



DECISION

Number 38/PHPU.D-VI/2008

FOR THE SAKE OF JUSTICE UNDER THE ONE ALMIGHTY GOD

THE CONSTITUTIONAL COURT OF THE REPUBLIC OF INDONESIA

[1.1] Examining, hearing, and deciding upon constitutional cases at the first and final level, has passed a decision in the case of Dispute over the Results of General Election of the Regional Head and Deputy Regional Head of Jeneponto Regency, filed by:

- [1.2] 1. Name : **H. Sjamsuddin Zainal, S.E., M.P**
- Age : 55 years of age
- Religion : Islam
- Occupation : Private Person
- Address : Jalan Lanto Dg. Pasewang Number 6
Jeneponto and/or Jalan Kenanga Number 6
Empowang Sub-district, Binamu District,
Jeneponto Regency
- Identification
- Card : 73.0403.050153.0003
2. Name : **Djahini, S.H**
- Age : 56 years of age

Religion : Islam
Occupation : Civil Servant
Address : Jalan Melati, Empowang Sub-district, Binamu
District, Jeneponto Regency
Identification
Card : 73.0403.010752.0005

In this matter granting the power of attorney to:

1. **Irwan Muin, S.H., M.H.;**
2. **Anwar, S.H;**
3. **Murlianto, S.H;**

All of whom being Advocates, having their office at Jalan Cendana Number 195 Panakkukang, Makassar, Telephone number: (0411) 5087858, Contact Person's Cellphone number: 08124115917, acting for and behalf of the Authorizer, both jointly and severally by virtue of a special power of attorney dated November 6, 2008;

Hereinafter referred to as ----- **the Petitioners;**

Against:

[1.3] Name : **The General Elections Commission of Jeneponto
Regency**
Address : Jalan Lanto Dg. Pasewang Number 30 Jeneponto
Municipality;

In this matter granting the power of attorney to:

1. **Mappinawang, S.H;**
2. **Sofyan, S.H;**
3. **Bakhtiar, S.H;**
4. **Mursalin Jalil, S.H., M.H;**

All of whom being Advocates, having their office at Jalan Topaz Raya Ruko Zamrud I Block G/12, Telephone number: 0411 423221, Makassar, South Sulawesi, acting for and behalf of the Authorizer, both jointly and severally under a special power of attorney dated November 12, 2008;

Hereinafter referred to as ----- **the Respondent;**

[1.4] Having read the Petitioners' petition;

Having heard the Petitioners' statement;

Having heard the statement and having read the written statement of the Respondent, namely the General Elections Commission of Jeneponto Regency;

Having examined the evidence and witnesses of the Petitioners;

Having examined the evidence and witnesses of the Respondent;

Having read the conclusion of the Petitioners;

Having read the conclusion of the Respondent;

3. LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

[3.1] Considering whereas the principal issue of the Petitioners' petition is an objection to the Results of General Election of the Regional Head and the Deputy Regional Head (*Pemilukada*) of Jeneponto Regency based on the Minutes of Stipulation of Elected Candidates of Regent and Deputy Regent for the 2008-2013 Period Number 77/P.KWK-JP/XI/2008 dated November 6, 2008 *juncto* Minutes of Recapitulation of Vote Count Results of General Election of the Regional Head and the Deputy Regional Head by the General Elections Commission of Jeneponto Regency;

[3.2] Considering whereas prior to examining the principal issue of the case, the Constitutional Court (hereinafter referred to as the Court) shall first consider the following matters:

1. the Court's authority to examine, hear, and decide upon the *a quo* petition;
2. the Petitioners' legal standing to file for the *a quo* petition;
3. the time limit for filing the petition of objection.

