

The Validity of Notarial Authentic Deeds Prepared Through Service Bureaus in the Perspective of the Notary Code of Ethics

Marlyn Christ Nathasia Br Sumbayak¹⁾ & Rasji²⁾

¹⁾Faculty of Law, Universitas Tarumanagara, Indonesia, E-mail: marlyn.217241027@stu.untar.ac.id

²⁾Faculty of Law, Universitas Tarumanagara, Indonesia, E-mail: rasji@fh.untar.ac.id

Abstract. *This study aims to analyze the validity of notarial authentic deeds prepared through cooperation with service bureaus and to examine violations of the Notary Code of Ethics within such practices. This collaborative phenomenon raises legal and ethical issues, as it potentially disregards the formal requirements for deed formation as stipulated in Article 15 and Article 16 paragraph (1)(m) of Law No. 2 of 2014 concerning the Office of the Notary (UUJN), as well as Article 1868 of the Indonesian Civil Code. This research employs a normative juridical method with statutory, conceptual, and case approaches, and examines practices in the Central Jakarta area as an illustration of the application of these norms. The findings indicate that deeds drafted through service bureaus lose their authenticity and possess only the evidentiary value of private deeds. From an ethical perspective, such cooperation violates Article 4(g) of the Notary Code of Ethics, which prohibits the use of intermediaries to obtain clients.*

Keywords: *Authentic; Code; Ethics; Notary; Validity.*

1. Introduction

Authentic deeds hold a highly significant position in Indonesia's civil law system because they function as the highest evidentiary instrument affirming the validity of an act or agreement made by or before an authorized public official. This provision establishes that for a deed to qualify as an authentic deed, it must cumulatively satisfy several requirements: it must be drawn up by or before a competent public official, follow the form prescribed by law, and be executed within the territorial jurisdiction of that official (Aida Musyarrifah Hasri Putri, 2025). Failure to meet even one of these requirements may result in the deed being downgraded to a private deed, which consequently possesses significantly weaker evidentiary value (Ismu et al., 2025). Furthermore, the duties and authority of public officials empowered to produce authentic deeds within the context of notarial practice are regulated in Law No. 2 of 2014 amending Law No. 30 of 2004 on the Office of the Notary (UUJN). Article 15(1) stipulates that a notary is a public official authorized to draw up authentic deeds regarding all acts, agreements, and determinations required by legislation and/or desired by the parties to be stated in authentic form. Thus, the presence of the notary as the authorized official is not

merely a formality but an essential requirement for a deed to obtain authentic status and possess perfect evidentiary force.

As a public official responsible for issuing authentic deeds, the notary is also required to comply with certain formal and material conditions. In the UUJN, for instance, Article 16(1)(m) provides that a deed must be read aloud before the appearers and witnesses, and signed at the same moment by the parties, the witnesses, and the notary. Such formal requirements such as the physical presence of the parties, witnesses, and the notary at the time of reading and signing are intended to ensure that the deed is executed transparently, under the direct supervision of the public official, and to minimize risks of fabrication, manipulation, or fraud. Meanwhile, material requirements ensure that the substance of the deed truly reflects the intention of the parties and does not violate statutory provisions or moral-legal principles (Ghani et al., 2025). The purpose of all these requirements is to guarantee authenticity, formal accuracy, and legal certainty for the parties executing the deed. An authentic deed prepared in full compliance with these requirements will carry perfect evidentiary force, meaning that judges and opposing parties may only challenge it using specific counter-evidence (Ghani et al., 2025). Therefore, these foundational aspects are crucial to examine in the context of cooperative practices between notaries and service bureaus, as any breach or disregard of these requirements may cast doubt on the authenticity of the deed and expose the involved parties to potential legal prejudice.

