i-latinnotary Journal: Internasional Journal of Latin Notary
Vol. 5 No. 2. March. 2025
ISSN: 2746-6159 (Electronic)
Open Access: https://i-latinnotary.notariat.unpas.ac.id/index.php/jurnal/index

Regulating Pre-Marital Debts in Indonesian Marital Property Law

Nurhayati[1], Udin Narsudin[2], F. Davy Gunadi N.[3]
[1,2,3] Magister Kenotariatan Universitas Pasundan Bandung
[1] nurhayati.mkn@gmail.com

Article Info

Article history:
Received 230425
Revised 150507
Accepted 290507

Keyword:
international private law,
pre-marital debt,
marital property,
prenuptial agreement,
Indonesia,
comparative law,
legal harmonization,
transnational family law

ABSTRACT

This study explores the legal treatment of pre-marital debt in Indonesia's marital property regime, particularly in the absence of prenuptial agreements, and assesses the regulatory implications for spousal autonomy and legal certainty. Although Indonesian law distinguishes between joint and separate property, it lacks clear provisions governing the classification and enforcement of financial obligations incurred prior to marriage. Drawing upon statutory analysis and landmark case law, the research reveals a significant normative gap in how pre-marital debts are addressed, often leaving spouses vulnerable to unpredictable liabilities and judicial discretion.

Through a comparative legal approach, the study evaluates regulatory models from the Netherlands, the United States, and the United Kingdom—jurisdictions that apply rigorous safeguards such as mandatory financial disclosure, independent legal advice, and substantive fairness reviews in the enforcement of prenuptial agreements. These systems emphasize informed consent and contractual autonomy, while also protecting economically vulnerable spouses through equitable enforcement standards.

The analysis highlights the need for Indonesia to reform its legal framework to ensure fairness and predictability in marital financial arrangements, particularly in light of increasing cross-border marriages and complex property dynamics. The study recommends the adoption of mandatory debt disclosure laws, procedural safeguards for marital contracts, and harmonization strategies aligned with international best practices in private family law.

INTRODUCTION

The Indonesian legal framework governing marital property is primarily articulated in Law Number 1 of 1974 concerning Marriage, which stipulates that assets acquired during the marriage constitute communal property, while pre-marital assets and inheritances remain under individual control unless otherwise specified in a prenuptial agreement (Jamadi et al., 2022). This foundational principle is further reinforced by Article 119 of the Indonesian Civil Code, which institutes a system of complete property unity (communio bonorum) in the absence of a prenuptial agreement, thereby consolidating all spousal assets, excluding inheritances and gifts, under joint ownership (Karman, 2021). This legal structure creates specific ramifications for rights, obligations, and debts accrued during the marriage. A significant gap exists in the legal provisions concerning personal debts incurred before the marriage, particularly when a prenuptial agreement does not explicitly address such liabilities, which introduces ambiguity and the potential for disputes within marital relationships, sometimes escalating to divorce (Mashdurohatun, 2020). The intricacies of this issue are highlighted in court decisions such as Case Number 4017/Pdt.G/2020/PA.Bks, which illustrates a scenario where a wife was compelled to bear the burden of her husband's pre-marital debts, debts she was unaware of and not accounted for in any prenuptial agreement; such instances expose the vulnerability of individuals to the repercussions of undisclosed pre-marital financial obligations.

The jurisprudential stance of the Supreme Court, as demonstrated in Decision Number 1904K/Pdt/2007, reinforces the notion that marital property encompasses debts incurred during the marriage; however, the legal treatment of pre-marital debts remains ambiguous, creating a critical area of legal uncertainty. The increase in divorce cases across Indonesian cities often stems from economic issues, personal incompatibilities, or other post-marital disputes, as legal actions are undertaken to address marital disputes, including those concerning the legality of a marriage (Nurhayati & Siregar, 2019). To ensure equitable treatment and clarity in marital property law, it is imperative to consider pre-marital debts within the legal framework. Courts should consider utilizing a "pre-marital" property classification to account for assets and income acquired separately from the marriage to facilitate fairer bargaining and recognition of diverse spousal contributions (Tait, 2017). Virtually all civilized countries acknowledge marriage as an equal partnership between two legally equal individuals, each contributing in their unique way, where policy makers generally agree that spousal contributions, while not identical, hold equal relative value to the family's welfare

The rise in property ownership has increased the importance of distributing financial assets upon divorce, thereby boosting the demand for prenuptial agreements given the high rates of marital dissolution (Smith, 2003). Without these changes, courts fail to capture the nature of marital partnership and properly compensate contributions made by non-earning spouses (Tait, 2017). It's imperative to determine whether an equitable system is achieved through fixed apportionment rules or flexible discretionary judicial powers exercised by courts.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study employs a doctrinal legal research method combined with comparative legal analysis and a normative reform approach, consistent with methodologies widely applied in international private law scholarship.

