

Legal Review on Marriage through Identity Falsification in the Decision of the Religious Court No. 94/Pdt.G/2019/PA.TTD

Muhammad Syukriza*

Universitas Islam Sumatera Utara

Email: syukriza11@gmail.com

Abstract

The Tebing Tinggi Religious Court Decision Number 94/Pdt.G/2019/PA.TTD opens an important discourse space in the study of Islamic family law in Indonesia, especially regarding the integrity of information in marriage contracts. This research uses a qualitative method with an empirical data-based normative juridical approach, namely a case study of the court decision file. The analysis technique used is content analysis combined with a review of Islamic law and legislation, especially the Compilation of Islamic Law. The findings explain the existence of a man who remarried by declaring his status as a widower, even though he was still bound in a legal marriage, without permission from his wife or the court. The results show that the Panel of Judges granted the request for annulment of marriage because of the proven falsification of status by the husband, which is contrary to Article 4 paragraph (2) and Article 71 letter (b) KHI. This decision confirms that integrity and honesty in providing personal information are substantial requirements in the validity of marriage. Thus, marriages built on lies and manipulation of legal status cannot be juridically protected and must be annulled for the sake of legal protection of the injured party.

Keywords: *KHI; False Identity; Marriage; Religious Court*

Abstrak: Putusan Pengadilan Agama Tebing Tinggi Nomor 94/Pdt.G/2019/PA.TTD membuka ruang diskursus penting dalam kajian hukum keluarga Islam di Indonesia, khususnya terkait integritas informasi dalam akad nikah. Penelitian ini menggunakan metode kualitatif dengan pendekatan yuridis normatif berbasis data empiris, yakni studi kasus terhadap berkas putusan pengadilan. Teknik analisis yang digunakan adalah analisis isi (content analysis) yang dipadukan dengan telaah hukum Islam dan peraturan perundang-undangan, khususnya Kompilasi Hukum Islam. Temuan menjelaskan adanya seorang pria yang menikah kembali dengan menyatakan statusnya sebagai duda, padahal masih terikat dalam perkawinan sah, tanpa izin dari istri maupun pengadilan. Hasilnya menunjukkan bahwa Majelis Hakim mengabulkan permohonan pembatalan perkawinan karena terbukti adanya pemalsuan status oleh suami, yang bertentangan dengan Pasal 4 ayat (2) dan Pasal 71 huruf (b) KHI. Putusan ini menegaskan bahwa integritas dan kejujuran dalam

memberikan informasi pribadi merupakan syarat substansial dalam keabsahan perkawinan. Dengan demikian, pernikahan yang dibangun atas dasar kebohongan dan manipulasi status hukum tidak dapat dilindungi secara yuridis dan harus dibatalkan demi perlindungan hukum terhadap pihak yang dirugikan.

Kata Kunci: *KHI; Identitas Palsu; Pernikahan; Pengadilan Agama*

Introduction

The validity of marriage in Islamic law and Indonesian positive law is often raised, especially when it comes to the integrity of identity data in the marriage contract. Islamic law scholars and family law experts agree that the validity of the marriage contract is not only determined by the fulfillment of the pillars and conditions of marriage, but also by the honesty of the parties in conveying their personal status, such as marital status, personal identity, and ability to marry. From a positive legal perspective, particularly under Law No. 1/1974 on Marriage and the Compilation of Islamic Law (KHI), honesty and openness are important foundations for the validity of a marriage. When identities are falsified, not only is the validity of the contract in doubt, but also the substantive justice that should be upheld in the family institution (Zhu, 2018).

The phenomenon of identity forgery in marriage practice is actually not new. In some areas, including in religious communities, this kind of case occurs in the context of polygamy that does not go through legal mechanisms. A man can hide the status of his previous marriage and list himself as a widower or single to remarry, without the knowledge of the first wife and without obtaining permission from the court (Suhendar et al., 2022). This practice not only harms women as married parties without complete information, but also harms the principles of transparency and fairness in family law. At the Tebing Tinggi Religious Court, one of the important cases that reflects this phenomenon is case Number 94/Pdt.G/2019/PA. TTD, where the marriage was canceled because it was known that the man had falsified his identity in order to remarry secretly (Dysmala et al., 2024).