Along with economic growth and increasing public demand for legal services and business entity formation, a significant phenomenon has emerged in which several commercial service bureaus have begun offering assistance in notarial deed processing in close cooperation with notaries (Fikri, 2024). These service bureaus not only assist in document collection but also act as intermediaries or client-soliciting agents who then refer clients and documents to the notary for deed execution (Natalia & Ma'mun, 2025). This practice raises concerns that notarial activities, which should be performed directly and independently by notaries, are being transformed into client-oriented service packages marketed through such bureaus. From legal and ethical perspectives, this collaboration presents two major issues. First, regarding the validity of deeds: legal problems arise to the detriment of clients because a deed may be considered invalid if a service bureau undertakes essential stages of deed preparation such as client solicitation, document preparation, or arrangement of signing thereby neglecting the formal requirements of personal appearance before the notary and the reading of the deed as mandated in Article 16(1)(m) of Law No. 2 of 2014 on the Office of the Notary (Krisma Natalia, Elma Meliana Eka Putri Ma'mun). Second, from the standpoint of professional ethics: the Notary Code of Ethics, Article 4(g), expressly prohibits notaries from engaging in self-promotion or using intermediaries to obtain clients (Hidayatulloh et al., 2024). Therefore, not only are formal legal aspects jeopardized, but the dignity, independence, and integrity of the notarial office as a public institution are also at stake.

The Regional Supervisory Council (Majelis Pengawas Daerah—MPD) is the body established to provide guidance and oversight over the performance of notarial duties, as regulated under Article 67 of Law No. 2 of 2014 on the Office of the Notary (UUJN). The primary functions of the MPD include investigating violations of notarial duties, inspecting notarial protocols, and enforcing discipline through recommendations for administrative sanctions. In practice, however, MPD's supervision over notaries who collaborate with service bureaus faces various structural and technical challenges (Purwanto, 2007). One major issue is the difficulty in proving cooperation between notaries and service bureaus, as such relationships are often informal, unwritten, and not recorded in official notarial documents. The MPD generally conducts only administrative supervision of notarial protocols (such as the organization of deed minutes, repertorium records, and document storage), without extending oversight to ethical or external behavioral aspects of how notaries obtain clients. As a result, many forms of collaboration go undetected, and oversight intended to be preventive often becomes reactive, triggered only after complaints are filed.

In addition, MPD's authority is limited to making recommendations. Under Article 70 of the UUJN, the MPD may only propose sanctions to the Regional Supervisory Council (MPW) or the Central Supervisory Council (MPP), without having the authority to directly impose disciplinary measures. This hierarchical structure makes the enforcement of ethical standards lengthy and often ineffective. Consequently, a grey area emerges in supervisory practices, particularly regarding notarial activities conducted outside the notary's office or through service bureaus (KUNTJORO, 2016). Beyond limited authority, another obstacle is the lack of reporting and coordination between the MPD and professional organizations such as the Indonesian Notary Association (INI). Yet, the Code of Ethics is an integral part of the professional oversight system, which can only be effectively enforced through strong cooperation between supervisory bodies and the professional association. In this context, reforms are needed, including strengthening MPD's institutional capacity, implementing digital-based supervisory systems, and establishing ethical audit mechanisms that enable the monitoring of notarial activities involving third parties such as service bureaus (Hasuri et al., 2020). The supervisory role of the MPD over ethical violations by notaries collaborating with service bureaus has not been optimal, both in terms of regulation and implementation. Synergistic efforts between the MPD, MPW, and the professional organization are required to uphold the principle of *officium nobile* in notarial practice and maintain public trust in the authenticity of notarial deeds.

2. Research Methods

This research employs a normative (doctrinal) juridical method, a legal research approach that focuses on the examination of applicable positive legal norms. The primary objective of this method is to systematically analyze the legal provisions governing the validity of notarial authentic deeds and the prohibition on notary collaboration with service bureaus, as stipulated in Law No. 2 of 2014 concerning the Office of the Notary (UUJN), the Indonesian Civil Code (KUHPerdota), and the Notary Code of Ethics. The approaches utilized include the

statutory approach, to examine the prevailing legal norms; the conceptual approach, to analyze the concepts of authentic deeds and professional ethical standards; and the case approach, by reviewing several instances of cooperation between notaries and service bureaus in Central Jakarta as illustrations of normative application. The legal materials used consist of primary legal materials (the UUJN, KUHPperdata, and the Code of Ethics), secondary legal materials (books, scholarly journals, and research findings), and tertiary legal materials (legal dictionaries and encyclopedias). All legal materials were analyzed using a descriptive qualitative analytical method, which interprets and correlates legal norms with theories and principles of notarial practice in order to address the two central focuses of this study: the validity of notarial authentic deeds prepared through service bureaus and the effectiveness of the Regional Supervisory Council's oversight regarding violations of the notary's code of ethics.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. The Validity of Notarial Authentic Deeds Prepared Through Service Bureaus