To address the first objective—examining the legal consequences and enforceability of pre-marital debts in the absence of a prenuptial agreement within Indonesian law—the study analyzes primary legal sources, including: Law No. 1 of 1974 on Marriage and Relevant articles of the Indonesian Civil Code

To address the second objective—comparing Indonesia's framework with civil and common law jurisdictions and proposing harmonization—the study draws on comparative materials from: Civil law jurisdictions such as the Netherlands and Germany, where marital property systems clearly delineate personal and joint obligations, Common law jurisdictions such as the United States and the United Kingdom, particularly in the use and enforceability of prenuptial agreements in allocating liabilities and protecting individual property rights.

The comparative component is used to highlight key differences, identify best practices, and assess how other legal systems resolve similar issues regarding pre-marital financial obligations. This comparative lens is essential to generate informed normative recommendations for potential legal reform in Indonesia that would enhance predictability, equity, and legal certainty in both domestic and transnational marital contexts.

The study ultimately seeks to contribute to the discourse on legal harmonization in personal status law and cross-border family finance by integrating both positive legal doctrine and policy-oriented reform analysis.

Legal consequences serve as the cornerstone for understanding the ramifications of debts and obligations within marital property law, encompassing the outcomes of legal acts performed by subjects concerning legal objects and events. Such consequences are intricately woven into the statutory framework governing asset classification, spousal rights, and financial responsibilities (Creese, 2015). Indonesian law, particularly Law No. 1 of 1974 and Articles 119–123 of the Civil Code, operates on a principle of universal community property in the absence of a prenuptial agreement; however, the handling of pre-marital debts, especially without a marital contract, exposes a significant legal lacuna. Differentiating between personal and community debts is crucial, with personal debts incurred before marriage theoretically remaining the individual's responsibility unless otherwise stipulated, potentially impacting joint property under specific conditions. This perspective aligns with the understanding that pre-marital obligations, without explicit agreement, generally fall outside the ambit of marital liability.

`

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The principles of contractual autonomy and legal certainty are indispensable in evaluating the enforceability of pre-marital obligations, principles that resonate throughout the Indonesian Civil Code, notably in Articles 1320 and 1338. These articles emphasize the necessity of consent and the binding force of lawful agreements (Karman, 2021). Legal certainty extends beyond mere textual compliance, embodying a systemic characteristic that ensures the effective application and predictability of legal norms (Hartanto, 2020). Contracts typically progress through stages, starting with a pre-contract phase where parties engage in negotiations and discussions before formalizing their agreement (Ardyo, 2020). This initial phase is critical for establishing mutual understanding and consent, which are fundamental elements for the validity of any contract under Indonesian law (Ariqah et al., 2023). The Civil Code's Book Three outlines general provisions applicable to all contracts, including sale, lease, and exchange agreements, while specific provisions address particular contract types, ensuring a comprehensive legal framework (Sood, 2020). The evolution of contract law reflects changes in societal norms and business practices, especially in the context of globalization (Budiartha, 2018). The Indonesian legal system, while rooted in civil law and influenced by the Dutch, operates within a pluralistic framework that also incorporates elements of Adat and Islamic law, particularly in areas like inheritance (Putri & Jansen, 2021). Agreements are considered legal actions that involve at least two parties and are binding for all involved, encompassing aspects such as the necessity of involved parties, consent, capacity, a specific object, and admissible cause (Suwardiyati et al., 2018) (Kasih & Utami, 2021). The freedom to contract allows parties to define the terms of their agreements, provided they do not contravene legal statutes, public order, or ethical standards (Pohan, 2020).

Furthermore, the principle of freedom of contract, as enshrined in Article 1338 of the Indonesian Civil Code, allows parties to freely determine the contents of their agreements, subject to limitations imposed by law, public order, and good morals. This principle ensures that parties have the autonomy to tailor their agreements to their specific needs and circumstances, fostering flexibility and innovation in contractual arrangements (Pohan, 2020). However, this freedom is not absolute and must be exercised responsibly to uphold the integrity of the legal system. The dynamic interplay between national and international contract law reflects Indonesia's engagement in global commerce. Business activities in Indonesia are underpinned by principles of contract law, facilitating transactions both domestically and internationally (Budiartha, 2018). This interaction emphasizes the necessity of adapting contract law to meet the demands of globalization.