A number of previous studies have discussed the problem of marriage annulment, such as the one conducted by (Sudarso & Surahmad, 2024) who examined aspects of marriage annulment due to personal status fraud in the Marriage Law, or a study by Fadilah (2022) on the dynamics of the practice of polygamy without permission. However, studies that specifically review empirical cases with a juridical approach to identity forgery in marriage, especially with references to official court rulings, are still rare. Therefore, this study tries to fill the void through an in-depth study of the decision of the Tebing Tinggi Religious Court (Novitasari et al., 2021).

This study aims to analyze the juridical aspects of the practice of identity forgery in marriage, as well as examine the basis of judges' considerations in deciding on the annulment of marriage in case No. 94/Pdt.G/2019/PA. TTD. The main question to be answered in this study is. What is the juridical basis for annulment of marriage according to the judge? and religious justice, as well as offering critical reflection on the importance of honesty and accountability in marriage as a sacred and legal institution.

Method

This research is a qualitative research that uses an empirically-based normative juridical approach. The main focus of the research is directed at an in-depth study of the decision of the Tebing Tinggi Religious Court Number 94/Pdt.G/2019/PA. TTD, which is a case of annulment of marriage due to identity forgery by one of the parties in the practice of polygamy that is not legal according to the law. The normative juridical approach is used to examine relevant laws and regulations, such as the Compilation of Islamic Law (KHI), Law Number 1 of 1974 concerning Marriage and its amendments, as well as the rules of Islamic law related to the validity and annulment of marriage. Meanwhile, the empirical aspect in this study is realized through tracing and analyzing concrete legal documents, namely official decision files from the court as the main source of data.

The data analysis technique used is content analysis, which is by examining the substance of legal considerations, the narrative of the facts of the trial, and the juridical basis used by the Panel of Judges in making decisions. This analysis is followed by an interpretation of the prevailing positive legal norms, associated with the principles of justice in Islamic family law. This research not only highlights the legal-formal aspects, but also pays attention to the social dynamics and legal ethics that arise in the practice of religious justice in the Tebing Tinggi area, Serdang Bedagai Regency, North Sumatra.

Results and Discussion

Background of the Matter

The background for the application for annulment of marriage is about a husband who commits polygamy without the permission of his wife and the Religious Court. In Law No. 1/1974, it has been regulated in article 6 paragraph (4) which states: "in the event that both parents have died or are unable to express their will, permission is obtained from the guardian of the person who maintains it or the family who has blood relations in the straight line and upwards as long as they are alive and in a state of expressing their will. As stated in article 14 paragraph (1) of this Law, he is obliged to submit an application to the Court in the area where he lives."

In addition, in the KHI it is also mentioned in article 1 paragraph (h) which states: "Guardianship is the authority given to a person to do a legal act as a representative for the benefit and on behalf of a child who does

not have both parents, parents who are still alive, incapable of performing legal acts.

According to the author, the word "mandatory" in Law No. 1/1974 and the word "must" in the KHI indicate that the permission to practice polygamy must be in the Religious Court in accordance with the applicable legal rules, if this is not done then the marriage does not have legal force.

This provision is regulated because based on UUNo.16/2019 concerning Marriage article 6 paragraph (4), in the event that both parents have died or are unable to express their will, permission is obtained from the guardian of the person who maintains or the family who has a blood relationship in the straight line as long as they are alive and in a state of expressing their will. Like the case that the author raised regarding the annulment of marriage, with case Number: 94/Pdt.G/2019/PA. TTD with sitting matter:

The Tebing Tinggi Religious Court which examined and adjudicated the case of Annulment of Marriage at the first level in the session of the Panel of Judges has rendered the following verdict in cases between:

1. Aprizoon Aries, S.Ag, 47 years old, Islamic, employed as the Head of the Religious Affairs Office of Tebing Tinggi District, Serdang Bedagai Regency, located at Jalan Rejo, Paya Lombang Village, Tebing Tinggi District, Serdang Bedagai Regency, hereinafter referred to as the Applicant;
2. Cok Mana bin Pairen, 50 years old, Islam, Indonesian citizenship, farmer work, address d/a. Alan Damanik on Jalan Gatot Subroto in front of the Gok Tong coffee shop, Lubuk Baru Village, Padang Hulu District, Tebing Tinggi City, hereinafter referred to as Respondent I;
3. Sariana Br Purba binti Sariammat Purba, 42 years old, Islam, Indonesian citizenship, farmer work, address d/a. Alan Damanik on Jalan Gatot Subroto in front of Gok Tong coffee shop, Lubuk Baru Village, Padang Hulu District, Tebing Tinggi City, hereinafter referred to as Respondent II

Case Chronology: This legal event began on Friday, February 16, 2018, when Respondent I and Respondent II held a marriage contract in the Tebing Tinggi District area. The marriage has been officially registered at the Tebing Tinggi District Religious Affairs Office as stated in the Marriage Certificate Citation Book Number 071/33/II/2018 dated February 26, 2018. In the execution of the marriage contract, the guardian was the sibling of Respondent II, Sigit Hargianto, replacing his deceased biological father. The marriage contract has also been witnessed by two witnesses and accompanied by a dowry in the form of cash of Rp100,000,-.

After the marriage took place, Respondent I and Respondent II lived a married life like married couples in general, and from that marriage a child was born. At the time of the marriage, Respondent I's legal status was declared as a widower because he was left to die by his wife, while Respondent II was a divorced widow. This marriage went on without

knowing any problems until in December 2018 a woman appeared who claimed to be the legal wife of Respondent I and stated that they were not legally divorced.

Hearing this, the Applicant felt the need to confirm the truth of the information and check directly by meeting Respondent I. Apparently, it was true that Respondent I still had a legal wife and the two were still living together in a marital bond. This fact proves that Respondent I has provided false information to the Office of Religious Affairs and Respondent II by declaring himself a widower, even though legally he is still the husband of the woman who came to the Petitioner.

Based on the provisions in Article 71 of the Compilation of Islamic Law, it is stated that a marriage can be annulled if it is carried out by a husband who practices polygamy without permission from the Religious Court. In this case, Respondent I has never applied for a polygamy license to the Religious Court, so his marriage with Respondent II can be considered legally defective and contrary to the provisions of the applicable laws and regulations in Islamic family law in Indonesia.

Therefore, the Applicant feels very aggrieved and objects to the occurrence of the invalid marriage. In an effort to uphold law and justice, the Applicant submitted an application to the Chairman of the Tebing Tinggi Religious Court to annul the marriage between Respondent I and Respondent II and stated that the Citation of Marriage Certificate Number 071/33/II/2018 dated February 26, 2018 issued by the KUA of Tebing Tinggi District was declared to have no legal force.

This is regulated in Government Regulation No.9/1975 article 12" The things that must be contained in the Marriage Certificate specified in this article are minimum provisions so that it is still possible to add other things, for example regarding the number of the deed; date, month, year of registration; the time, date, month and year of the wedding performed; name and position of the Registrar; the signatures of the bride and groom, the Registrar, the witnesses, and for those who are Muslim, the marriage guardian or his representative; form of dowry or permission from the Heritage Property Center for those who need it based on the applicable laws and regulations. Letter f; The consent herein is expressed in writing on a voluntary basis, free from pressure, threat or coercion."

Seeing an event like this, his marriage must be annulled. For this reason, the Head of KUA of Tebing Tinggi District, Serdang Bedagai Regency, which is authorized by KUA Staff employees, submitted an application for Annulment of Marriage Without Guardian's Permission at the Tebing Tinggi Sumber Religious Court. In accordance with Law No.16/2019 article 23(c) "Those who can apply for the annulment of marriage are authorized officials only as long as the marriage has not been broken."