In the Indonesian legal system, notaries hold a crucial position as public officials authorized by the state to draw up authentic deeds. Under Article 15(1) of Law No. 2 of 2014 concerning the Office of the Notary (UUJN), a notary is a public official vested with the authority to create authentic deeds regarding all acts, agreements, and stipulations required by statutory regulations and/or desired by the parties to be stated in authentic form. This provision is reinforced by studies asserting that notaries, as formal state officials, are obligated to provide public services in preparing legally valid authentic deeds (Supriyadi & Handoko, 2023). The core functions of notaries in the drafting of authentic deeds encompass three main aspects: legal certainty, formal correctness, and legal protection for the public. As the highest evidentiary instrument in civil law, an authentic deed prepared by a notary carries perfect evidentiary value, provided that all statutory requirements are fulfilled. Research on "The Application of the Principle of Professionalism in Notarial Practice for the Drafting of Authentic Deeds" demonstrates that the professionalism of notaries directly correlates with the quality of authentic deeds they produce (Fortuna et al., 2024).

The principles of personal presence and professional independence form the foundation of notarial authority. This means that a notary is not merely an administrative facilitator but a public official who bears direct responsibility for each deed executed. Literature affirms that notaries are positioned as public officials entrusted with the authority to draw up authentic deeds (Ma'ruf & Wijaya, 2015). One manifestation of such independence is the prohibition against delegation or the use of intermediaries in the execution of notarial duties. Article 16(1)(m) of the UUJN requires that a deed be read aloud before the appearers and witnesses, and that it be signed at the same moment by the parties, the witnesses, and the notary. Furthermore, Article 4(g) of the Notary Code of Ethics prohibits notaries from using intermediaries to obtain clients. The code of ethics functions as a moral and professional

instrument underpinning the personal accountability of notaries (Prasetyawati & Prananingtyas, 2022).

Within Indonesia's civil law framework, an authentic deed constitutes a legal document possessing the highest evidentiary force compared to other forms of evidence. Article 1868 of the Indonesian Civil Code (KUHPperdata) stipulates that an authentic deed is one made in the form prescribed by law, by or before a competent public official, at the place where the deed is executed. Therefore, the authenticity of a deed is fundamentally determined by the involvement of the competent public official (the notary) and the fulfillment of the statutory form and procedures. As a public official, the notary is responsible for ensuring compliance with both the formal and material requirements of an authentic deed. The formal requirements include the preparation of the deed by or before the competent official, the presence of the appearers and witnesses, and the reading and signing of the deed simultaneously in the presence of the notary (Supriyadi & Handoko, 2023). Meanwhile, the material requirements demand that the contents of the deed accurately reflect the free will of the parties and not contravene the law or public morality (Prasetyawati & Prananingtyas, 2022). Together, these requirements constitute essential prerequisites for the validity of an authentic deed.

If any of these requirements are not fulfilled, then pursuant to Article 1869 of the Indonesian Civil Code (KUHPperdata), the deed loses its authentic nature and has only the evidentiary force of a private deed. This means that the deed no longer possesses perfect evidentiary value and its validity may be contested by other parties. Violations of formal procedures such as the absence of the appearers before the notary or the reading of the deed by administrative staff may reduce the status of the deed to that of a private document (Fortuna et al., 2024). Furthermore, the validity of an authentic deed is strongly influenced by the principle of the notary's direct presence. Article 16(1)(m) of the UUJN explicitly states that "the notary must read the deed before the appearers in the presence of at least two witnesses, and it shall be signed at that moment by the appearers, the witnesses, and the notary." This provision demonstrates that the direct presence of the parties and the reading of the deed constitute the core of the authentic deed-making process. If these procedures are delegated to service bureaus or other third parties, the deed legally loses its formal validity.