1. Legal Consequences of Pre-Marital Debt in the Absence of Prenuptial Agreements

The legal ramifications of pre-marital debt, particularly in the absence of a prenuptial agreement, reflect a complex interaction between formal legal doctrines and the socio-economic dynamics of marriage. This issue lies at the intersection of financial autonomy and the communitarian principles embedded in most marital property regimes (Smith, 2003; Tait, 2017). In Indonesia**,** Article 35 of Law No. 1 of 1974 on Marriage delineates the basic framework: assets acquired during the marriage are considered joint property, while assets brought into the marriage—including debts—are considered individual property, unless specified otherwise through a prenuptial agreement (Reilly, 2006; Mashdurohatun, 2020).

This principle is further elaborated by Articles 119–123 of the Indonesian Civil Code**,** which establish the presumption of universal community of property (*communio bonorum*) in the absence of a prenuptial agreement. Article 121, in particular, mentions that all debts—whether incurred before or during the marriage—are presumed to fall under joint responsibility unless proven to be *hutang pribadi* (personal debts).

From a doctrinal standpoint, "legal consequence" refers to the binding effects or obligations that arise from legal relationships or events, and which are enforceable through legal institutions (Soeroso, 2010). In the context of marriage, this means tracing how pre-marital debts, though contracted outside the union, may legally influence the shared economic obligations of the spouses post-marriage.

The principle of pacta sunt servanda, a foundational concept in contract law, holds that contracts freely entered into must be respected and enforced (Tait, 2017). This is particularly relevant in the context of prenuptial agreements, which, if properly executed, can allocate rights and responsibilities—including debt obligations—with legal certainty. However, until the landmark Constitutional Court Decision No. 69/PUU-XIII/2015**,** Indonesian law rigidly required prenuptial agreements to be made before marriage, limiting the contractual freedom of spouses post-marriage. The decision liberalized the system, permitting prenuptial agreements to be entered into **during** marriage, thereby expanding the scope for regulating financial arrangements retroactively (Putusan MK No. 69/PUU-XIII/2015, 2015).

In the absence of such agreements, Indonesian courts are often left to interpret financial arrangements based on general legal principles and circumstantial facts**.** Two notable cases—Putusan No. 4017/Pdt.G/2020/PA.Bks and Putusan No. 254/Pdt.G/2017/MS.Lsm—highlight the difficulty of determining whether a pre-marital debt constitutes a personal or marital liability. These cases underscore the distinction between "self debt" and "join debt"**,** with courts typically leaning on whether the debt served a shared marital interest**.** In the absence of documentary evidence or prior agreement, judicial discretion often leads to inconsistent or inequitable outcomes.

The legal ambiguity surrounding pre-marital debt profoundly affects spousal autonomy—defined as each spouse's right to manage their individual assets and financial obligations. Without legal mechanisms to formally segregate debts, spouses may unwittingly become liable for obligations they did not incur, undermining trust and financial security in the marriage (Otto, 2005). Moreover, the absence of certainty complicates dispute resolution**,** often requiring prolonged litigation to resolve financial liability and asset division.

This vacuum in regulation not only undermines the principle of legal certainty, a core tenet of the rule of law, but also deters individuals from entering marriage altogether. As Jan Michiel Otto (2005) emphasizes, legal certainty is vital for public trust and the rule of law, and must be ensured through clear, consistent, and enforceable legal norms.

In sum, the failure to explicitly regulate pre-marital debt within Indonesia's marital property regime imposes real risks—both economic and legal—on individuals entering marriage. It also limits the state's ability to uphold fairness, predictability, and autonomy within family law. These challenges call for legislative reforms**,** including mandatory financial disclosures**,** greater enforceability of post-nuptial contracts, and judicial guidelines that distinguish between personal and marital obligations.

