Journal of International Islamic Law, Human Rights and Public Policy
(JISHUP Journal) | ISSN(e): 3031-2280
Website https://jishup.org/index.php/ojs/index| Volume 4 No. 4 (2026)

JURIDICAL ANALYSIS OF LEGAL PROTECTION FOR SHAREHOLDERS DUE TO THE CANCELLATION OF A NOTARIAL DEED BY A COURT DECISION (CASE STUDY OF CASSATION DECISION 4605 K/PDT/2025

Antoni Harsono, Erniyanti
Universitas Batam
E-mail: **Anthonyharsono@ymail.com, erniyanti@univbatam.ac.id**

Received: 03/07/2026 | **Revised:** 10/07/2026 | **Accepted:** 29/07/2026 | **Published:**31/08/2026

Abstract

The unilateral dismissal of corporate organs through an Extraordinary General Meeting of Shareholders (EGMS) potentially triggers corporate disputes and the degradation of the legality of a Notarial deed. This dispute raises complex juridical problems, especially when a Notarial deed is canceled by a cassation-level court decision that has obtained permanent legal force (inkracht), thereby dragging the Notary's office into the vortex of share ownership conflicts. This research aims to analyze the legal standing of the parties regarding the cancellation of the Notarial Deed, classify the juridical reasons for the deed's cancellation from the aspect of Unlawful Acts (Onrechtmatige Daad) and procedural violations, and examine the mechanism for restoring the administrative rights of the parties post-court decision. This research utilizes a normative-empirical legal research method. Data were obtained through library research and focused on the analysis of primary data in the form of Supreme Court Decision Number 4605 K/Pdt/2025, minutes of meeting documents, as well as the results of in-depth interviews with the Notary who formulated the deed and the disputing parties. The research results indicate that the dispute arose due to the disregard of the subjective rights of minority shareholders, where the dismissal from the position of Commissioner was carried out without stating specific reasons and without the right to self-defense. The Supreme Court classified the Directors' actions as an Unlawful Act because it violated imperative provisions, thus resulting in the EGMS Minutes Deed being declared null and void by law. The Notary was not subjected to material compensation sanctions but bears a passive obligation to adjust the records on the minuta (minute) of the deed. In conclusion, repressive legal protection for the injured party is achieved through the cancellation of the deed by the judiciary, but the protection of administrative rights is still hindered by execution desynchronization, thus requiring a manual data update application to the Legal Entity Administration System (SABH) to realize the restoration to the original state (restitutio in integrum).

Keywords: Deed Cancellation, Unlawful Act, EGMS, Legal Protection,Cassation Decision.

INTRODUCTION

A limited liability company is an important legal institution in Indonesia's economic system. As a legal entity, a company possesses rights and obligations that are legally separated from the personal rights and obligations of its shareholders. This separation creates a distinctive legal structure in which corporate actions must be undertaken through authorized corporate organs and in accordance with applicable legislation and the company's articles of association. The legal relationship within a company is therefore not merely contractual in nature. It is also institutional. Shareholders, Directors, Commissioners, and the General Meeting of Shareholders each possess different powers and responsibilities. The distribution of authority is intended to prevent the concentration of corporate power in one party and to create a system of checks and balances. Law Number 40 of 2007 concerning Limited Liability Companies recognizes shareholders as holders of legally protected rights. Among those rights are the right to attend and vote at a General Meeting of Shareholders (GMS), receive dividends and liquidation proceeds, and exercise other rights provided by company legislation. The protection of shareholder rights becomes particularly important when a corporate decision directly affects the shareholder's economic or governance interests. This is especially relevant in disputes involving the dismissal of members of the Board of Directors or Board of Commissioners. Although shareholders possess authority to make corporate decisions through the GMS, such authority must be exercised according to legal procedures. The principle of majority rule cannot be interpreted as an unlimited power to impose decisions upon minority shareholders. Majority shareholders remain subject to statutory requirements, the company's articles of association, principles of good faith, fairness, and the protection of individual legal rights. In corporate practice, decisions of the GMS are frequently recorded in a Notarial deed. The involvement of a Notary is important because the Notary is a public official authorized to create authentic deeds. An authentic deed is intended to provide certainty regarding the occurrence and content of a legal act. Nevertheless, the evidentiary strength of a Notarial deed does not mean that the underlying legal act is immune from judicial review. The thesis underlying this article explains that the Notary has an exclusive authority to frame the legal acts of shareholders into an authentic deed with evidentiary force covering external, formal, and material aspects. This function is intended to create legal certainty and legal protection.