Several academic studies reinforce this perspective. A deed prepared without the presence of the appearers before the notary potentially violates the principle of personal responsibility and exposes the notary to ethical and legal liability. Thus, the validity of an authentic deed depends not only on its content but also on the formal process, which must be carried out directly by the notary as a public official. In modern notarial practice, however, the emergence of service bureaus acting as third-party facilitators has become increasingly common. These bureaus assist the public in handling legal documents, including notarial deeds and business entity establishment. Juridically, service bureaus are not official legal institutions and do not possess the authority to create authentic deeds. Nevertheless, in practice, they frequently act

as intermediaries between the public and notaries by offering packaged deed-processing services.

Service bureaus typically engage in activities such as client solicitation, document preparation, deed form completion, and scheduling deed execution before the notary. This phenomenon has emerged due to two primary factors: the public's need for fast and practical services, and the interest of some notaries in expanding client networks through third parties. However, such practices pose legal risks because they shift the personal and non-delegable duties of notaries as public officials. Although cooperation between notaries and service bureaus is not explicitly regulated in statutory law, the prohibition against such practice is found in Article 4(g) of the Notary Code of Ethics, which states that notaries "are prohibited from promoting their position or using other parties as intermediaries to obtain clients." This rule aims to preserve the independence and integrity of the notarial profession so that it does not become a commercialized activity. The involvement of service bureaus in the deed-making process constitutes a form of ethical violation because it undermines the notary's personal responsibility for the creation of authentic deeds (Fikri, 2024).

Cases in Central Jakarta exhibit similar patterns. According to field reports and media coverage, several service bureaus in the area offer deed-making services, company establishment assistance, and business licensing, often listing specific notaries as partners. For instance, the case involving Notary Nurlisa Uke Desy, who collaborated with a service bureau named Infiniti, showed that the bureau marketed deed services through social media and arranged deed signings outside the notary's office. This case illustrates weak supervisory mechanisms and the difficulty of proving such collaborations, as the relationships between notaries and service bureaus are often informal, unwritten, and undocumented. From a legal standpoint, the involvement of service bureaus in the deed-making process may result in two principal consequences. First, ethical implications arise from violations of personal responsibility and the independence of the notarial office as mandated by the UUJN and the Notary Code of Ethics. Second, there are legal implications for the validity of the deed, as a deed made without the direct presence of the appearers before the notary may lose its authentic force and be downgraded to a private deed. Thus, although service bureaus are often perceived as facilitating administrative efficiency, such practices fundamentally contradict the core principles of notarial practice and jeopardize the legal legitimacy of the resulting deed.

Collaboration between notaries and service bureaus in deed-making brings serious consequences for the validity and evidentiary force of authentic deeds. In principle, an authentic deed possesses perfect evidentiary force when it is made in accordance with Article 1868 of the KUHPdata and Article 16(1)(m) of the UUJN. However, when formal procedures—such as the personal presence of the appearers, the reading of the deed, or the signing ceremony—are carried out without the notary's direct presence, the deed loses its authentic nature and is classified merely as a private deed under Article 1869 of the

KUHPperdata. In civil law, this means that the deed no longer possesses perfect evidentiary force and may be challenged by opposing parties. Collaboration between notaries and service bureaus presents significant risks to the validity of deeds because the deed-making process is no longer performed personally and directly by the authorized public official (Fikri, 2024). Violations of these requirements are not merely administrative defects but constitute substantive breaches of evidentiary law that ensures legal certainty and formal truth.

From an ethical and supervisory perspective, the involvement of service bureaus in notarial practice constitutes a violation of Article 4(g) of the Notary Code of Ethics, which prohibits notaries from engaging in promotional activities through third parties or cooperating with intermediaries to obtain clients. As a consequence, notaries proven to have engaged in such conduct may be subject to ethical sanctions imposed by the Regional Supervisory Council (Majelis Pengawas Daerah, MPD) or the Honorary Council of the Indonesian Notary Association (Ikatan Notaris Indonesia, INI). The sanctions vary, ranging from written warnings and temporary suspension to permanent dismissal from the notarial office. Beyond ethical violations, such cooperation may also give rise to civil liability if a deed prepared through a service bureau results in losses to third parties. Under the principle of personal responsibility, the notary remains fully accountable for every deed made in their name, even if the administrative process is assisted by another party. In such cases, the injured party may seek annulment of the deed or claim compensation on the basis of tort (Article 1365 of the Indonesian Civil Code).

