JIHAD: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum dan Administrasi
Vol. 8 No. 3 September 2026
p-ISSN : 2745-9489, e-ISSNl 2746-3842
DOI: *10.36312/jihad.v8i2.11387/*https://ejournal.mandalanursa.org/index.php/JIHAD/issue/archive

Responsibility of Construction Consulting Service Providers for Third Party Losses

Gabriel Libertus Turnip[1], Pahala Sinambela[2], Muh. Amin Saleh[3], Muhenri Sihotang[4], Appe Hutauruk[5]
Program Studi Ilmu Hukum, Fakultas Hukum, Universitas Mpu Tantular, Indonesia

Article Info

Article history:
Accepted: 19 Agustus 2026
Publish: 2 September 2026

Keywords:
Construction Services;
Construction;
Construction Projects;
Losses;
Third Parties.

Abstract

In practice, third-party victims often encounter legal obstacles and difficulty in claiming compensation because consultants hide behind the principle of contractual personality and the lack of explicit regulations detailing external protections in the Construction Services Law, so that the process of recovering victims' rights is suboptimal. Das Sollen: Construction consultancy service providers should bear clear and firm legal responsibility to third parties if proven to have committed professional errors or negligence that violates safety standards, codes of ethics, and the principle of prudence, as mandated by Article 1365 of the Civil Code concerning Unlawful Acts. Legal protection for third parties is a form of public justice that cannot be ignored by the barriers of internal contractual relationships in the project. This research uses normative legal research, which is examined through a statutory approach, a conceptual approach, and a case study approach using primary, secondary, and tertiary legal materials analyzed qualitatively using a descriptive-analytical method. Indonesian positive law through Law Number 2 of 2017 concerning Construction Services clearly regulates the liability of service providers for building failures due to planning or supervision, where third parties have a legal basis to claim compensation under Article 1365 of the Civil Code even though they are not bound by a direct contract, with professional standards, codes of ethics, and duty of care as the primary references for determining professional error. The form of legal responsibility of construction consultancy service providers can arise through default or unlawful acts, where the consultant can be held responsible for paying material and immaterial compensation if it is proven that the losses to third parties are a direct result of professional errors such as negligence in technical analysis, errors in working drawings, or supervision that does not meet standards.

Corresponding Author:
Appe Hutauruk
Program Studi Ilmu Hukum, Fakultas Hukum, Universitas Mpu Tantular, Indonesia
Email Coresspondent: appehturuk@gmail.com

1. INTRODUCTION

As infrastructure development increases, the complexity of construction service delivery also increases. The implementation of a construction project involves not only service users and construction service providers (contractors), but also construction consultancy services, consisting of planning consultants and supervisory consultants. Consultants play a highly strategic role, responsible for developing technical plans, providing professional recommendations, and overseeing construction work to ensure compliance with technical specifications, safety standards, and statutory regulations. In practice, the quality of a building is determined not only by the contractor's ability to execute the construction work but also by the quality of the consultant's planning and supervision. Design errors, structural calculation errors, suboptimal work supervision, or negligence in providing technical recommendations can result in building failure, resulting in losses for various parties (Manurung, 2022).

Losses resulting from construction activities are not only experienced by service users and service providers bound by the contractual relationship, but can also be experienced by third parties who have no direct legal relationship with the parties to the construction contract. These third parties can include communities surrounding the project site, owners of buildings adjacent to the project, road users, business owners, and the general public affected by the construction work (Wahid, Hutauruk, Sinambela, & Hutahaean, 2026). Losses experienced by third parties can include damage to buildings, damage to public facilities, environmental pollution, disruption of community economic activities, workplace accidents impacting the surrounding community, and even loss of life due to building collapse or construction failure. These conditions indicate that construction services activities carry significant legal risks, requiring clear and firm regulations regarding the responsibilities of each construction service provider (Febrian, 2026).

Normatively, the provision of construction services in Indonesia is regulated by Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 2 of 2017 concerning Construction Services, which is further regulated by Government Regulation of the Republic of Indonesia Number 22 of 2020 concerning Implementing Regulations of Law Number 2 of 2017 concerning Construction Services. Both regulations emphasize that construction service providers are required to meet safety, security, health, and sustainability standards at every stage of construction work. This obligation constitutes a form of legal protection for service users and the public who may potentially suffer losses due to the provision of construction services. Furthermore, the legal relationship between consultants and service users is essentially born from an agreement, as stipulated in Article 1233 of the Civil Code, which stipulates that every obligation arises from an agreement or by law. Based on this provision, consultants have contractual obligations to service users according to the contents of the agreed-upon agreement (Ferdy, Muktisani, Syaro, & Zaskiah, 2026).