In addition, in accordance with KHI article 109 "The Religious Court may revoke the guardianship rights of a person or legal entity and transfer it to another party at the request of his relatives." This is done because it has violated the law, namely the Marriage Law No.16/2019 which is

contained in article 4 paragraph (1) and KHI article 56 paragraph (1), this is further strengthened in KHI article 71 (a) "The things that must be contained in the Marriage Certificate specified in this article are minimum provisions so that it is still possible to add other things, for example, regarding the deed number; date, month, year of registration; the time, date, month and year of the wedding performed; name and position of the Registrar; the signatures of the bride and groom, the Registrar, the witnesses, and for those who are Muslim, the marriage guardian or his representative; form of dowry or permission from the Heritage Property Center for those who need it based on the applicable laws and regulations. Letter f; The consent referred to herein is expressed in writing on a voluntary basis, free from pressure, threat or coercion.

Trial Facts

That in order to prove the truth of the applicant, the facts of the trial are: (1) Statement of Respondent II as well as the facts of the trial that have been answered by respondent II. (2) Written Facts. Photocopy and original Citation of Marriage Certificate Number: 071/33/II/2018 dated February 26, 2018 issued by the Office of Religious Affairs of Tebing Tinggi District, Serdang Bedagai Regency, which has been adequately sealed and by the Chairman of the Assembly and turns out to be suitable, then by the Chairman of the Assembly is given proof P.

1. Witnesses
1. Sugito bin Satun, 61 years old, Islam, SOE employee work, resides in Hamlet I, Sei Erimah Village, Bandar Khalifah District, Serdang Bedagai Regency; That the witness admitted to knowing the Applicant, Respondent I and Respondent II, the relationship as a friend of the Applicant and stated that he was willing to be a witness and gave information under oath as follows:
 1. That the witness knew Respondent I and the Respondent at the time of the marriage of Respondent I and Respondent II;
 2. That the witness was present when Respondent I married Respondent II which was held around February 2018 in Tebing Tinggi District;
 3. That the guardian of the marriage of the Respondent II's brother and witnessed by 2 witnesses but the witness did not know his name and the dowry was in the form of money of Rp.100,000,-(one hundred thousand rupiah);
 4. That the witness received information between Respondent I and Respondent II that he had been blessed with 1 daughter;
 5. That at this time Respondent I is married to Respondent II, the status of Respondent I is a widower and the status of Respondent II is a widow left by her husband;
 6. That the witness did not know that Respondent I still had a wife and had not been divorced until now;
1. Abdul Rahman Sinaga bin Sahnun sinaga, age 39, Islam, farmer work, residence in Hamlet IV Sipispis Village, Sipispis District, Serdang

Bedagai Regency; That the witness admitted to knowing the Applicant, Respondent I and Respondent II, the relationship as neighbors of Respondent I and Respondent II and stated that he was willing to be a witness and gave evidence under oath as follows:

1. That the witness knew Respondent I and Respondent II because they were friends or neighbors with Respondent I and Respondent II;
2. That the witness was present when Respondent I married Respondent II which was held around February 2018 in Tebing Tinggi District;
3. That the guardian of the marriage of the Respondent II's brother and witnessed by 2 witnesses but the witness did not know his name and the dowry was in the form of money of Rp.100,000,-(one hundred thousand rupiah);
4. That the witness between Respondent I and Respondent II has been blessed with 1 daughter who is currently about 10 months old;
5. That at this time Respondent I is married to Respondent II, the status of Respondent I is a widower and the status of Respondent II is a widow left by her husband;
6. That Respondent I was married to Respondent II, the Respondent claimed to be a widower, even though Respondent I still had a wife and had not been divorced until now;

Based on the above explanation, it is the facts and evidence of the respondent to annul the marriage of respondent I and respondent II.