From a moral and professional standpoint, the use of service bureaus undermines the dignity of the notarial office as a noble profession grounded in integrity, independence, and public trust. The authenticity of a deed is measured not only by compliance with formal requirements but also by the ethical values and moral integrity of the notary as the public official responsible for its creation (Prasetyawati & Prananingtyas, 2022). Therefore, cooperation with commercially oriented service bureaus is inconsistent with the fundamental values of the notarial profession, which is expected to uphold legal certainty and social justice. Consequently, the legal implications of preparing authentic deeds through service bureaus are twofold: from a formal perspective, the deed loses its authenticity, and from an ethical perspective, the notary may be subject to moral or administrative sanctions. In a broader context, this practice threatens public trust in the notarial profession and highlights the need to strengthen the role of the Regional Supervisory Council (MPD) in conducting inspections and providing guidance regarding violations committed by notaries within its jurisdiction.

3.2. The Notary Code of Ethics on the Preparation of Authentic Deeds Through Service Bureaus

The notarial profession in Indonesia has a dual character: on the one hand, notaries serve as public officials vested with state authority under Law No. 30 of 2004 on the Office of the Notary and its amendment; on the other hand, they function as professional practitioners who

must uphold dignity, integrity, and public trust. In this context, the Notary Code of Ethics established by the Indonesian Notary Association (Ikatan Notaris Indonesia, INI) serves as the primary instrument for internal professional control. The professional code of ethics carries several strategic functions. First, as a moral standard, it obliges notaries to act honestly, responsibly, fairly, and independently in carrying out their duties. Second, as a behavioral guideline, it provides direction regarding the notary's interactions with clients, colleagues, and third parties, ensuring that professional practice remains aligned with both legal and ethical norms. Third, as a boundary of professionalism, the code of ethics defines prohibited conduct, including professional promotion or the use of third parties to obtain clients, as stipulated in Article 4(g) of the Notary Code of Ethics (Khasanah et al., 2023).

Pursuant to Article 82 of the Notary Law, every notary must be a member of the sole professional organization, INI, which holds the authority to establish and enforce the code of ethics. This legal basis grants formal legitimacy to the code of ethics, making it normatively binding on notaries even though it is not a statutory regulation. The INI Bylaws explicitly provide that all members are required to adhere to the Notary Code of Ethics as their professional guideline (Anand & Syafruddin, 2016). Key provisions of the code of ethics include the prohibition on professional promotion and the prohibition on obtaining clients through intermediaries. These prohibitions are intended to safeguard the dignity of the notarial office as a public function, protect the integrity of the profession from commercial influence, and maintain public trust, which is the foundation of the notary's legitimacy as a public official. For instance, Article 4(3) of the Notary Code of Ethics prohibits notaries from engaging in public promotion or self-advertising through print or electronic media, including the use of service bureaus to acquire clients. From a normative analysis perspective, the code of ethics not only serves as a moral guideline but also functions as an internal control mechanism within the profession. It forms the basis for the Regional Supervisory Council (Majelis Pengawas Daerah, MPD) and the Honorary Council to assess and adjudicate alleged disciplinary violations by notaries. Thus, the code of ethics plays a dual role: regulating the ethical conduct of notaries and providing an internal supervisory instrument that strengthens the professionalism of the public office.

The Regional Supervisory Council (MPD) is the supervisory body responsible for overseeing notarial practice at the district or municipal level. Its establishment is regulated under Articles 67–70 of the Notary Law and further detailed in Minister of Law and Human Rights Regulation No. 15 of 2020, which outlines the mechanisms for notarial supervision and guidance, including procedures for examining suspected violations of the code of ethics. Normatively, the MPD functions as an extension of professional oversight at the local level, ensuring that notaries comply with the code of ethics and properly fulfill their public office. The MPD's authority includes:

1. Receiving public reports concerning alleged violations of the notary code of ethics;

2. Conducting examinations of alleged violations, both administratively and through preliminary investigation;
3. Providing recommendations for sanctions to the Regional Supervisory Council (Majelis Pengawas Wilayah, MPW), which may impose disciplinary measures according to the gravity of the violation (Khasanah et al., 2023)

The structure of the Regional Supervisory Council (MPD) generally consists of representatives from the Ministry of Law and Human Rights (Kemenkumham), the notary professional organization (INI), as well as independent academics or legal practitioners. This composition is designed to maintain the objectivity of supervision and to bridge legal, professional, and academic perspectives in evaluating notarial conduct.