Legal issues arise when losses are actually experienced by a third party who is not part of the contractual relationship. In such circumstances, the third party cannot file a claim based on breach of contract because they do not have a contractual relationship with the consultant. Therefore, the legal basis that can be used is the provisions regarding Unlawful Acts as regulated in Article 1365 of the Civil Code, which states that any unlawful act that causes harm to another person requires the perpetrator to compensate for the loss. However, the application of Article 1365 of the Civil Code to construction consultancy service providers still raises various issues (Prayoga, Sofiana, Ashfiya, & Khoirudin, 2026). One of the main issues is proving the existence of professional error by the consultant, considering that consultants essentially only provide intellectual services in the form of planning and supervision and are not directly implementing construction work. In judicial practice, debate often arises as to whether the losses experienced by third parties are a direct result of the consultant's negligence, the contractor's error, the service user's error, or a combination of these factors. Furthermore, Law Number 2 of 2017 concerning Construction Services primarily regulates the legal relationship between service users and construction service providers, while provisions regarding legal protection for third parties have not been detailed. Consequently, there remains a gap in norms regarding the limits of liability of planning consultants and supervisory consultants for losses suffered by third parties (Safran Pasaribu, Arif Lubis, & Aslami, 2026).

Several previous studies have focused on the discussion of legal liability in construction services, focusing more on the contractor's responsibility to service users (Priyambodo, 2021), the resolution of construction contract disputes (Napitupulu & Haryanto, 2024), and building failures (Arifin et al., 2023; Daeli, 2025). Research specifically addressing the liability of construction consultancy service providers for third-party losses is still relatively limited. Therefore, there remains a research gap that requires further study, particularly regarding the legal basis for consultant liability, the limits of consultant professional liability, and legal protection mechanisms for third parties.

Theoretically, this research is important because it contributes to the development of civil law, particularly regarding the relationship between the theory of contract, the theory of legal responsibility, the theory of torts, and the theory of professional responsibility in the provision of construction services.1[6] This research also provides an analysis of the extension of the legal responsibility of construction consultancy service providers to third parties who are not in a contractual relationship.

Practically, the results of this research are expected to serve as a guideline for construction consultancy service providers in carrying out their professional obligations more responsibly, serve as a consideration for the government in improving construction service regulations, and provide legal certainty for the public who experience losses due to the implementation of construction work. Based on this description, the author is interested in conducting research entitled "The Responsibility of Construction Consultancy Service Providers (Planning/Supervisory Consultants) for Third Party Losses".

2. METHOD

This research employs a normative legal research approach, examining positive legal norms, legal principles, legal doctrine, and court decisions related to the liability of construction consultancy service providers for third-party losses. The approaches employed in this research include a statute approach, which examines all laws and regulations related to the provision of construction services, civil law, and other relevant regulations; a conceptual approach, which examines legal doctrine, principles, and concepts regarding legal responsibility, torts, legal protection, and professional responsibility; and a case study approach, which analyzes court decisions related to construction service disputes and tort claims to obtain legal arguments.

The legal sources and materials used in this research are classified into three categories: primary, secondary, and tertiary legal materials. Primary legal materials consist of the Civil Code (Burgerlijk Wetboek), Law Number 2 of 2017 concerning Construction Services, Law Number 11 of 2020 concerning Job Creation, Law Number 6 of 2023 concerning the Stipulation of Government Regulation in Lieu of Law Number 2 of 2022 concerning Job Creation into Law, Government Regulation in Lieu of Law Number 2 of 2022 concerning Job Creation, Government Regulation Number 22 of 2020 concerning Implementing Regulations of Law Number 2 of 2017 concerning Construction Services, Government Regulation Number 14 of 2021 concerning Amendments to Government Regulation Number 22 of 2020 concerning Implementing Regulations of Law Number 2 of 2017 concerning Construction Services, as well as relevant court decisions. Secondary legal materials include law books, scholarly articles, national and international journals, research results, and expert opinions, while tertiary legal materials include the Legal Dictionary, the Legal Encyclopedia, and the Great Dictionary of the Indonesian Language.