With respect to the foregoing three matters, the Court is of the following opinion:

Authority of the Court

[3.3] Considering whereas based on the provision of Article 24C paragraph (1) of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia (hereinafter

referred to the 1945 Constitution) and Article 10 paragraph (1) sub-paragraph d of Law Number 24 Year 2003 regarding the Constitutional Court (State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia Year 2003 Number 98, Supplement to the State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia Number 4316, hereinafter referred to as the Constitutional Court Law) *junctis* Article 12 paragraph (1) sub-paragraph d of Law Number 4 Year 2004 regarding Judicial Power, and Law Number 12 Year 2003 regarding the Second Amendment to Law Number 32 Year 2004 regarding Regional Government, one of the constitutional authorities of the Court is to decide upon disputes over general election results;

At first, based on the provision of Article 106 paragraph (1) and paragraph (2) of Law Number 32 Year 2004 regarding Regional Government (State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia Year 2004 Number 125, Supplement to the State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia Number 4437), objections related to vote count results affecting the election of the candidate pair was filed to the Supreme Court. Such authority of the Supreme Court was also included in Article 94 of Government Regulation Number 6 Year 2005 regarding Election, Ratification of Appointment and Dismissal of Regional Heads and Deputy Regional Heads;

In Article 1 sub-article 4 of Law Number 22 Year 2007 regarding General Elections Organizer (State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia Year 2007 Number 59, Supplement to the State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia Number 4721), it is stipulated that, "*General Elections of Regional Heads and*

Deputy Regional Heads shall be general elections to directly elect regional heads and deputy regional heads within the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia under Pancasila and the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia”;

Law Number 12 Year 2008 regarding the Second Amendment to Law Number 32 Year 2004 regarding Regional Government, in Article 236C stipulates, *”The handling of disputes over the vote count results of the election of regional heads by the Supreme Court shall be delegated to the Constitutional Court no later than 18 (eighteen) months following the promulgation of this Law”;*

In October 29, 2008, the Chairperson of the Supreme Court and the Chairperson of the Constitutional Court jointly signed the Minutes of Delegation of the Authority to Adjudicate, as the implementation of Article 236C of Law Number 12 Year 2008 above.

[3.4] Considering whereas since the Petitioners’ petition concerns the dispute over the vote count results of the General Election of Regional Heads, namely the General Election of Regional Heads of Jeneponto Regency in accordance with the Minutes of Recapitulation of Vote Count of General Elections and Stipulation of the Elected Candidates of Regent and Deputy Regent of Jeneponto for the 2008-2013 Period dated November 4, 2008, hence the Court has the authority to examine, hear, and decide upon the *a quo* petition;

Legal standing of the Petitioners

[3.5] Considering whereas Article 106 paragraph (1) of Law Number 32 Year 2004 regarding Regional Government, Articles 3 and 4 of Constitutional Court Regulation Number 15 Year 2008 regarding Guidelines for Proceedings in the Dispute over the Results of General Elections of Regional Heads (hereinafter referred to as PMK 15/2008), provides for, among other things, the following matters:

- a. the Petitioners are the Candidate Pair of Regional Head and Deputy Regional Head;
- b. the Petition may only be filed against the stipulation of the vote count results of the General Election of Regional Heads affecting the determination of candidate pairs qualified to participate in the second round of the General Election of Regional Heads or the election of candidate pairs as Regional Head and Deputy Regional Head;

[3.6] Considering whereas with regard to legal standing of the Petitioners, the Court shall consider based on the provision of Article 106 paragraph (1) of Law Number 32 Year 2004 regarding Regional Government, Articles 3 and 4 of PMK 15/2008 as intended in paragraph **[3.5]** as follows:

- whereas the Petitioners are the Candidate Pair of Regent and Deputy Regent as Regional Heads of Jenepono Regency, which were assigned with candidacy number 6 (six) by the Respondent;

- whereas the petition filed by the Petitioners is an objection to the Decision of General Elections Commission of Jeneponto Regency Number 77/P.KWK-JP/XI/2008 regarding Stipulation of the Elected Candidate Pair as the Result of the 2008 General Election of Regional Head and Deputy Regional Head of Jeneponto Regency dated November 6, 2008. Such objection was filed because the Petitioners have been mistakenly stipulated to have only acquired 66,189 votes, which is ranked 2nd (second) after the candidate pair of Radjamilo and Burhanuddin Baso Tika who acquired 100,434 votes;

- whereas according to the Petitioners, the result of the recapitulation of votes calculated by the Respondent as mentioned above was obtained because the count was based on data and facts deriving from vote inflation by the candidate pair of Radjamilo and Burhanuddin Baso Tika in several Voting Stations (TPS) as a systematic default committed by the Respondent. According to the Petitioners, the correct result should be 101,469 votes, so the Petitioners should have been determined as the Elected Candidate Pair of Regent/Deputy Regent of Jeneponto Regency. Hence, the Petitioners request for the Court to nullify the vote count conducted by the Respondent;