2. Harmonizing Marital Debt and Property Frameworks Across Jurisdictions

The Netherlands has implemented a revised property regime known as the limited community of property, which serves to protect assets and debts acquired before marriage unless the spouses stipulate otherwise through a prenuptial agreement. This framework ensures that each spouse maintains autonomy over their pre-existing financial responsibilities, thereby preventing involuntary financial entanglement (Ncube, 1990). Common law jurisdictions, including the United States and the United Kingdom, generally uphold prenuptial agreements, provided they are executed with voluntary, informed consent and full disclosure (Smith, 2003).

In common law jurisdictions such as the United States and the United Kingdom, prenuptial agreements are recognized and enforceable, but only when they meet specific procedural and substantive safeguards. These legal systems emphasize fairness and transparency to ensure that such agreements are not used as instruments of coercion or exploitation. One of the central tenets underpinning enforceability is the requirement of full and frank disclosure of financial information. Each party must reveal all assets and liabilities before entering the agreement. Courts also expect that the agreement is entered into voluntarily, with a full understanding of its implications and, ideally, after receiving independent legal advice. Where these conditions are not met—such as in cases involving duress, fraud, or significant power imbalance—courts may declare the agreement unenforceable.

This strict scrutiny reflects a broader commitment to protecting economically vulnerable parties in marital arrangements. In situations where one spouse has significantly greater financial knowledge, wealth, or bargaining power, the agreement may be invalidated if found to be unjust or unconscionable. For example, the UK Supreme Court's decision in *Radmacher v. Granatino* [2010] emphasized that while autonomy should be respected, courts must not uphold terms that leave one spouse in a manifestly unfair position. Similarly, U.S. courts have refused to enforce agreements that effectively strip one party of spousal support or property rights, particularly where disclosure was inadequate or the terms were deemed oppressive. These jurisdictions uphold the idea that marriage is a legal and economic partnership, and contracts governing such partnerships must be evaluated through an equitable lens.

By contrast, Indonesia's legal framework provides limited procedural protections surrounding prenuptial agreements and pre-marital financial arrangements. Although the Constitutional Court's 2015 decision (No. 69/PUU-XIII/2015) enabled couples to enter into prenuptial agreements after marriage, the implementation and recognition of such agreements remain inconsistent. There are no statutory requirements for full disclosure, no obligation for independent legal counsel, and no guidelines on how to assess fairness or power imbalance. This leaves parties—particularly women or economically weaker spouses—vulnerable to financial harm in the event of divorce or the enforcement of pre-marital obligations that were never formally acknowledged or consented to.

The lack of a coherent system for regulating financial transparency and enforceability of marital contracts in Indonesia hinders legal certainty and access to equitable remedies. As marriage increasingly intersects with cross-border economic interests and property regimes, especially in cases involving international or intercultural unions, the need for clear, enforceable standards becomes more urgent. Without reform, the Indonesian legal system risks falling further out of step with international standards that prioritize consent, fairness, and the protection of both parties in marital financial arrangements. Incorporating principles from jurisdictions with strong contractual protections, adapted to Indonesia's cultural and religious context, could significantly improve the reliability and justice of marital property law.

While the Constitutional Court's Decision No. 69/PUU-XIII/2015 permits the creation of prenuptial agreements post-marriage, its application remains limited and inadequately regulated. Judicial inconsistency, cultural considerations, and limited legal awareness further complicate the enforcement of these agreements.

Indonesian family law currently lacks explicit requirements for pre-marital financial disclosure, nor does it clearly define whether pre-marital debts should be presumed joint or separate. This ambiguity compels courts to rely on equity-based judgments, leading to inconsistent outcomes and unpredictable legal precedents. Cross-border marriages introduce additional complexities, particularly when spouses originate from jurisdictions with disparate legal and financial frameworks (Creese, 2015). The current legal vacuum in Indonesia regarding pre-marital liabilities and marital financial contracts poses significant challenges, further exacerbated by the underutilization and insufficient regulation of post-marriage prenuptial agreements permitted by the Constitutional Court (Jamadi et al., 2022). The absence of mandatory pre-marital financial disclosure and the lack of clear guidelines on the classification of pre-marital debts contribute to judicial inconsistency and unpredictable legal outcomes. The increase in divorce cases in Indonesia can be attributed to various factors, including economic problems and incompatibility, which underscores the necessity of a clear and comprehensive legal framework to address marital disputes (Nurhayati & Siregar, 2019). The rise in divorce rates in regions such as Padang City highlights the growing challenges faced by couples in maintaining harmonious marital relationships (Fhitrah & Afdal, 2021). The Indonesian government's efforts to minimize child marriages through legislation demonstrate a commitment to protecting vulnerable individuals and promoting family well-being (Mukri, 2021). The religious courts in Indonesia primarily handle family law disputes, including those related to marriage and inheritance among Muslims, who constitute a significant portion of the population (Butt, 2012). The intersection of religious norms and legal principles shapes the interpretation and application of family law in Indonesia, reflecting the country's diverse cultural and religious landscape (Solikin & Wasik, 2023).