However, an authentic deed may become the subject of judicial examination when a dispute concerns the legality of the underlying corporate act. A court may determine that the corporate decision recorded in the deed was conducted contrary to mandatory legal requirements. In such circumstances, the deed may subsequently be cancelled or declared legally ineffective. This issue is particularly significant when the cancellation affects shareholders. The cancellation of a deed may alter the legal status of corporate organs, corporate governance arrangements, and the administrative records of the company. Therefore, the legal consequences extend beyond the formal status of the deed itself. The issue is illustrated by the internal dispute within PT Glory Cipta Prima. The dispute concerned an Extraordinary General Meeting of Shareholders and the Notarial deed recording its resolutions. The relevant deed was subsequently challenged through judicial proceedings. The dispute ultimately reached the Supreme Court and resulted in Supreme Court Decision Number 4605 K/Pdt/2025.

The thesis identifies a central problem in the case: the dismissal of a Commissioner occurred without adequate reasons and without providing an effective opportunity for self-defense. The research considers this a violation of the legal rights associated with the dismissal procedure. The issue is not limited to whether the corporate decision was legally valid. A further question concerns the consequences after the court has cancelled the deed. Once a final judgment has been issued, how can the shareholder's rights actually be restored? This question is important because there may be a difference between the legal status established by a court and the administrative information recorded in the state corporate database. The thesis identifies a lack of synchronization between the judicial decision and the Legal Entity Administration System (SABH) as a major source of uncertainty.

A final judgment may legally cancel the deed, while the previous corporate information may continue to appear administratively until a further process is completed. Such a situation can create uncertainty for shareholders, corporate organs, Notaries, government institutions, and third parties dealing with the company. The problem becomes even more significant for minority shareholders. A minority shareholder may have limited voting power and may therefore be structurally vulnerable to decisions made by the majority. Legal protection is consequently required to ensure that majority power does not become arbitrary corporate power. The principle of fairness within good corporate governance is relevant in this context. Corporate governance should ensure that shareholders receive fair treatment and that corporate decisions are taken according to transparent and accountable procedures.

The thesis specifically identifies the position of the minority shareholder in the PT Glory Cipta Prima dispute and discusses the significance of the shareholder's ownership of 350 shares. The research considers the protection of minority shareholders to be closely related to the maintenance of checks and balances within the company. From this perspective, cancellation of the Notarial deed can be understood not simply as the invalidation of a document but as a judicial mechanism for restoring the balance of corporate rights. The legal problem also concerns the position and responsibility of the Notary. When a Notarial deed is cancelled by a court, it cannot automatically be concluded that the Notary has committed a professional violation. The substantive decision recorded in the deed generally originates from the parties appearing before the Notary.

Consequently, it is necessary to distinguish between the Notary's formal responsibility and the substantive responsibility of the parties. The thesis emphasizes that the Notary was not subjected to material compensation sanctions in the case, although administrative adjustment of the deed and related records remained necessary. The distinction is important because legal protection must operate in two directions. On the one hand, the legal system must protect shareholders whose rights have been violated. On the other hand, the system must also protect the Notary from being held responsible for substantive decisions that were actually made by the corporate parties. The effectiveness of legal protection therefore cannot be measured solely by whether the plaintiff wins the litigation. It must also be assessed according to whether the judgment produces practical restoration. The thesis refers to this restoration through the concept of restitutio in integrum, namely the restoration of the legal position to the condition that should exist after the unlawful corporate act has been removed. This study therefore focuses not merely on the validity of the Notarial deed but on the complete legal protection mechanism available to shareholders after cancellation.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Legal Protection Theory