The data collection technique in this research was conducted through library research, which included searching for legal documents and reviewing court decisions relevant to the research object. The collected legal materials were then processed and analyzed qualitatively using descriptive-analytical methods. The analysis was conducted through interpretation of legal norms, doctrines, and court decisions, followed by drawing conclusions using deductive reasoning, which involves drawing conclusions from general provisions to resolve specific problems.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A major legal issue in the Indonesian construction services industry is the continued neglect of protection for third parties (the general public) who suffer losses due to building failures stemming from the negligence of planning and supervising consultants. Normatively, the Construction Services Law and its implementing regulations are exclusive, governing only the internal relationship between service users, service providers, and the government, creating a legal vacuum (rechtscelum) for external parties. In dispute resolution, third-party victims are hampered by the doctrine of privity of contract under Article 1340 of the Civil Code (KUHPerdata), which limits legal obligations to only the parties signing the contract, allowing consultants to easily seek cover under private contracts to avoid direct prosecution. When victims attempt to sue through Unlawful Acts (PMH) under Article 1365 of the Civil Code, they face a severe evidentiary barrier (probatio diabolica) related to the elements of professional negligence and causality. The victims' position is further weakened by information asymmetry resulting from the monopoly of technical documents by corporations, the absence of regulations that integrate professional standards or doctrines such as the presumption of negligence into positive law, and the lack of mandatory Third Party Liability insurance. Due to the blurring of proportional liability boundaries among project actors and the dominance of commercially biased positivistic-legalistic views in the judiciary, legal processes often result in blame-shifting practices and the deprivation of substantive justice for affected communities.

An in-depth study of Indonesia's positive legal system in the construction services sector reveals fundamental weaknesses related to the regulation of legal liability of consultancy service providers, including planning consultants and supervisory consultants, for losses suffered by third parties (external communities). Based on a comprehensive review using the Legal Protection Theory initiated by Philipus M. Hadjon and Satjipto Rahardjo, the law is essentially created to guarantee certainty, justice, and protection of the interests of all legal subjects without exception, both those bound by contractual relationships and external parties affected externally. However, the current sectoral legal instruments, particularly Law Number 2 of 2017 concerning Construction Services as amended by the Job Creation Law, are proven to still focus exclusively on regulating vertical-corporate and administrative legal relationships. These regulations only map business interactions between service users (owners), service providers (planners, supervisors, and implementing contractors), and the government as regulator, while the dimensions of preventive and repressive legal protection for the wider community outside the scope of construction projects are often neglected normatively. From the perspective of Preventive Legal Protection Theory, the state has not been able to provide a preventative instrument that requires consulting service providers to take into account the impact of project externalities on public safety in detail in the law. Meanwhile, from the perspective of Repressive Legal Protection Theory, this lack of explicit norms makes it difficult for third-party victims to claim their right to redress due to the absence of references to sectoral articles that explicitly mandate legal liability for consultants who are negligent in their dealings with external safety. This creates a normative vacuum (rechtsleegte) that undermines substantive justice (Setiawan, 2024).

This normative weakness is further exacerbated by the orthodox classical civil law doctrines, namely the principle of freedom of contract and the principle of contractual personality, or privity of contract, as explicitly stipulated in Article 1340 of the Civil Code (KUHPerdata). Based on this fundamental doctrine of contract law, a construction work contract document is legally binding only on the parties who sign it, while external parties who have no role in the project's implementation are deemed to have no legal connection whatsoever. In the construction project ecosystem, the planning consultant who designs the blueprint and the supervising consultant responsible for the field are contractually bound exclusively to the owner. The absolute legal consequence of applying this principle is that when a third party suffers severe losses such as the destruction of a resident's house, disabling physical injuries, or even loss of life due to the collapse of a building structure stemming from careless technical planning or negligent supervision, they encounter a thick wall of privity of contract doctrine in the courtroom. Consultants can easily hide behind the argument that they are not bound by a contract with the victim, so that, doctrinally, they are purely free from demands for performance or breach of contract. This closes the conventional door for third parties, forcing them to seek other legal instruments outside the contractual legal regime to seek justice for the disaster that befell them and their property without any fault on the part of the victim (Basri, Sahputra, & Sitompul, 2026).