Normative analysis indicates that the MPD holds a strategic position in maintaining notarial professionalism. Its authority to receive reports, examine alleged violations, and issue recommendations for sanctions positions it as the frontline supervisory body of the profession. However, the effectiveness of the MPD remains limited by several factors:

1. Human resource capacity, as the number of MPD members is often disproportionate to the number of notaries they are required to supervise.
2. Limited authority, since the MPD may only issue recommendations and does not have the power to directly impose severe sanctions.
3. Investigative limitations, which result in supervisory practices that are predominantly administrative or reactive in nature.

The MPD also plays a significant role in public protection. By enforcing the notary code of ethics, the MPD helps prevent the commercialization of the profession, safeguard professional dignity, and maintain public trust. However, empirical practice shows that the effectiveness of MPD supervision highly depends on cross-institutional collaboration, the availability of adequate resources, and its ability to adapt to modern practices involving digital technology. (Anand & Syafruddin, 2016). Cooperation between notaries and service bureaus has become one of the most significant challenges for the Regional Supervisory Council (MPD) in carrying out its supervisory functions. This practice possesses characteristics that hinder the enforcement of the notarial code of ethics:

1. Informal and concealed, often conducted without written agreements, making it difficult to detect through administrative supervision.
2. Difficult to prove legally, as interactions frequently occur through digital media or online communication channels.
3. Involving non-legal third parties, such as service bureaus that market notarial services to attract clients, which may create conflicts of interest and lead to the commercialization of the profession. (Khasanah et al., 2023)

Such violations have the potential to contravene Article 4 letter g of the Notarial Code of Ethics, which expressly prohibits notaries from using third parties to obtain clients. This prohibition aims to preserve the integrity, dignity, and public trust vested in the notarial profession. The Regional Supervisory Council (MPD) faces several limitations in supervising this form of collaboration:

1. Supervision is reactive, as the MPD generally acts only upon receiving public complaints;
2. Lack of adequate investigative tools, making it difficult to trace concealed practices;
3. Challenges in verifying covert arrangements, particularly when documents or communications are conducted through online platforms or third parties.

Other inhibiting factors include the scarcity of concrete evidence, weak regulations governing digital-based violations and sanctions, and potential conflicts of interest among notaries serving within the MPD. (Anand & Syafruddin, 2016)

As an illustration, there was a case in Central Jakarta in which a service bureau promoted notarial deed services by displaying the name of a particular notary without direct authorization. This practice demonstrates that although the MPD has normative legitimacy, its effectiveness in addressing non-transparent and concealed collaboration remains limited. A normative analysis highlights several key issues:

1. A gap between norms and practice, where the MPD's authority is clear in theory, but factual practices often escape oversight;
2. A legal–technological gap, as current regulations do not fully accommodate modern digital practices;
3. Risks of professional integrity degradation, as covert practices may undermine public trust in notaries;
4. The need for a proactive approach, including digital monitoring and ethical audits to identify concealed activities.

This proactive approach is essential to closing legal loopholes and ensuring that the code of ethics remains relevant to modern practices involving service bureaus and digital technologies. The weak oversight of the Regional Supervisory Council (MPD) regarding collaborations between notaries and service bureaus has significant implications for notarial professionalism and public trust. The main impacts include:

1. Increased commercialization of the notarial office, where the focus shifts from public service to client acquisition and profit-making;
2. Degradation of professional integrity, as hidden promotional practices and third-party involvement may cause the public to question the professionalism of notaries;

3. Declining public trust, which ultimately affects the legitimacy of the notarial office as a public institution.

From a legal perspective, this situation underscores the discrepancy between legal norms and practical implementation. Although the UUJN, the Notarial Code of Ethics, and Ministerial Regulation No. 15 of 2020 provide a normative framework, actual supervision remains limited particularly with regard to digital and concealed practices. To address these weaknesses, several strengthening strategies may be implemented: Digital-based supervision enables the MPD to monitor online promotions and service-bureau activities linked to notaries. Implementing electronic monitoring systems can increase oversight effectiveness, especially for concealed practices that are difficult to trace manually. Cross-institutional cooperation facilitates information sharing, coordinated sanctions, and standardized supervisory procedures. Such collaboration also provides the MPD access to additional resources, including investigative capabilities and risk analysis. The Notarial Code of Ethics and MPD regulations need to be updated to address online promotions, the use of digital platforms, and cooperation with non-legal third parties. Consistent enforcement of sanctions for digital violations reinforces the MPD's credibility in supervising the profession.