Legal protection theory serves as the principal theoretical foundation of this research. Legal protection refers to mechanisms through which the legal system safeguards the rights and interests of legal subjects. Philipus M. Hadjon distinguishes between preventive and repressive legal protection. Preventive protection seeks to prevent violations before they occur, while repressive protection operates after a legal violation or dispute has occurred. In the corporate context, preventive protection includes compliance with GMS procedures, proper notification of shareholders, transparency of corporate decisions, respect for shareholder participation, and compliance with statutory requirements concerning dismissal of corporate organs.

Repressive protection is provided through judicial mechanisms when preventive mechanisms fail. In the present case, judicial cancellation of the EGMS deed represents repressive legal protection because the court intervened after a corporate dispute had already occurred. The thesis expressly treats cancellation of the deed as a manifestation of legal protection for shareholders whose rights were impaired by an unlawful corporate act. Legal protection must therefore be understood as more than the existence of formal legal rules. It must include effective remedies capable of restoring the rights recognized by law.

Legal Accountability Theory

The second theoretical basis is legal accountability theory, particularly the ideas associated with Roscoe Pound and Hans Kelsen. Roscoe Pound viewed law as a mechanism of social engineering. Legal responsibility is therefore not merely punitive but serves to balance competing interests. Within a corporation, these interests include the interests of the majority shareholders, minority shareholders, corporate management, the company itself, and third parties. The thesis applies Pound's theory to the PT Glory Cipta Prima dispute. The dismissal of the Commissioner without adequate procedural safeguards was viewed as an action that disturbed the balance between majority corporate power and minority shareholder interests.

Hans Kelsen's approach emphasizes the relationship between legal norms, obligations, violations, and sanctions. From this perspective, an unlawful corporate act produces legal consequences that may include cancellation and restoration. The theory helps distinguish the responsibility of the corporate actors from the responsibility of the Notary. The corporate parties are responsible for the substantive decisions they make, while the Notary's responsibility relates to the exercise of Notarial authority.

Evidence Theory

Evidence theory is applied to understand the role of the Notarial deed and other corporate documents in judicial proceedings. An authentic deed has significant evidentiary force. Nevertheless, the existence of an authentic deed does not prevent a court from examining whether the legal act underlying the deed complied with mandatory legal requirements.

In the present case, the court's analysis focused on the legality of the corporate process that produced the deed. Therefore, the judicial assessment was not limited to the physical existence of the Notarial document. The distinction between the formal authenticity of a deed and the legality of the underlying transaction is essential. A Notary records the legal act of the parties, but the parties remain responsible for the substantive content and legality of their corporate decision.

Notarial Deeds in Corporate Transactions

A Notarial deed is an authentic instrument created by a public official authorized by law. In corporate transactions, Notaries commonly prepare deeds related to GMS resolutions, amendments to articles of association, changes in the composition of corporate organs, and other corporate acts. The function of a Notarial deed is to provide legal certainty and evidentiary certainty. However, the deed's evidentiary strength does not mean that every substantive act recorded in it is necessarily lawful. The thesis distinguishes between deeds that are void by operation of law and deeds that can be annulled through judicial proceedings. This distinction is important because the legal consequences and procedural mechanisms may differ.

Shareholder Rights and Minority Shareholder Protection

Indonesian company law recognizes important rights of shareholders. Law Number 40 of 2007 provides that shares give their owners rights to attend and vote at GMS, receive dividends and liquidation proceeds, and exercise other statutory rights. The law also provides a judicial mechanism through which shareholders may bring claims when they suffer losses because of unfair corporate actions. Article 61, for example, provides a basis for shareholders to bring an action against the company where they are harmed by unfair and unreasonable corporate decisions. These provisions demonstrate that shareholder protection is not merely a matter of internal corporate policy. It is supported by statutory remedies. Minority shareholder protection is especially relevant where majority shareholders possess sufficient voting power to determine the outcome of a GMS. Majority rule remains legitimate only when exercised within the boundaries established by law.