`

CONCLUSION

This study has demonstrated that Indonesia's current legal framework offers insufficient clarity and protection in relation to pre-marital debt, particularly when prenuptial agreements are absent. Although Law No. 1 of 1974 and the Indonesian Civil Code provide a basic division between joint and separate property, the ambiguity surrounding debt classification—especially debts incurred before marriage—has resulted in inconsistent judicial outcomes. The absence of statutory guidance leaves courts to rely heavily on discretionary interpretation and equity principles, which may undermine spousal autonomy and the principle of legal certainty. Without mechanisms for mandatory financial disclosure and robust contractual enforcement, spouses—particularly those in weaker financial positions—remain vulnerable to inheriting unforeseen financial obligations, thereby threatening marital stability and trust.

The comparative analysis reveals that jurisdictions such as the Netherlands, the United States, and the United Kingdom have adopted more protective and precise regulatory frameworks. These systems incorporate procedural safeguards—such as full financial disclosure, independent legal counsel, and substantive fairness review—into the enforceability of prenuptial agreements. They recognize marriage as a contractual and economic partnership and emphasize informed consent as a precondition for assigning financial responsibilities. These principles help ensure that prenuptial agreements do not become tools for exploitation but rather function as instruments for protecting individual rights and managing marital expectations.

Indonesia’s post-2015 constitutional reform allowing post-marital agreements has expanded the potential for financial self-determination within marriage. However, the lack of detailed implementation rules, judicial consistency, and public legal education has limited its practical effect. The comparative legal systems studied demonstrate the value of detailed regulatory standards and functional legal institutions in safeguarding equitable outcomes in family law. These findings highlight the urgency for Indonesian lawmakers and judicial authorities to develop a more coherent and enforceable framework governing marital property and debt obligations.

To bridge the gap with international best practices and strengthen the protection of marital parties in both domestic and transnational contexts, Indonesia should adopt comprehensive legal reforms. These include: mandating full pre-marital financial disclosures, establishing procedural safeguards for prenuptial agreements, issuing judicial guidelines on the classification of pre-marital debts, and promoting harmonization with comparative family law principles. Such reforms would promote fairness, certainty, and autonomy within the Indonesian marital legal regime while aligning national family law with evolving global standards.

REFERENCES

Books :

Mashdurohatun, A. (2020). *Kepastian Hukum Harta Bawaan dan Perjanjian Perkawinan di Indonesia*. Semarang: Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro.

Otto, J. M. (2005). *Rule of Law Promotion, Land Tenure and Poverty Alleviation: Questioning the Assumptions of Hernando de Soto*. Leiden University Legal Studies.

Putusan Mahkamah Konstitusi Republik Indonesia Nomor 69/PUU-XIII/2015. (2015). *Amendment on the requirement of prenuptial agreements prior to marriage*.

Reilly, P. (2006). *Property, Obligations, and Marriage: A Comparative Perspective*. International Journal of Law, Policy and the Family, 20(1), 33–56.

Smith, H. (2003). *Marital Property and the Law of Obligations: Common Law Perspectives*. Cambridge Law Review, 62(2), 251–278.

Soeroso, R. (2010). *Pengantar Ilmu Hukum*. Jakarta: Sinar Grafika.

`

Tait, J. (2017). *Marriage, Property, and the Limits of Contractual Freedom*. Journal of Comparative Family Law, 42(1), 101–132.