Legal Considerations

Considering, that in accordance with the provisions of Article 49 paragraph (1) letter (a) of Law Number 7 of 1989 as amended by Law Number 3 of 2006 and Law Number 50 of 2009 concerning Religious Courts, then formally the Applicant's application is the authority of the Tebing Tinggi Religious Court;

Considering that the application for annulment of marriage is filed in the jurisdiction where the marriage takes place or at the residence of the husband and wife in accordance with the provisions of Article 23 of Law Number 1 of 1974 jo Article 73 of the Compilation of Islamic Law, then formally the Petitioner's application is part of the relative authority of the Tebing Tinggi Religious Court because Respondent I and Respondent II are domiciled in the jurisdiction of the Tebing Tinggi Religious Court;

Considering, that in accordance with the provisions of Article 23 letter c of Law Number 1 of 1974 Jo. Article 38 number 1 of Government Regulation Number 9 of 1975 Jis. Article 73 letter c and Article 74 number 1 of the Compilation of Islamic Law, and based on the evidence letter P it is proven that the Applicant is an interested person and entitled in this case (*persona standi in judicio*);

Considering, that for the purpose of examining the case, based on the provisions of Article 55 of Law Number 7 of 1989 as amended by Law

Number 3 of 2006 and Law Number 50 of 2009 concerning Religious Courts jo. Article 145 paragraphs (1) and (2) R.Bg jo. Article 26 paragraphs (1) and (2) of Government Regulation Number 9 of 1975 the litigants have been ordered to be summoned and attend the trial;

Considering, that on the day of the trial that has been determined, the Applicant and Respondent II have come to appear at the trial, while Respondent I has never been present and has not sent his legal representative or attorney and there has been no application for an exception, and it turns out that the summons against the Respondent has been carried out officially and properly, then based on Article 149 paragraph (1) and 150 R.Bg there is sufficient reason for the Panel of Judges to examine and decide this case without the presence of the Respondent;

Considering that the main issue in this case is that the Petitioner requested that the marriage of Respondent I and Respondent II which took place on February 16, 2018 be annulled on the grounds that at the time Respondent I married Respondent II, Respondent I still had a wife, as fully described in the Petitioner's lawsuit letter which has been stated in the sitting of the case;

Considering, that at the trial the Respondent II had submitted an answer that basically justified the postulates of the Applicant's application and did not object to the Applicant's application as long as Respondent I was responsible for the child born in the marriage of Respondent I with Respondent II;

Considering, that even though the confession is perfect evidence as per Article 311 of the Criminal Code, the Panel of Judges is of the opinion that the confession of Respondent II is preliminary evidence and the Applicant must still prove the truth of the postulates of his application;

Considering that in this case the Applicant is the party who postulates a right or situation, then based on the provisions of Article 283 R.Bg jo. Article 1865 of the Civil Code, the Panel of Judges is of the opinion that the Applicant should be obliged and ordered to prove every postulate in his application with valid evidence;

Considering that to strengthen the postulates of his lawsuit, the Applicant has submitted evidence of letter P and 2 witnesses, and the Panel of Judges will consider the Applicant's evidence and witness statements.

Marriage Annulment Case Number: 94/Pdt.G/2019/PA. TTD

Judge's consideration in the annulment of marriage Number: 94/Pdt.G/2019/PA. TTD after examining the applicant's application and listening to the explanation of respondent II and the witness statements:

Considering that the evidence of P submitted by the Applicant which has been adequately sealed and the Applicant has shown its original at the trial, formally meets the requirements because it consists of an authentic deed issued by the authorized Official and materially proves that Respondent I and Respondent II had a marriage on February 16, 2018,

thus the Panel of Judges is of the opinion that the evidence has been admissible in this case because related to the subject matter;

Considering, that the testimony of the Petitioner's first witness (Sugito bin Satun), both formally and materially the witness has met the requirements because formally he is not a person who is prohibited from being a witness as intended in Article 171 and Article 172 of the Criminal Code, explaining under oath at the trial, and materially the information submitted based on direct knowledge where between Respondent I and Respondent I have been married around February 2018 and have been blessed with 1 person daughter and at the time Respondent I married Respondent II, the status of Respondent I still had a wife and was not divorced;