METHOD

This study employs a normative-empirical legal research method. The normative component examines legislation, legal principles, legal doctrines, and judicial decisions relevant to shareholder protection and cancellation of Notarial deeds. The empirical component examines the implementation of those legal norms in practice. The principal legal material is Supreme Court Decision Number 4605 K/Pdt/2025, supplemented by the relevant EGMS minutes, Notarial documents, corporate documents, and information obtained through interviews with persons connected to the dispute. The thesis expressly identifies the Supreme Court decision, meeting documents, and interviews with the Notary and disputing parties as important research materials.
Four approaches are employed.

First, the statutory approach is used to examine the legal provisions governing limited liability companies, shareholder rights, GMS procedures, the dismissal of corporate organs, and Notarial duties.

Second, the conceptual approach is used to analyze legal protection, legal accountability, fairness, legal certainty, corporate governance, and restitutio in integrum.

Third, the case approach is used to analyze Supreme Court Decision Number 4605 K/Pdt/2025 and the underlying proceedings.

Fourth, the empirical approach is used to identify practical difficulties arising after the judicial decision, particularly concerning administrative implementation.

The analysis is qualitative. Legal materials are organized according to the three research questions. The facts established by the judicial record are then examined in relation to statutory requirements and the theoretical framework.

The study does not treat the cancellation of the deed as an isolated document-related issue. Instead, it examines the entire chain from the corporate decision, the Notarial deed, the judicial challenge, the final judgment, and the subsequent administrative consequences.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Legal Regulation of Shareholder Protection

The first finding is that shareholder protection is embedded within the broader legal framework governing limited liability companies. A shareholder is not merely an investor who possesses an economic interest in the company. A shareholder also possesses governance rights. The right to attend and vote at the GMS is particularly important because the GMS is the institutional mechanism through which shareholders exercise their corporate authority. Law Number 40 of 2007 establishes the GMS as one of the company's organs and regulates the procedures governing corporate decision-making. The law remains in force, subject to subsequent amendments, including amendments associated with the Job Creation legislation.

The legal framework requires corporate decisions to comply with procedural requirements. Such requirements are not merely administrative formalities. They are intended to protect the legitimacy of corporate decision-making. This is particularly important where the decision concerns the dismissal of a member of the Board of Directors or Board of Commissioners. The right to defend oneself represents an important procedural safeguard. The thesis identifies the absence of an adequate opportunity for self-defense as one of the central defects in the PT Glory Cipta Prima case. The procedural requirement serves two purposes. First, it protects the individual whose position is being terminated. Second, it ensures that the GMS reaches its decision based on a fair process. Therefore, majority approval cannot cure every procedural defect. A decision may receive sufficient votes and still be legally vulnerable if mandatory procedures are disregarded.

The Importance of Fairness in Corporate Governance

The dispute also illustrates the relationship between shareholder protection and Good Corporate Governance. Fairness requires that shareholders be treated equitably according to their legal status. It does not mean that minority shareholders must receive the same economic power as majority shareholders. Rather, it means that majority power must not be exercised arbitrarily. The thesis argues that the forced dismissal of the Commissioner without a fair procedure weakened the internal checks-and-balances mechanism of the company. This is significant because the Board of Commissioners has a supervisory function. Removing a Commissioner without adequate safeguards may affect not only the individual but also the governance structure through which shareholder interests are monitored. The protection of minority shareholders therefore has an institutional dimension. It protects the integrity of corporate governance itself.