To overcome the impasse of the privity of contract doctrine, the only universal civil path available in Indonesian positive law is through the application of the provisions of Article 1365 of the Civil Code concerning Unlawful Acts (PMH) or onrechtmatige daad. The existence of Article 1365 of the Civil Code functions as a universal safety net that breaks the boundaries of contracts by placing obligations between fellow citizens to not cause harm to other parties, which in legal doctrine is known as the principle of neminem laedere. However, the application of the Theory of Unlawful Acts to the construction consultant profession faces extraordinary conceptual and dogmatic obstacles, considering that the article was originally designed for direct violations of private subjective rights, not for losses arising from high-risk technical professional activities. Based on the Theory of Legal Liability, imposing liability on non-contractual parties requires an expansion of the duty of care doctrine, whereby a technical professional, such as an architect or civil engineer, is deemed to have a moral and legal obligation not to endanger public safety in their work area, regardless of the absence of a transactional relationship. The absence of a clear codification of the duty of care doctrine in Indonesian positive law makes third parties highly vulnerable, as they are required to prove that a consultant's violation of technical standards on a client's project is directly qualified as a civil tort that harms their personal interests in court (Adzan, 2024).

Another crucial issue that marks the chaotic state of the national construction law is the continued blurring of the boundaries of proportional legal liability among the various legal entities involved in the modern industrial supply chain. In large-scale construction practices, an infrastructure project involves a complex multi-sector network, from the capital owner (owner), planning consultant, supervisory consultant, to the implementing contractor. When a building failure triggers massive losses for third parties, Indonesian positive law fundamentally fails to formulate the doctrine of joint and several liability (solidair verbintenis) or an instrument for apportioning the blame among the service providers involved. The Construction Services Law, while normatively mapping out the administrative duties of each subject on paper, fails to provide operational guidance when losses extend to the external realm. As a concrete illustration in the field, when a public facility collapses and injures residents, third-party victims are immediately faced with a confusing maze of legal dilemmas regarding who is most legally responsible. This lack of clear legal boundaries is ironically often exploited strategically by business actors to engage in blame-shifting practices. In court, planning consultants tend to argue that building failures occurred due to poor field supervision by the supervising consultant or deviant execution by the implementing contractor, while the supervising consultants hide behind daily reports as if they had issued written warnings. As a result of this lack of norms and conflicting evidence, the judicial process becomes protracted, expensive, and ultimately robs innocent third-party victims of their rights to restorative justice and legal protection (Marito, & Kanthika, 2024).

Besides the issue of determining the subject of liability, the biggest and most complex obstacle in claiming compensation through the general civil regime is the extraordinary difficulty in proving the element of professional negligence. Based on Indonesian civil procedural law, which is guided by the principle that those who allege are obliged to prove (Article 163 HIR / Article 283 RBg), third parties are burdened with an absolute obligation to prove the existence of an element of error, negligence, or technical deviation committed by the planning consultant or the supervising consultant. The main problem is that proving professional negligence in the construction sector cannot be done visibly by the layperson or even by civil judges who have a background in pure law, not civil engineering or architecture. Proving whether a planning consultant made an error in structural calculations or whether the supervising consultant was negligent in controlling implementation in the field requires an in-depth forensic audit of the building, laboratory testing of materials, and independent expert testimony, which are very expensive. The absence of an independent appraisal body officially recognized by the judicial system to assist third-party victims leaves them trapped in a nearly impossible state of proof (probatio diabolica). Victims face information asymmetry because all crucial technical documents, from blueprints and structural calculation sheets to field logs, are completely controlled and monopolized by construction corporations. Without the adoption of progressive modern legal doctrines such as res ipsa loquitur (the facts speak for themselves) or the presumption of negligence (the legal presumption of negligence) to shift the burden of proof to consultants, civil litigation for third parties will continue to result in substantive failures.

This weak legal accountability framework is further exacerbated by the suboptimal implementation of professional standards, technical standards, and codes of ethics as the basis for construction consultants' legal liability in court. In Indonesia, professional organizations such as the Indonesian Architects Association (IAI), the Indonesian Engineers Association (PII), and the Indonesian Construction Experts Association (HAKI) already have strict codes of ethics and technical standards, including compliance with Indonesian National Standards (SNI). However, the sanctions imposed by the professional ethics council are generally purely internal and administrative in nature, such as written warnings or suspension of internal expertise certificates, without any executive power capable of recovering material losses suffered by the public outside the organization. In judicial practice, technical standards and codes of ethics are often reduced to mere internal administrative guidelines, rather than being used as objective benchmarks (standards of care) by judges to assess whether or not an unlawful act has occurred. When consultants violate structural safety standards to meet service users' demands for budget efficiency, threatening public safety, these violations should automatically constitute grounds for civil liability. The lack of integration between professional standards and positive law allows consultants to easily evade legal action, while the safety of third parties is sacrificed for short-term commercial interests (Novindrastuti, Suartini, & Hidayat, 2024).