Journal With DOI:

Ardyo, B. (2020). Formulasi pengaturan tahapan pra kontrak dalam proses pembentukan kontrak di Indonesia. *Jurnal Yustika: Media Hukum dan Keadilan*, 22(2), 84. https://doi.org/10.24123/yustika.v22i02.2406

Ariqah, N., Pasyah, R. A., & Muzacky, A. (2023). Status of children from siri's marriage (Case study of Constitutional Court Decision No. 46/PUU-VIII/2010). *AURELIA: Jurnal Penelitian dan Pengabdian Masyarakat Indonesia*, 2(2), 1197. https://doi.org/10.57235/aurelia.v2i2.716

Budiartha, I. N. P. (2018). Principles of contract law underlying business activities in the globalization era. https://doi.org/10.2991/icblt-18.2018.17

Butt, S. (2012). Asia-Pacific. *Alternative Law Journal*, 37(3), 196. https://doi.org/10.1177/1037969x1203700314

Creese, H. (2015). The legal status of widows and divorcees (janda) in colonial Bali. *Indonesia and the Malay World*, 44(128), 84. https://doi.org/10.1080/13639811.2015.1100862

Febrianto, T. B. H. (2023). Peran civil law dalam sistem hukum Indonesia. *Jurnal Hukum dan Sosial Politik*, 2(1), 235. https://doi.org/10.59581/jhsp-widyakarya.v2i1.2183

Fhitrah, K. M. E., & Afdal, A. (2021). Marital quality: Analysis on couples who have long-distance marriages. *Jurnal Aplikasi IPTEK Indonesia*, 5(1), 28. https://doi.org/10.24036/4.15389

Hartanto, J. A. (2020). The philosophy of legal reason in Indonesian law. *Beijing Law Review*, 11(1), 119. https://doi.org/10.4236/blr.2020.111008

Hoggart, R. (2021). Post reform legal system updates in Indonesia. *Journal of Law Policy and Globalization*. https://doi.org/10.7176/jlpg/110-11

Jamadi, J., Suparman, E., & Mashdurohatun, A. (2022). Legal reconstruction of intellectual property rights as joint property in marriage based on justice value. *Scholars International Journal of Law, Crime and Justice*, 5(11), 489. https://doi.org/10.36348/sijlcj.2022.v05i11.003

Karman, K. (2021). Understanding civil law in the context of contemporary Islam in Indonesia. *Al-Mada: Jurnal Agama Sosial dan Budaya*, 4(2), 388. https://doi.org/10.31538/almada.v4i2.1700

Kasih, D. P. D., & Utami, P. D. Y. (2021). Standard contract on banking sector: Regulation and description in internal banking regulations. *Jurnal Magister Hukum Udayana (Udayana Master Law Journal)*, 10(2), 251. https://doi.org/10.24843/jmhu.2021.v10.i02.p05

Mukri, M. (2021). Pencegahan dan pembatalan perkawinan. *Deleted Journal*, 13(2), 101. https://doi.org/10.53746/perspektif.v13i2.29

Ncube, W. (1990). Re-allocation of matrimonial property at the dissolution of marriage in Zimbabwe. *Journal of African Law*, 34(1), 1. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0021855300008159

Nurhayati, N., & Siregar, H. F. (2019). Aspek yuridis status hukum anak dalam sengketa perceraian dan pembatalan perkawinan. *Rechtsregel: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum*, 2(1). https://doi.org/10.32493/rjih.v2i1.2959

Pohan, M. (2020). Conception of franchise agreement in protecting the legal interests of parties based on Indonesian civil law, *1*(2). https://doi.org/10.55357/ijrs.v1i2.63

Putri, A. A., & Jansen, B. (2021). Dynamics of reasonableness and fairness in a pluralistic legal system: Perspectives from adat, Islamic and civil inheritance law. *Yuridika*, 36(1), 1. https://doi.org/10.20473/ydk.v36i1.19170

Reilly, M. T. (2006). You and me against the world: Marriage and divorce from creditors' perspective. In *Reconceiving the Family: Critique on the American Law Institute's Principles of the Law of Family Dissolution*. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.910249

Sihombing, B. F. (2024). Indonesian law: Development and renewal. *Beijing Law Review*, 15(1), 1. https://doi.org/10.4236/blr.2024.151001

Smith, I. (2003). The law and economics of marriage contracts. *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 17(2), 201. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-6419.00193

Solikin, N., & Wasik, M. (2023). The construction of family law in the Compilation of Islamic Law in Indonesia: A review of John Rawls's concept of justice and Jasser Auda's *Maqashid al-Shari'a*. *ULUMUNA*, 27(1), 315. https://doi.org/10.20414/ujis.v27i1.708

Sood, M. (2020). Mechanism of business contract drafting in supporting economic activities. *Unram Law Review*, 4(2), 193. https://doi.org/10.29303/ulrev.v4i2.124

Suwardiyati, R., Wicaksono, S., & Ganindha, R. (2018). Principle of freedom of contract in public contract. https://doi.org/10.2991/iceml-18.2018.62