Legal Status of the Notarial Deed

The next issue concerns the legal status of the Notarial deed after the underlying corporate decision has been declared unlawful. The deed constitutes evidence of the legal act recorded by the Notary. However, the authenticity of the document does not prevent judicial examination of whether the underlying corporate act complied with mandatory law. In the present case, the defect was associated with the corporate procedure. The thesis identifies the failure to comply with mandatory procedural requirements, particularly the right of defense, as the central legal defect. This demonstrates that the validity of a Notarial deed cannot always be separated from the legality of the act that the deed records. At the same time, the cancellation of a deed should not automatically be interpreted as proof of professional misconduct by the Notary. The Notary's role must be assessed according to the legal duties imposed upon the office. Where the substantive corporate decision originates from the parties, responsibility for that decision remains primarily with those parties.

The Position of the Notary as a Defendant or Co-Defendant

The involvement of the Notary as a co-defendant or related party in corporate disputes reflects the evidentiary importance of the Notarial deed. However, the Notary's position must be carefully distinguished from that of the parties who made the corporate decision. The thesis emphasizes the distinction between formal and material truth. The Notary's role is closely related to the formal validity and documentation of the legal act, whereas the parties remain responsible for the substantive decision they make. Therefore, when a deed is cancelled because the underlying corporate decision violated mandatory law, the court must determine separately whether the Notary committed an independent violation. In the present case, the Notary was not subjected to material compensation sanctions. Nevertheless, the cancellation created an administrative consequence requiring adjustment of the relevant deed records. This distinction is important for legal certainty. If every cancellation automatically resulted in Notarial liability, the legal function of the Notary would become unnecessarily burdensome. Conversely, if Notaries were never examined, procedural defects could remain unchecked. The appropriate approach is therefore one of differentiated responsibility.

The PT Glory Cipta Prima Dispute

The PT Glory Cipta Prima dispute is the central factual setting of this research. The dispute concerned an EGMS and the resulting Notarial deed. The contested corporate decision involved the dismissal of a Commissioner. According to the thesis, the dismissal was undertaken without stating sufficiently specific reasons and without providing the affected party with an effective opportunity for self-defense. The legal significance of this conduct is substantial. The right to defend oneself functions as a procedural safeguard against arbitrary corporate decisions. The failure to provide such an opportunity transformed what might initially appear to be an internal corporate disagreement into a legal dispute concerning the validity of the corporate decision itself. The court subsequently assessed the conduct as an unlawful act and the resulting deed was cancelled. The case demonstrates that corporate autonomy is not absolute. The company may regulate its internal affairs, but its decisions remain subject to mandatory legal norms.

Unlawful Act and Procedural Violation

The thesis characterizes the corporate conduct as an Unlawful Act (Perbuatan Melawan Hukum). In Indonesian civil law, an unlawful act can arise where conduct violates legal obligations, rights, or standards of propriety and causes harm. In this case, the alleged unlawful conduct was not merely the decision to dismiss the Commissioner. Rather, it was the manner in which the decision was implemented. The absence of a fair opportunity to defend oneself was treated as a procedural violation capable of undermining the legality of the corporate decision. This distinction is important. Corporate organs possess legitimate powers, including the power to make personnel decisions. But legitimate authority must be exercised according to legal procedures. A lawful power exercised unlawfully may therefore produce unlawful consequences.

Protection of Minority Shareholders

The case has a particularly important implication for minority shareholders. The thesis identifies Khaidir as a minority shareholder holding 350 shares and argues that the removal of the Commissioner affected the institutional protection available to minority shareholders. The importance of the Commissioner in this context lies in the supervisory role of the Board of Commissioners. When a Commissioner who is expected to participate in corporate oversight is removed through a procedurally defective process, the effect may extend beyond the individual's employment or office. The minority shareholder may lose an important institutional safeguard against abuse of majority power. The case therefore illustrates what may be described as minority oppression in a corporate governance context. The issue is not simply the number of shares owned by the minority shareholder but whether the corporate governance structure continues to provide meaningful protection.