[3.7] Considering whereas the Minutes of Vote Count and Stipulation of the Elected Candidate Pair of Regent and Deputy Regent of Jeneponto Regency for 2008-2013 by the Respondent was stipulated on November 6, 2008 under

Number 77/P-KWK-JP/XI/2008, while the petition for objection to the stipulation of the Respondent was filed on November 10, 2008 and registered at the Registrar's Office of the Court on November 10, 2008;

[3.8] Considering whereas Article 5 PMK 15/2008 stipulates that "*Petitions may only be filed by no later than 3 (three) working days after the Respondent determines the vote count results of the General Election of Regional Heads in the region concerned*", hence the filing of Petitioners' petition was still within the time limit determined;

[3.9] Considering whereas based on the foregoing evaluation of facts and legal grounds in paragraphs [3.6] and [3.8], the Court is of the opinion that the Petitioners have legal standing to file for the *a quo* petition in accordance with the requirements provided for in Article 106 paragraph (1) of Law Number 32 Year 2004, Articles 3 and 4 of PMK 15/2008, and that the Petitioners' petition is still within the time limit determined in Article 5 of PMK 15/2008;

[3.10] Considering whereas since the Court has the authority to examine, hear, and decide upon the *a quo* petition and the Petitioners have legal standing to file the petition, and that the filing of the petition is still within the time limit, the Court shall further consider the principal issue of the petition.

Principal issue of the petition

[3.11] Considering whereas the Petitioners principally argue in their petition as follows:

- Whereas the General Elections Commission of Jenepono Regency has announced that the vote count result of the General Election of Regional Heads acquired by the Petitioners was 66,189 votes, while the Candidate Pair of Regional Head and Deputy Regional Head with candidacy number 5 (five), Radjamilo and Burhanuddin Baso Tika, was stipulated as the Elected Pair of Regional Head and Deputy Regional Head of Jenepono Regency with 100,434 votes acquired;
- Whereas the vote acquisition of the Candidate Pair with candidacy number 5 (five) was based on incorrect calculations, due to the fact that:
 - a. there has been an inflation of 680 votes in several Voting Stations, particularly in Bontoramba District and Binamu District, which was committed by certain people, by the following means: (i) names of demised people were still registered in the List of Permanent Voters; (ii) hamlets with numbers of population which could still be accommodated in one Voting Station were mobilized to a great distance by the Village Head to vote in Voting Stations in other hamlets; (iii) none of the voters' fingers in Voting Stations were marked with ink after voting; (iv) there were 30 (thirty) voters in Sarwangin Hamlet of Tanam Mawang Village, 31 (thirty-one) voters in Tabbuakkang Hamlet of Batualan Village, and 5 (five) voters in

Balla Rompo Hamlet who were registered in the List of Permanent Voters but did not receive any voting invitations, while the invitations were given to other people unregistered in the List of Permanent Voters; (v) in Voting Station 5 (five) in Batu Jala Village, there were only 331 voters exercising their right to vote, yet there were 334 ballots used , so there was an inflation of 3 (three) votes, and (vi) there was a vote inflation in Bungung Kanona Hamlet, Tolo Barat Sub-District, where the total number of ballots including the spares was 268 ballots, with 189 ballots used and 90 ballots were not used, so there was an inflation 12 (twelve) votes. Whereas due to the vote inflation, the candidate pair with candidacy number 5 (five) acquired an addition of 680 votes.

- b. Whereas there were 35,280 voters dispersed in a number of Voting Stations who did not receive voting invitations and/or voting cards so they could not exercise their right to vote, resulting in an evident loss at the Petitioners' side since it has cost the Petitioners approximately 35,280 votes from their supporters, which, if given the chance by the Respondent, would certainly determine the Petitioners as the winner of the General Election of Regional Heads. Hence, based on mathematical ratio, without vote deflation experienced by the Petitioners and without vote inflation by the candidate with candidacy number 5 (five), the correct vote count for the Petitioners should have been 101,469 votes, while the

candidate pair with candidacy number 5 (five) only acquired 100,434 votes;

[3.12] Considering whereas to support their arguments, the Petitioners have presented written evidence (Exhibit P-1 through Exhibit P-25) as well as 6 (six) witnesses whose statements have been heard under oath at the hearing on November 18, 2008, principally stating as follows:

1. Statement of Witness Zulkifli KR. Ngupa

- The witness as the Head of the Petitioners' Success Team and the witness of the General Elections Commission;
- The witness states that the implementation of the General Election of Regional Heads in Jeneponto Regency failed to comply with the existing guidelines;
- Whereas all witnesses from "Sejalan" Team at the Voting Station level were not provided with C-KWK forms. At the level of District Polling Committee, out of the total number of witnesses in 11 (eleven) Districts in Jeneponto, only two witnesses received the vote acquisition recapitulation;
- When the Sub-district Polling Committee reported to the General Elections Commission, the witness had the opportunity to be present and the result of recapitulation evaluation was directly brought to the General Elections

Commission's room to be recapped and the witness was not allowed to enter because it was very important and the room was strictly guarded;

2. Statement of Witness Mustani

- The witness explains that on T-2, there were 31 (thirty-one) voters in Tabbuakkang Hamlet of Batualan Village who were not provided with voting cards or invitations and the witness had asked the Head of Voting Organizer Group (KPPS) about why the Voting Organizer Group did not distribute the voting invitations to the voters. The Head answered that apparently, a different person distributed the invitations, as instructed by the supporters of candidacy number 5 (five);
- In Sarwangin Hamlet of Tanam Mawang Village, 36 (thirty-six) voters were not provided with voting cards;
- In Kaware Hamlet of Tanam Mawang Village, 12 (twelve) voters were not provided with voting cards;
- In Balla Rompo Hamlet, there were 5 (five) voters were not provided with voting cards;
- The witness also explains that on T-1, some people were giving away money in the amount of Rp.50,000 (fifty thousand rupiah) per voter to vote for one of the candidates and at the time, the witness

had reported the incidence to the General Election Supervisory Committee of Bontoramba District and the report had been forwarded to the Public Prosecutor's Office;

- The witness states that 53 (fifty-three) voters were not provided with voting cards;
- The witness received the vote count result in District Polling Committee after 3 (three) days and did not sign it because there were many violations occurred during the process in all Voting Stations in Bontoramba District and that the vote recap was made globally, instead of per Voting Station;

3. Statement of Witness Indar DG. Tonang

- The witness who became a witness in "Sejalan Success Team" was not provided with C-1 KWK and C-2 KWK forms even though he had requested for them;
- The witness was present in the Voting Station from 7 am up to the vote count at 13.30;
- The witness states that after the of vote count, he was asked to sign and the persons drawing up the minutes were the Head of Sub-district Polling Committee and its members;

4. Statement of Witness Ahmad Basir

- As a witness in “Sejalan Success Team”, he was not provided with C-1 KWK and C-2 KWK forms;
- The witness also explains that he had asked for the forms but in return, he was answered that the Voting Organizer Group would deal with the issue and report to the District;
- The witness was present during the vote count until it was completed and no one raised an objection;
- The witness was present in the Voting Station from 6.45 am until the vote count was completed and had once left the Voting Station to escort a voter who was sick and then the witness returned to the Voting Station;

5. Statement of Witness DG. Rate

- The witness explains that he had been registered but not given the invitation to vote at the voting;

6. Statement of Witness P. DG. Rewa

- The witness states that the witness and 3 (three) family members had been registered but were not given voting cards or invitations at the voting and they did not raise any protest;

[3.13] Considering whereas with respect to the Petitioners' petition, the Respondent has conveyed its response which is entirely set out in the foregoing Facts of the Case part, principally stating as follows:

- whereas the vote count recapitulation conducted by the Respondent was correct since the data contained therein was obtained from the correct result of vote acquisition recapitulation at the level (of District Election Committee—PPK), subsequently the recapitulation result at the level of District Polling Committee was obtained from the correct vote count in all Voting Stations in Jenepono Regency;
- whereas the argument of the Petitioners stating that there had been vote inflation was unjustifiable and irrational, since vote inflation can only be done to the vote count result, since the addition of certain figures which was merely a groundless assumption had exceeded the number of votes obtained from the Valid Ballot Count Results at Voting Station level. Whereas certainly, the votes of Registered Voters failing to exercise their right to vote cannot be taken into account, because they were not given through or by means of validly perforating the ballots;
- whereas the Petitioners' claim to be the owner of votes from 35,280 voters failing to exercise their right to vote in the General Election of Regional Heads of Jenepono Regency, in order that the number of Petitioners' votes become $66,189+35,280=101,469$ or surpassing the number of votes for the elected candidate pair, namely the candidate pair with candidacy

number 5 (five), H. Radjamilo and Burhanuddin Baso Tika, is truly a “misleading” calculation method and it is not legally accountable;

