). <https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/Details/51310/uu-no-5-tahun-1960>
- Undang-Undang Nomor 30 Tahun 1999 tentang Arbitrase dan Alternatif Penyelesaian Sengketa. (1999). <https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/Details/45348/uu-no-30-tahun-1999>
- Verawati, N., Warman, K., & Andora, H. (2026). Pendaftaran tanah pertama kali berdasarkan putusan pengadilan pada Kantor Pertanahan Solok. *Jurnal Niara*, 19(1), 231–239.
- Wahdi. (2024). Peran Agraria dan Tata Ruang/Badan Pertanahan Nasional (ATR/BPN) dalam menangani sengketa pertanahan di Kota Palopo [Skripsi, IAIN Palopo].