A proactive, technology-based approach is not merely a strategic option but a normative necessity to safeguard the integrity of the notarial public office. Through adaptive supervision supported by electronic evidence, the MPD can mitigate the risks of commercialization, uphold moral and behavioral standards, and enhance transparency and accountability—thus maintaining public trust in the profession. These strengthening strategies align with normative legal principles and professional ethics while closing the gap between norms and modern practices involving service bureaus and digital technologies. Violations of the notarial code of ethics through collaborations with service bureaus constitute a deviation from the fundamental principles of the notarial public office, which must be carried out with integrity and independence. Cases of covert promotion or the involvement of third parties underscore the need for effective, adaptive, and evidence-based supervision. The MPD has both a moral and legal responsibility to reinforce the professional oversight system. The normative legitimacy provided by the UUJN, Ministerial Regulation No. 15 of 2020, and the Notarial Code of Ethics must be implemented proactively, rather than merely reactively based on public complaints. Strengthening oversight can be achieved through ethical audits and digital monitoring, closer collaboration with Kemenkumham and the INI, and revising internal regulations to cover digital practices. The effectiveness of MPD supervision ultimately depends on regulatory reform, transparency, and consistent enforcement of ethical sanctions. Through these measures, the integrity of the notarial profession can be preserved, the dignity of the public office maintained, and public trust in notaries upheld. MPD supervision is not merely an administrative obligation but a strategic instrument for protecting public interest, safeguarding notarial professionalism, and ensuring that modern practices remain aligned with legal principles and professional ethics.

4. Conclusion

The preparation of an authentic deed through a service bureau is invalid because it contravenes the fundamental principles of notarial law as stipulated in Article 15 and Article 16 paragraph (1) letter m of Law No. 2 of 2014 on the Office of the Notary (UUJN). The physical presence of the parties before the notary and the reading of the deed by the notary are mandatory formal requirements to ensure the authenticity of the deed. When these procedures are delegated to or carried out by a third party such as a service bureau the deed loses its authentic character as defined in Article 1868 of the Indonesian Civil Code and is reduced to the status of a private deed. This situation has legal implications for the personal liability of the notary and threatens legal certainty for the parties involved. The preparation of an authentic deed through a service bureau also violates the Notarial Code of Ethics, as such collaboration breaches Article 4 letter g, which prohibits notaries from engaging in promotional activities or using intermediaries to obtain clients. This practice undermines the principle of officium nobile, diminishes the independence and dignity of the notarial office, and may erode public trust in the notarial profession. The violation not only affects the moral and reputational dimensions of the profession but also compromises the legitimacy of the resulting deed, as it disregards the personal responsibility inherent in the notary's role as a public official. As an institution responsible for the supervision and guidance of notaries, the Regional Supervisory Council (MPD) plays a crucial role in enforcing the code of ethics and preventing unlawful collaboration between notaries and service bureaus. However, its effectiveness remains limited due to its merely recommendatory authority, lack of adequate investigative tools, and the absence of a digital monitoring system. Strengthening supervision is therefore essential and can be achieved through enhanced collaboration among the MPD, the Ministry of Law and Human Rights, and the Indonesian Notary Association (INI), alongside the implementation of ethical audits and digital monitoring to adapt to contemporary practices. Through these measures, the integrity of the notarial profession can be preserved, the authenticity of deeds can be safeguarded, and public trust in the notarial institution can be restored.