- whereas the arguments of the Petitioners on the inflation of 680 votes occurring and spreading in several Voting Stations (TPS), particularly in the areas of Bontoramba District and Binamo District were completely unsupported with facts, namely in the form of official minutes of vote count result ranging from the Voting Station, the District Polling Committee, to the Regency General Elections Commission. The inflation argument pointed out by the Petitioners is contradictory to the facts presented by the Petitioners’ witnesses about the vote count recapitulation, namely Abdul Rasyid in Binamo District and Sudirman Tompo, S.Pd in Bontoramba District respectively, all of whom signed the Minutes of Recapitulation at District Level without any reasons for objection;
- whereas the Petitioners’ argument on the discrepancy between the number of voters exercising their right to vote and the number of ballots collected is an erroneous argument, and has indicated the Petitioners’ misunderstanding about vote count procedures, as well as the procedures for drawing up minutes of vote count result. It appears that in their calculations, the Petitioners failed to consider other voters from other Voting Stations into the number of voters exercising the right to vote in Voting Stations where vote inflation had allegedly occurred;

- whereas 35,280 votes claimed as belonging to the Petitioners' voters who did not receive invitations as conveyed on page 7 (seven) is an arbitrary claim with unclear source of data , considering the arbitrary claim conveyed by the Petitioners, stating that the 35,280 voters would automatically vote for the Petitioners when given the opportunity to exercise their right to vote. It is an assumption that cannot be used as a ground to contest the vote acquisition result of a certain candidate pair because such an action would violate the principles of the General Election of Regional Heads which are direct, public, free and confidential;

[3.14] Considering whereas in order to support the arguments of its petition, the Respondent has presented written evidence (Exhibit T-1 through Exhibit T-26) and 3 (three) witnesses whose statements have been heard under oath at the hearing on November 18, 2008, principally explaining as follows:

1. Statement of Witness Edi

- The witness was given the form for the minutes of vote count and 4 (four) persons were not given the form, namely in Mero Village of Bontoramba District;
- On the voting day, no one forced the voters to vote for one of the candidates;

2. Statement of Witness Abdul Razak

- The witness was a member of the success team for candidacy number 5 (five) and had been briefed on the voting up to the vote count;

3. Statement of Witness Hamka S.Pdi

- The witness was the Head of the General Election Supervisory Committee of Jeneponto Regency;
- During the voting, the witness saw that witnesses of candidates with Candidacy Numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 attended the vote count, but they only observed the candidate with the Candidacy Number they respectively represented and when the candidate they represented lost, they went home immediately;
- The witness explains that there were two cases at the level of competent authority, namely the use of voting cards in Pasamutarukan Voting Station 6 (six) in Binamu District and money politicking by the former Village Head of Buluksibatang of Bontoramba District;

Opinion of the Court

[3.14] Considering whereas after carefully examining the petition and arguments presented by the Petitioners, as well as the evidence produced, and

also examining the Respondent's statement, evidence, as well as statements of witnesses presented, the Court is of the following opinion:

[3.14.1] Whereas the Petitioners' written evidence (P-17 through P-21) have indicated that there were voters who did not receive invitations or voting cards, although it cannot be assured whether the names mentioned on the list of statements concerned were also included in the List of Permanent Voters (DPT), since the statements set out in Exhibit P-17 through Exhibit P-21 did not mention such fact. The evidence was only deemed by the Court as a lead;

[3.14.2] Whereas Exhibits P-4 through P-12 which are statements or acknowledgements of witnesses of the Candidate Pair with candidacy number 6 (six) in Voting Stations who did not receive the form for the Minutes/Record of Vote Acquisition Results for each pair in 9 (nine) Voting Stations, cannot be deemed as negating the validity of vote acquisition and vote count results in each Voting Station because the objections at Voting Station level raised by every witness of the candidate pair should have been conveyed during the vote count in order to correct any mistakes made, and mistakes which were not immediately corrected must be recorded in the Minutes. Such matter was not evident from the evidence presented.