Judicial Cancellation as Repressive Legal Protection

The Supreme Court decision provides the principal form of repressive legal protection in the case. The judicial process allowed the affected party to challenge the legality of the corporate decision and seek cancellation of the resulting deed. The cancellation removed the legal foundation of the disputed corporate action. The thesis considers the cancellation to be an essential mechanism for restoring the rights of the injured party. From this perspective, judicial cancellation has two dimensions. The first is corrective. It corrects a corporate act that violated mandatory law. The second is restorative. It creates a legal basis for returning the affected party to the position that should have existed absent the unlawful action. This restorative function is consistent with the concept of restitutio in integrum.

Restitutio in Integrum

The principle of restitutio in integrum requires that legal consequences of an unlawful act be removed to the extent necessary to restore the injured party's legal position. In the context of the present case, cancellation of the EGMS deed means that the corporate consequences based upon that deed must also be reconsidered. The concept is therefore broader than cancellation of a document. If the deed served as the basis for changes in corporate management, the administrative consequences of those changes must be corrected as well. This is where the distinction between judicial protection and administrative implementation becomes critical. A court may determine that the deed is no longer legally effective. However, if the corporate database continues to reflect the consequences of the cancelled deed, the shareholder may still experience practical difficulties.

The Gap Between Judicial and Administrative Protection

One of the most important findings of the research is the gap between judicial recognition and administrative implementation. The thesis explains that an inkracht judgment should be respected as legally binding. Nevertheless, implementation may face difficulties because the judicial system and the corporate administration system do not automatically operate as a single integrated mechanism. This produces a paradox. Legally, the shareholder has won. Administratively, however, the previous corporate status may remain recorded until a further correction procedure is completed. Such a gap weakens the effectiveness of legal protection. Legal certainty requires consistency between the legal reality determined by the court and the administrative reality recorded by the state.

Administrative Obstacles in SABH

The Legal Entity Administration System is important because it records corporate legal information. The research identifies the absence of automatic synchronization between final judicial decisions and SABH as a central administrative obstacle. The shareholder may therefore need to initiate additional procedures to update the corporate records. The thesis describes this as a bureaucratic process that can delay restoration of rights. This problem is not merely technical. A corporate database may be consulted by third parties. If the database does not reflect a final judicial decision, third parties may rely on information that is legally outdated. The result may be uncertainty concerning the authority of corporate organs, the validity of corporate transactions, and the position of shareholders.

Obstacles in Executing the Court Decision

Another obstacle concerns the execution of declaratory and constitutive judgments. A court may order the cancellation of a corporate deed, but implementation may require further administrative action. Where the losing party does not voluntarily comply, the successful party may need to request further enforcement measures. The thesis specifically identifies the absence of an automatic enforcement mechanism for changes in the corporate database as a source of difficulty. Before the Supreme Court decision became final, appellate and cassation proceedings also delayed the final restoration of rights. Once Supreme Court Decision Number 4605 K/Pdt/2025 became final, however, the continuing existence of ordinary legal remedies could no longer serve as a reason to postpone recognition of the final legal position. The problem consequently shifts from litigation to execution.

Protection of Third Parties Acting in Good Faith

The consequences of cancelling a corporate deed may extend to third parties. A third party may have entered into a transaction with a company based on corporate information that was officially recorded at the time. If that information is later invalidated, questions may arise concerning the legal status of transactions undertaken before the cancellation was administratively reflected. Therefore, the implementation of judicial decisions must also consider third-party legal certainty. The protection of third parties acting in good faith should not undermine the rights of the successful shareholder, but neither should restoration create disproportionate uncertainty for parties who were not involved in the original dispute. This demonstrates the systemic nature of corporate legal disputes.

The Effectiveness of Legal Protection

The research shows that legal protection has been effective at the judicial level but remains imperfect at the administrative level. At the judicial level, the affected party was able to challenge the corporate act, obtain a judicial review, and ultimately secure a final Supreme Court decision. At the administrative level, however, additional procedures remain necessary to translate the judgment into updated corporate records. Consequently, the study rejects a narrow understanding of legal protection that equates judicial victory with complete protection. Legal protection should be measured by the practical restoration of rights. The thesis states that the legal protection mechanism must not end with a "victory on paper," but should result in real and rapid protection for the parties concerned.