5. References

- Aida Musyarrifah Hasri Putri, W. W. (2025). Legalitas Akta Autentik Berbasis Teknologi: Tantangan dan Peluang Implementasi Cyber Notary di Indonesia. *Jurnal Rekomendasi Hukum*, 1(1), 30–32.
- Anand, G., & Syafruddin, S. (2016). Pengawasan Terhadap Notaris dalam Kaitannya dengan Kepatuhan Menjalankan Jabatan. *Lambung Mangkurat Law Journal*, 1(1), 87–101. <https://doi.org/10.32801/abc.v1i1.17>
- Fikri, E. D. (2024). AKIBAT HUKUM NOTARIS YANG BEKERJA SAMA DENGAN BIRO JASA Legal Consequences Of A Notary Cooperating With A Service Bureau. *Wijaya Putra Law Review*, 3(1), 72–90.
- Fortuna, T., Wijaya, M., Kenotariatan, M., Diponegoro, U., Tengah, J., Kenotariatan, M.,

- Diponegoro, U., & Tengah, J. (2024). *Penerapan Asas Profesionalitas Pada Notaris Dalam Pembuatan Akta Autentik Ery Agus Priyono 9*(November), 229–255.
- Ghani, A. R., Firdaus, M., Ansari, M. Al, Islam, U., & Antasari, N. (2025). *INDONESIA*.
- Hasuri, H., Rokilah, R., & Pitasari, D. N. (2020). Peranan Majelis Pengawas Notaris Daerah terhadap Pelaksanaan Kode Etik Notaris di Kabupaten Serang. *Legalitas: Jurnal Hukum*, 12(2), 275. <https://doi.org/10.33087/legalitas.v12i2.223>
- Hidayatulloh, A. S., Perdana, D. M. J., Adzkiya, M. F., & Hidayat, J. (2024). Penerapan Kode Etik Atas Etika Profesi Hukum Pada Profesi Notaris. *Jurnal Ilmiah Nusantara*, 1(4), 114–121.
- Ismu, M., Yara, R., Surono, A., Zulpadli, B., Studi, P., Kenotariatan, M., Hukum, F., Pancasila, U., Hukum, F., & Pancasila, U. (2025). *Analisis Kekuatan Hukum Akta Notaris terhadap Ketidaklengkapan Syarat Formil Data Pribadi*. 18, 645–663.
- Khasanah, C. A., Satoto, A. Y., & Anwar, M. H. (2023). Akibat Hukum Notaris Yang Melakukan Penandatngannya Akta Di Luar Wilayah Jabatan Notaris. *Jurnal Education and Development*, 11(2), 378–383. <https://doi.org/10.37081/ed.v11i2.4921>
- KUNTJORO, N. (2016). Efektivitas Pengawasan Majelis Pengawas Daerah (MPD) Kota Yogyakarta Terhadap Perilaku Notaris di Kota Yogyakarta menurut Kode Etik Notaris. *Jurnal Lex Renaissance*, 1(2), 201–215. <https://doi.org/10.20885/jlr.vol1.iss2.art5>
- Ma'ruf, U., & Wijaya, D. (2015). Pejabat Umum Dalam Membuat Akta Otentik (Studi Kasus di Kecamatan Bergas Kabupaten Semarang). *Jurnal Pembaharuan Hukum*, 11(3), 299–309.
- Natalia, K., & Ma'mun, E. M. E. P. (2025). Penerapan Prinsip Mengenal Pengguna Jasa Serta Kepastian Hukum terhadap Akta Pendirian Perseroan Terbatas oleh Notaris yang Berafiliasi dengan Biro Jasa. *Wajah Hukum*, 9(1), 11. <https://doi.org/10.33087/wjh.v9i1.1593>
- Prasetyawati, B. I., & Prananingtyas, P. (2022). Peran Kode Etik Notaris Dalam Membangun Integritas Notaris Di Era 4.0. *Notarius*, 15(1), 310–323. <https://doi.org/10.14710/nts.v15i1.46043>
- Purwanto. (2007). Konsep Pengembangan Pengaturan Sistem Pengawasan Pelaksanaan Jabatan Notaris di Indonesia (The Regulating Development Concept of Implementing and Controlling System of Notary Profession in Indonesia). *Fakultas Hukum Universitas Mulawarman*, 1(1), 1–14.
- Supriyadi, S., & Handoko, W. (2023). Tinjauan Yuridis Terhadap Notaris Selaku Pejabat Formal. *Notarius*, 16(1), 126–140. <https://doi.org/10.14710/nts.v16i1.39498>