[3.14.3] Whereas the argument of the Petitioners conveying the certainty occurrence of vote inflation by 679 votes in Bontoramba District and by one vote in Binamu District, totaling 680 votes and taken into account as the vote

acquisition of the Candidate Pair with candidacy number 5 (five) was completely unsupported with valid evidence, and therefore, it cannot be accepted as a ground to deduct by the argued number of votes the acquisition of the candidate pair with candidacy number 5 (five);

[3.14.4] Whereas the argument of the Petitioners on the deflation of the Petitioners' vote acquisition by 35,280 votes based on the argument that 35,280 voters who did not receive voting invitations or cards in the entire Jenepono Regency were believed to be the supporters of the candidate pair with candidacy number 6 (six), so that the votes should have been accounted for the Petitioners' vote acquisition. Hence, the Petitioners should have acquired 66,189 plus 35,280 votes, totaling 101,469 votes, which could have changed the position of vote acquisition and stipulated the Petitioners as the elected Candidate Pair. Such argument was not supported with valid evidence either, namely that the argued 35,280 votes would have been cast for the Petitioners;

[3.15] Considering whereas the witnesses presented by the Petitioners have provided valid evidence on voters who did not receive voting invitations or cards, but the number indicated cannot immediately be included into the Petitioners' vote acquisition, and even if it was—*quod non*—the result will not have enough significance to change the position of the Candidate Pair with candidacy number 5 (five) in such a way that the Petitioners would accordingly be the elected Candidate Pair, since the argued deflation of the Petitioners' votes was due to the fact that 35,280 voters failing to exercise the right to vote because they did

not receive any voting invitations or cards, cannot be automatically included into the Petitioners' vote acquisition. Such argument was only an assumption which should have been supported with valid evidence.

4. CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing evaluation of facts and legal grounds, the Court concludes as follows:

[4.1] whereas although some voters did not receive any voting invitation or card in Jeneponto Regency during the General Election of Regional Heads of Jeneponto Regency on October 28, 2008, they cannot be immediately assumed that they would elect the Petitioners;

[4.2] whereas the argument on the occurrence of vote inflation by 680 votes for the Candidate Pair with candidacy number 5 (five) and vote deflation by 35,280 votes which were supposedly cast for the Petitioners could not be proven;

[4.3] whereas since the Petitioners' arguments cannot be validly and convincingly substantiated, the Petitioners' petition must be rejected in its entirety.

5. DECISION

In view of the Articles of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, Law Number 24 Year 2003 regarding the Constitutional Court, Law Number 4 Year

2004 regarding Judicial Power, and Law Number 32 Year 2004 regarding Regional Government as most recently amended with Law Number 12 Year 2008 regarding the Second Amendment to Law Number 32 Year 2004 regarding Regional Government.

Passing the Decision,

To reject the Petitioners' petition in its entirety.

Hence the decision was made in the Plenary Consultative Meeting of 9 (nine) Constitutional Court Justices on Monday, the twenty-fourth of November two thousand and eight and was pronounced in a Plenary Session open for public on the same day by us, Moh. Mahfud MD as the Chairperson and concurrent Member and Maruarar Siahaan, Maria Farida Indrati, Muhammad Alim, H. Abdul Mukthie Fadjar, H. M. Arsyad Sanusi, H. Achmad Sodiki, Jimly Asshiddiqie, and H.M. Akil Mochtar respectively as Members and assisted by Ida Ria Tambunan as Substitute Registrar, in the presence of the Petitioners and/or their Attorneys and the Respondent and/or its Attorneys.

CHIEF JUSTICE

Sgd.

Moh. Mahfud MD

JUSTICES,

Sgd.

Maruarar Siahaan

Sgd.

Maria Farida Indrati

Sgd.

Muhammad Alim

Sgd.

H. Abdul Mukthie Fadjar

Sgd.

H. M. Arsyad Sanusi

Sgd.

H. Achmad Sodiki

Sgd.

Jimly Asshiddiqie

Sgd.

H. M. Akil Mochtar

SUBSTITUTE REGISTRAR,

Sgd.

Ida Ria Tambunan