Proposed Digital Integration

The first principal solution is the development of an integrated digital mechanism between the judiciary and SABH. A final court decision affecting a company's legal status should be capable of being transmitted electronically to the relevant administrative system. The system could include a verification process through which the final judgment is authenticated and linked to the relevant company record. Once verified, the system could automatically flag the affected corporate information. The thesis recommends a form of digital bridge or interoperability between the judicial system and SABH to enable faster information exchange. Such integration would reduce dependence on manual applications and minimize administrative delays.

Regulatory Reform

The second solution is regulatory reform. A clear legal framework is needed to govern the correction of corporate data following a final civil judgment.

The regulation should specify:

1. which institution has authority to initiate the correction;
2. what documents must be submitted;
3. how finality of the judgment is verified;
4. the time limit for administrative action;
5. the responsibilities of the Notary and corporate organs; and
6. remedies where an institution fails to implement the judgment.

The thesis proposes a specific regulatory framework concerning corporate data updates following final civil judgments. A clear framework would reduce administrative discretion and prevent successful litigants from being trapped in prolonged bureaucratic procedures.

Strengthening Notarial Supervision

The third solution is stronger supervision of Notaries. The thesis proposes a more proactive supervisory model where a Notarial deed cancelled because of a legal violation triggers appropriate supervisory consideration. However, supervision must remain proportional. A cancelled deed does not automatically establish Notarial misconduct. The supervisory authority must examine whether the Notary independently violated professional or statutory obligations. The purpose of supervision should therefore be twofold: preventing future violations and protecting the integrity of the Notarial profession.

Strengthening Minority Shareholder Protection

The fourth solution concerns the shareholders themselves. Minority shareholders should maintain complete documentation of corporate meetings, notices, resolutions, share ownership, and relevant correspondence. When a court has issued a final judgment, the successful shareholder should ensure that the judgment is formally communicated to the Notary and relevant government institutions. The thesis specifically recommends proactive documentation and communication of final judgments by minority shareholders. Corporate actors should also strengthen Good Corporate Governance practices. The prevention of corporate disputes is preferable to prolonged litigation. Fair procedures, transparency, accountability, and respect for minority shareholders can significantly reduce the risk of corporate conflicts.

CONCLUSION

This study concludes that Indonesian law provides a substantial legal basis for protecting shareholders whose rights are affected by unlawful corporate decisions and the cancellation of Notarial deeds. The legal protection operates through preventive and repressive mechanisms. Preventive protection is achieved through compliance with corporate procedures, shareholder participation, proper GMS procedures, and Good Corporate Governance. Repressive protection is provided through judicial proceedings when a corporate action violates legal rights. In the PT Glory Cipta Prima dispute, the dismissal of the Commissioner without adequate reasons and without an effective opportunity for self-defense constituted a significant procedural defect. The defect affected the legitimacy of the corporate decision and ultimately resulted in the cancellation of the EGMS Notarial deed. Supreme Court Decision Number 4605 K/Pdt/2025 therefore represents an important form of repressive legal protection. It confirms that majority corporate power cannot be exercised outside mandatory legal procedures.

The study further concludes that the cancellation of the deed does not automatically establish professional liability on the part of the Notary. The substantive responsibility for the corporate decision must be distinguished from the Notary's formal responsibility in preparing the deed. The Notary may nevertheless have administrative responsibilities after the judgment, particularly concerning the adjustment of relevant records and documents. The second conclusion concerns implementation. Judicial protection has been achieved through the cancellation of the disputed deed, but administrative restoration remains problematic. The most significant problem is the lack of effective synchronization between the final court judgment and the Legal Entity Administration System. This creates a gap between legal status and administrative records. The result is that a shareholder may obtain a final judicial victory but still have to undertake additional procedures before the corporate database reflects the new legal position.