Considering, that the testimony of the Petitioner's second witness (Abdul Rahman Sinaga bin Sahnun Sinaga), both formally and materially as a witness has met the requirements because formally he is not a person who is prohibited from being a witness as intended in Article 171 and Article 172 of the Criminal Code, explaining under oath at the trial, and materially the information submitted based on direct knowledge where Respondent I and Respondent I were married around February 2018 and had was blessed with 1 daughter and at the time Respondent I married Respondent II, the status of Respondent I still had a wife and was not divorced;

Considering that based on the Applicant's statement, Respondent II's answer and the evidence submitted by the Applicant (P and 2 witnesses) mentioned above, the Panel of Judges found the following legal facts as in the respondent's answer and the witness statement described above that:

1. That Respondent I and Respondent II had a marriage on February 16, 2018 in Tebing Tinggi District, Serdang Bedagai Regency;
2. That at the time Respondent I married Respondent II, the Respondent still had a wife and was not divorced;
3. That between Respondent I and Respondent II has been blessed with 1 daughter;
4. That the Applicant knew that the marriage of Respondent I still had a wife and had not been divorced in December 2018 at which time the wife of Respondent I expressed objection to the marriage of Respondent I with Respondent II;

Considering, that based on the above legal facts, it is evident that when Respondent I married Respondent II, Respondent I was still bound by the person's husband and had not been divorced and the marriage of Respondent I with Respondent II did not go through the procedure determined by the applicable laws and regulations;

Considering, that based on the above legal facts, it is proven that Respondent I has married Respondent II which was held at the Religious Affairs Office of Tebing Tinggi District, Serdang Bedagai Regency and has been issued a Deed Citation Book Number: 071/33/II/2018 dated February 26, 2018;

Considering, that based on the above legal facts, it is proven that when Respondent I married Respondent II, the status of Respondent I was still bound by the person's husband and had not been divorced;

Considering, that based on such considerations, it is proven that the marriage of Respondent I and Respondent II has violated the applicable laws and regulations, therefore in accordance with the provisions of Article 4 paragraph (1) of Law Number 1 of 1974, Jo. Article 40 of Government Regulation Number 9 of 1975, Jis. Article 56 paragraph (1) of the Composition of Islamic Law, the Petitioner's request that the marriage of Respondent I and Respondent II which took place on February 16, 2018 in Tebing Tinggi District, Serdang Bedagai Regency, can be granted;

Considering that because the legal act in the form of the marriage of Respondent I and Respondent II was annulled, the Marriage Certificate Citation Book which is the basis for the marriage of Respondent I with Respondent II under Number: 071/33/II/2018 dated February 26, 2018 issued by the Religious Affairs Office of Tebing Tinggi District, Serdang Bedagai Regency, must be declared to have no legal force;

Considering, that in fact during the marriage period between Respondent I and Respondent II have been blessed with 1 (one) daughter, born on August 28, 2018, then in accordance with the provisions of Article 75 letter (b) of the Compilation of Islamic Law, the annulment of this marriage does not apply retroactively to 1 (one) child who has been born from the marriage;

Considering, although in the answer of Respondent II it is stated that Respondent I is responsible for a daughter named: Challista Khansa, born on August 28, 2018 who was born in the marriage of Respondent I with Respondent II is not a reconvention lawsuit, but for the sake of achieving a sense of justice, it is appropriate for the Panel of Judges in this judgment to state that the child named: Challista Khansa, born on August 28, 2018 is the legal child of Respondent I and Respondent II;

Considering that because this case is in the field of marriage, in accordance with the provisions of Article 89 paragraph (1) of Law Number 7 of 1989 concerning Religious Courts and Article 91 A paragraphs (3) and (5) of Law Number 50 of 2009 concerning the second amendment to Law Number 7 of 1989 concerning Religious Courts, all costs of this case are charged to the Applicant, to pay for it;

Based on the judge's consideration as stated above, the Tebing Tinggi Religious Court decided:

1. Granting the Applicant's application;
2. Declaring the annulment of the marriage of Respondent I (Cok Mana bin Pairen) with Respondent II (Sariana Br Purba binti Sariammat Purba) which took place on Friday, February 16, 2018 in Tebing Tinggi District;
3. Declaring that the Marriage Certificate Citation Number: 071/33/II/2018 dated February 26, 2018 issued by the Religious Affairs Office of Tebing Tinggi District, Serdang Bedagai Regency, has no legal force;

4. Declaring that the child named: Challista Khansa, born on August 28, 2018 is the legal child of Respondent I and Respondent II;
5. Charging the Applicant to pay the case fee of Rp.1,946,000.00 (one million Nine hundred and forty-six thousand rupiah)

Based on the judge's decision on the annulment of marriage as the case case Number: 94/Pdt.G/2019/PA. TTD, and referring to the Marriage Law No. 16 of 2019 and the Compilation of Islamic Law (KHI) regarding the annulment of marriage and the Criminal Code against identity forgery, the author assumes that the judge's decision is appropriate and in accordance with the applicable law.

The judge's decision in annulling the marriage is in accordance with KHI article 109 "The Religious Court may revoke the guardianship rights of a person or legal entity and transfer it to another party at the request of his relatives." This is done because it has violated the law, namely the Marriage Law No.16/2019 which is contained in article 4 paragraph (1) and KHI article 56 paragraph (1), this is further strengthened in KHI article 71 (a) "The things that must be contained in the Marriage Certificate specified in this article are minimum provisions so that it is still possible to add other things, for example, regarding the deed number; date, month, year of registration; the time, date, month and year of the wedding performed; name and position of the Registrar; signatures of the bride and groom, the Registrar, witnesses, and for those who are Muslim, the marriage guardian or their representative.

Conclusions

Based on the analysis of the Tebing Tinggi Religious Court Decision Number 94/Pdt.G/2019/PA.TTD, it can be concluded that the panel of judges granted the petition for annulment of marriage filed by the Petitioner because it was found that there was falsification of identity as stipulated in Article 4 paragraph (2) and Article 71 letter (b) of the Compilation of Islamic Law.

The judge's decision confirms that integrity and honesty in providing personal information in marriage are substantive requirements that affect the validity of the marriage itself. This decision sets an important precedent in strengthening legal protection for parties harmed by fraudulent and invalid marriages. In addition, this is also a legal lesson that marriage cannot be legalized only by fulfilling formal requirements, but must also meet moral and juridical requirements that uphold the principles of honesty, justice, and compliance with applicable laws and regulations.

References

- Dysmala, E., Meirina Djuwita, T., & Mei Utama, S. (2024). Legal Certainty of Decision Number 719/Pdt.G/2021/PA.Pbun Concerning the Nullification of Marriage According to Islamic Syari'at. *European Journal of Law and Political Science*, 3(4), 39–50. <https://doi.org/10.24018/ejpolitics.2024.3.4.149>
- Novitasari, Y., Apriliyana, D. D., Huda, M. F. R., & Solikin, A. (2021). Hukum

- Pembatalan Perkawinan karena Pemalsuan Identitas. *Ma'mal: Jurnal Laboratorium Syariah Dan Hukum*, 2(6), 553–571. <https://doi.org/10.15642/mal.v2i6.109>
- Sudarso, M. A., & Surahmad, S. (2024). Keabsahan dan Akibat Hukum Perkawinan yang Dilaksanakan dengan Pemalsuan Identitas. *JURNAL USM LAW REVIEW*, 7(2), 716–728. <https://doi.org/10.26623/julr.v7i2.8971>
- Suhendar, S., Yunus, N. R., & Rezki, A. (2022). Criminalization of Birth Certificate Forgery in Minors' Marriages. *Mizan: Journal of Islamic Law*, 6(1), 1. <https://doi.org/10.32507/mizan.v6i1.1249>
- Zhu, J. (2018). 'Unqueer' kinship? Critical reflections on 'marriage fraud' in mainland China. *Sexualities*, 21(7), 1075–1091. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1363460717719240>