

## CHAPTER V

### CLOSING

#### A. CONCLUSION

Based on the results of research and discussion, it can be concluded that:

1. The authority to request a Bankruptcy Declaration against a State-Owned Enterprise based on Article 223 of Law Number 37 of 2004 concerning Bankruptcy and Postponement of Debt Payment Obligations in Decision Number: 1454K/Pdt.Sus-Pailit 2022 can only be submitted by the Minister of Finance.
2. The legal consequences of the PKPU application against BUMN based on Law Number 37 of 2004 Bankruptcy and Postponement of Debt Payment Obligations, namely the debtor, or in this decision, PT. Garuda Indonesia (Persero) Tbk is given temporary protection from creditor demands and is given the opportunity to restructure its debts under court supervision, and all execution actions that have been initiated in the debt repayment process must be suspended. That based on Article 249 Paragraphs (1) and (3) of Law Number 37 of 2004, it is stated that if a reciprocal agreement occurs during PKPU, then the party entering into the agreement with the debtor can ask the management to provide certainty regarding the continuation of the agreement and if this does not happen agreement, and the party entering into the agreement who feels disadvantaged can claim rights or act like a concurrent creditor.

## **B. SUGGESTION**

There needs to be an update in Law Number 37 of 2004 on Bankruptcy and Suspension of Debt Payment Obligations in detail, especially regarding PKPU arrangements which are regulated before bankruptcy so that readers can easily understand the contents of the article and the flow of dispute resolution in language that is easy to understand and for the parties to understand more. pay attention to existing laws so as not to get caught in a PKPU case.