The third conclusion concerns the obstacles and solutions. The principal obstacles are administrative desynchronization, the absence of automatic enforcement, bureaucratic procedures, dependence on manual data updates, and insufficient coordination between the judiciary, Notaries, corporate parties, and government administration. The solution requires a systemic approach. The legal system should move from a purely litigation-oriented model toward an integrated judicial-administrative protection model. Effective legal protection should mean not only obtaining a favourable judgment but also obtaining timely restoration of the legal and administrative position established by that judgment.

REFERENCES

Abdulkadir Muhammad. (2019). Hukum dan penelitian hukum. Citra Aditya Bakti.

Adjie, H. (2020a). Kebatalan dan pembatalan akta Notaris. Refika Aditama.

Adjie, H. (2020b). Penafsiran tematik hukum Notaris Indonesia: Berdasarkan Undang-Undang Nomor 2 Tahun 2014 tentang Perubahan atas Undang-Undang Nomor 30 Tahun 2004 tentang Jabatan Notaris. Refika Aditama.

Adjie, H. (2022). Sanksi perdata dan administratif terhadap Notaris dalam menjalankan tugas jabatannya. Refika Aditama.

Amiruddin, & Asikin, Z. (2020). Pengantar metode penelitian hukum. RajaGrafindo Persada.

Budiono, H. (2022). Dasar teknik pembuatan akta Notaris. Citra Aditya Bakti.

Harahap, M. Y. (2021). Hukum acara perdata: Tentang gugatan, persidangan, penyitaan, pembuktian, dan putusan pengadilan. Sinar Grafika.

Ibrahim, J. (2020). Teori dan metodologi penelitian hukum normatif. Bayumedia Publishing.

Kelsen, H. (2021). General theory of law and state. Routledge.
Latumeten, P. (2021). Tanggung jawab jabatan Notaris dalam menjalankan tugas profesi. Penerbit Buku Kompas.
Lumban Tobing, G. H. S. (2021). Peraturan jabatan Notaris. Erlangga.
Mertokusumo, S. (2019). Hukum acara perdata Indonesia. Cahaya Atma Pustaka.
Mulyadi, L. (2020). Kompilasi hukum acara perdata dalam teori dan praktik peradilan Indonesia. Alumni.
Nadapdap, B. (2022). Hukum perseroan terbatas: Berdasarkan Undang-Undang Nomor 40 Tahun 2007 dan perubahannya. Jala Permata Aksara.
Pound, R. (2021). An introduction to the philosophy of law. Routledge.
Rifai, A. (2021). Problematika eksekusi putusan perdata yang bersifat deklaratif terhadap sistem administrasi negara. Jurnal Hukum dan Peradilan, 10(2).
Satrio, J. (2019). Hukum perikatan: Perikatan yang lahir dari perjanjian. Citra Aditya Bakti.
Sharianti, N. P. (2022). Implementasi prinsip itikad baik dalam perlindungan hukum pihak ketiga pada sengketa akta otentik. Jurnal Kertha Patrika, 44(1).
Suharyo. (2022). Hukum dan keadilan: Teori dan praktik perlindungan hukum di Indonesia. Kencana.
Tan Thong Kie. (2019). Studi notariat dan serba-serbi praktik Notaris. Ichtiar Baru van Hoeve.
Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia. (2025). Supreme Court Decision Number 4605 K/Pdt/2025.
District Court of Batam. (2024). Decision Number 277/Pdt.G/2024/PN Btm.
Republic of Indonesia. (2007). Law Number 40 of 2007 concerning Limited Liability Companies. The law regulates, among other matters, shareholder rights, GMS, Directors, Commissioners, and corporate governance.
Republic of Indonesia. (2014). Law Number 2 of 2014 concerning Amendments to Law Number 30 of 2004 concerning the Position of Notary.