The most significant impact felt by victims of this systemic weakness is the absence of a comprehensive, effective, and equitable compensation mechanism, reflecting a failure in repressive protection based on the Theory of Legal Protection. In the current reality of civil justice, a victim's victory before a panel of judges, even if they have successfully proven an unlawful act, often ends up as a mere illusory victory (paper victory). The execution of the compensation decision often reaches a dead end due to the limited liquid assets of the consulting firm in question, or due to the lack of adequate financial protection instruments to guarantee the full restoration of victims' rights. The Construction Services Law does address the importance of risk management through insurance, but the mandatory schemes are generally designed exclusively to protect the internal interests of business actors, such as Contractor's All Risks (CAR) which focuses on physical losses of building materials or work accident insurance for workers. In contrast, protection instruments specifically aimed at guaranteeing external parties—third-party liability insurance (TPL) and Professional Indemnity Insurance—have not been integrated as absolute, imperative requirements in every high-risk project permit issuance. Due to the absence of this comprehensive mechanism, the burden of project failure risk is not distributed fairly to business actors who enjoy economic benefits, but rather unequally and is borne entirely by the general public, who suffer physical and psychological losses independently.

The root of the slow pace of construction law reform in Indonesia lies not only at the technical level of legislation but also deeply rooted in the limitations of academic discourse in the Indonesian legal world. Legal literature and academic research in universities have for years been dominated by commercial studies that view the construction sector solely as a macroeconomic instrument to boost investment, capital growth, and achieve physical development targets. While the dimensions of public safety, environmental protection, and the human rights of affected citizens are often marginalized. This limited academic discourse creates a conceptual vacuum for legislators to formulate progressive legal policies and leaves legal practitioners and judges with little doctrinal reference when faced with innovative cases that require broad legal interpretation. Therefore, a radical paradigmatic overhaul is needed through the integration of professional standards into positive law, the development of responsive civil doctrine, the imperative obligation of TPL insurance, and the strengthening of interdisciplinary academic studies, so that the national construction legal order no longer ignores the rights of justice of third parties who are vulnerable to the destructive impacts of modern infrastructure development, but instead becomes a comprehensive public protection instrument (erga omnes) in order to uphold a legal state that is socially just for all Indonesian people.

4. CONCLUSION

Legal regulations regarding the responsibility of construction consultancy service providers (planning consultants and supervisory consultants) for losses suffered by third parties according to Indonesian positive law are emphasized that Law Number 2 of 2017 concerning Construction Services clearly regulates the responsibility of service providers for building failures, including failures resulting from planning or supervision errors. Although the sectoral law has not explicitly detailed protection for external parties who are not bound by a contract, third parties still have a valid legal basis to claim compensation based on Article 1365 of the Civil Code (KUHPerdata) concerning Unlawful Acts, even though they do not have a direct contractual relationship with the consultant. Within this framework, professional standards, codes of ethics, and the principle of prudence (duty of care) are the main references in determining whether or not there is professional error in construction consultancy activities, which is also supported by the parameters of the Security, Safety, Health, and Sustainability Standards and the mechanism for determining Building Failure by Expert Assessors. The form of legal liability of construction consultancy service providers for third party losses based on Law Number 2 of 2017 concerning Construction Services and the Civil Code can arise through the default regime or unlawful acts, where this depends on whether the third party's loss is caused by a breach of contract or purely due to professional negligence. Based on Article 60 of the Construction Services Law and the general civil regime through Article 1365 and Article 1366 of the Civil Code, planning consultants and supervisory consultants can be held liable if it is legally proven that the third party's loss is a direct impact of professional negligence, such as negligence in technical analysis, errors in working drawings, or supervision of implementation in the field that does not meet standards. This form of liability requires the consultant to restore the victim's condition and bear all material and immaterial compensation in full to restore the victim's position as before (restitutio in integrum).

5. BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adzan, M. (2024). Perlindungan Hukum Pelaku Usaha Dalam Sengketa Kontraktual Pengadaan Barang Dan Jasa Konstruksi Pemerintah Ditinjau Dari Aspek Hukum Perdata. *JISPENDIORA Jurnal Ilmu Sosial Pendidikan Dan Humaniora*, *3*(3), 164-183. https://doi.org/10.56910/jispendiora.v3i3.3091

Arifin, Z., *et al*. (2023). Keabsahan dan perlindungan hukum perjanjian kemitraan jasa konstruksi. *Jurnal USM Law Review*, *6*(1), 65–78. https://doi.org/10.26623/julr.v6i1.6095

Basri, H., Sahputra, R., & Sitompul, A. (2026). Perlindungan Hukum Terhadap Pengguna Jasa dan Penyedia Jasa Pekerjaan Jasa Konstruksi dalam Tahap Pelaksanaan Konstruksi. *Judge: Jurnal Hukum*, *6*(11), 2454-2462. https://doi.org/10.54209/judge.v6i11.2592

Daeli, S. D. (2025). Pertanggungjawaban hukum bagi penyedia jasa konstruksi dan pengguna jasa konstruksi dalam kegagalan bangunan. *Jurnal Ilmu Ekonomi, Pendidikan dan Teknik*, *2*(3), 122–129. https://doi.org/10.70134/identik.v2i3.732

Febrian, R. I. (2026). Enshrining Non-Solicitation and Non-Competition Doctrines within Employment Agreement Provisions. *Smart Journal of Criminal Law Review and Analysis*, *1*(3), 17–32. https://doi.org/10.65101/scrim.v1i3.76

Ferdy, M., Muktisani, P. G., Syaro, M. S., & Zaskiah, R. A. (2026). Analisis Manajemen Konflik dalam Proses Pembebasan Lahan Proyek Infrastruktur di Jalan MERR Kota Surabaya. *Indonesian Journal of Innovation Multidisipliner Research*, *4*(3), 5385–5392. https://doi.org/10.69693/ijim.v4i3.787

Manurung, E. H. (2022). Kontrak Konstruksi Infrastruktur Ditinjau Dari Perspektif Undang-Undang Nomor 2 Tahun 2017 Tentang Jasa Konstruksi. *Legal Studies Journal.*, *2*(2). https://doi.org/10.33650/lsj.v2i2.4302

Marito, A., & Kanthika, I. M. (2024). Mitigasi Risiko Sengketa dalam Kontrak Jasa Konstruksi di Pemerintahan Kota Tangerang Selatan. *Arus Jurnal Sosial dan Humaniora*, *4*(3), 2488-2501. https://doi.org/10.57250/ajsh.v4i3.971

Napitupulu, L. A. T., & Haryanto, I. (2024). Pertanggungjawaban hukum konsultan konstruksi terhadap kegagalan konstruksi bangunan. *Jurnal USM Law Review*, *7*(1), 45–58. https://doi.org/10.26623/julr.v7i1.7756

Novindrastuti, A., Suartini, S., & Hidayat, Y. (2024). Kajian hukum tentang e-tendering dalam pengadaan barang dan jasa konstruksi. *Binamulia Hukum*, *13*(2), 447-459. https://doi.org/10.37893/jbh.v13i2.953

Prayoga, M. R., Sofiana, N. O., Ashfiya, S., & Khoirudin, A. A. (2026). Konstitusionalitas Pembangunan Koperasi Desa/Kelurahan Merah Putih sebagai Proyek Strategis Nasional serta Kesesuaiannya dengan Prinsip-Prinsip Perkoperasian dalam Mewujudkan Pemerataan Ekonomi Desa. *Ethos and Pragmatic Law Review*, *2*(2), 158–173. https://doi.org/10.69836/ethos.v2i2.343

Priyambodo, M. A. (2021). Mekanisme penyelesaian sengketa konstruksi menurut Undang-Undang Nomor 2 Tahun 2017 tentang Jasa Konstruksi. *Iblam Law Review*, *1*(3), 173–177. https://doi.org/10.52249/ilr.v1i3.32

SafranPasaribu, A., ArifLubis, F., & Aslami, N. (2026). Dampak Pelatihan Anti-Fraud terhadap Kesadaran dan Perilaku Karyawan. *Tasyri.*, *8*(1), 103–115. https://doi.org/10.55656/tjmes.v8i1.778

Setiawan, B. (2024). Perlindungan hukum para pihak dalam perjanjian jasa konstruksi. *Jurnal Cinta Nusantara (JCN)*, *2*(02). https://doi.org/10.63754/jcn.v2i02.36

Wahid, S., Hutauruk, A., Sinambela, H., & Hutahaean, F. M. P. (2026). Debtor's default and Bank Rakyat Indonesia credit guarantee auction procedure. *JILPR Journal Indonesia Law and Policy Review*, *7*(3), 644–654. https://doi.org/10.56371/jirpl.v7i3.700