

LAND REGULARIZATION AND THE RIGHT TO HOUSING: PATHS TO DIGNITY AND SOCIAL INCLUSION IN BRAZIL



<https://doi.org/10.56238/arev7n3-130>

Submitted on: 02/12/2025

Publication date: 03/14/2025

Helen Cristiany Pimenta de Oliveira¹ and Karla Eriely Pereira Magalhães²

ABSTRACT

The Urban Land Regularization - or also called REURB - was developed to implement environmental and social measures aimed at legal protection for real estate and the reduction of conflicts related to housing in the urban environment. Land Regularization, protected by Federal Law No. 13,465 of 2017, transforms irregular properties into legalized properties, guaranteeing not only the social right to housing, but also access to public services. This article aims to analyze REURB as a tool for the realization of this right, highlighting the illegal guidelines, the challenges of implementation and the social and urban impacts of this public policy. Through a qualitative approach, the research analyzes the pertinent legislation and practical implementation experiences. The results point to advances in the improvement of living conditions, but also highlight barriers such as bureaucracy and the lack of resources to ensure the full effectiveness of the policy. The article proposes, at the end, strategies to improve the implementation of REURB, aiming at inclusion and access to citizenship.

Keywords: Land regularization. Right to housing. Social inclusion. Dignity of the human person.

¹Dr. in Environmental Law and Sustainable Development from Escola Superior Dom Helder Câmara PPGD-ESDHC

Master in Social Development from UNIMONTES

Specialist in Legal Education Teaching from FASA and in Tax Law from UNISUL

Research Professor

Lawyer working in Tax and Environmental Law

E-mail: helenpimenta@yahoo.com

Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2384-9387>

²Specialization in Management of Social Public Policies and Intervention with the Family

Bachelor's degree in Law and Social Work from Faculdades Santo Agostinho de Montes Claros Guest professor in the Law and Social Work courses in optional subjects

Legal Advisor at the Multipurpose Intermunicipal Consortium of the Mining Area of SUDENE – CIMAMS Social Worker

Lawyer at a firm specializing in Environmental Law, Public and Tax Law

E-mail: karlaemagalhaes2@gmail.com

Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0009-0001-6600-3488>

INTRODUCTION

Land regularization for social purposes (REURB) is a public policy aimed at the legalization of informal urban settlements, providing the titling of land and housing that, historically, were occupied without proper legal support. In Brazil, REURB plays an important role in seeking to guarantee the right to quality housing, one of the guidelines of the right to the city enshrined in the Federal Constitution of 1988 in its article 6. Land regularization appears as an essential instrument for the realization of this right, particularly for the low-income population, which is often on the margins of legal formality.

The implementation of REURB is directly linked to the confrontation of socio-spatial inequalities in Brazilian cities. It takes place through a process that involves the organization of urban space, overcoming problems related to land tenure, basic infrastructure and the guarantee of residents' rights. This process implies the integration of these areas into the formal dynamics of the city, providing greater access to public services and citizenship.

This article proposes to analyze REURB as an instrument for promoting the fundamental right to housing, focusing on its legal, social and urban implications, in addition to reflecting on the challenges faced in its practical application. The methodology adopted will be a qualitative approach, with documentary analysis of the laws that govern land regularization in Brazil, as well as practical experiences that exemplify the different forms of application of REURB in different urban contexts. The research also seeks to identify the main barriers to the effectiveness of this public policy and the real impacts on the lives of residents of irregular settlements.

THE EVOLUTION OF LAND REGULARIZATION IN BRAZIL

Land and property regularization laws in Brazil have changed along with several historical events, reflecting the country's social and economic changes. Unlike land ownership, the process of legalizing the use and occupation of land, guaranteeing the right to property and giving legal certainty to the owners, goes through land regularization. In addition to settling land conflicts and promoting socio-environmental sustainability, the institute involves mapping, surveying and registering property titles. The Portuguese government considered the sesmarias more harmful than beneficial, leading to their extinction on July 17, 1822. However, this decision left Brazil without land legislation for a period of 28 years. It was only on September 18, 1850, already under the imperial regime,

that Law No. 601 was sanctioned, which became a milestone in Brazilian agrarian legislation (Marques, 2015)

In 1532, Dom João III, king of Portugal, had the decision to divide the lands overseas among some people, lands called captaincies. In the colonial period, due to the scarcity of financial resources, the Portuguese Crown transferred to private individuals the responsibility of "occupying" and exploiting land in Brazil. The country was divided into 14 large areas, given to court officials and the Portuguese gentry. These individuals, called donatários, received the captaincies and held the "lordship" over the lands, but they had the obligation to populate and economically develop the regions under their domain (Angelo, 2009)

Also according to Angelo (2009), the donatários could allocate portions of land to production, portions called sesmarias, a system instituted in Portugal in the fourteenth century, during the economic crisis of the Late Middle Ages. Adapted, the sesmarias were implemented with the purpose of accelerating the colonization of the Portuguese American territory. Marques (2015, p. 24) explains, "being a colony of Portugal, Brazil had its territory subjected to concessions, from the colonization initiated by Martin Afonso de Sousa, with the use of the institute of sesmarias, which existed in the Portuguese legislative context, although with a different meaning". Those who received dominion over the sesmarias were called sesmeiros, and had a period of five years to cultivate them, under penalty of losing them in case of non-compliance with the legislation. Between the 16th and 18th centuries, the captaincies gradually returned to the domain of the Portuguese Crown, through purchase or confiscation. This occurred because the lands were not owned by the donatários, who only held possession, but by Portugal. In 1759, by order of the Marquis of Pombal, the hereditary captaincies were extinguished and Brazil began to be divided into royal captaincies, which were granted to Portuguese noblemen and religious (Angelo, 2009)

In 1822 the occupations remained unchanged, since the Independence of the Brazilian territory. Until the time of the sanction of Law No. 601, the lands of the Empire were illegally occupied, mainly with the expansion of large farms that produced coffee. Faced with this situation, in 1850 the Land Law was approved, with the objective of regularizing the land issue and at the same time responding to the challenges that arose with the end of the slave trade, and the need for foreign labor. In 1843, a proposal to regulate Brazilian lands was presented to the Chamber of Deputies, inspired by the

colonization model of Australia. The project suggested, among other things, the purchase of vacant land (unoccupied) with payment in cash and high values (Angelo, 2009)

The Land Law of 1939, which replaced the Land Code of 1934, made important modifications to the Land Law of 1939 that represented an attempt to modernize and rationalize Brazilian agrarian legislation. It aimed, among other things, to promote colonization, combat unproductive latifundia and promote agriculture. However, the law ended up reinforcing land concentration and contributing to the exclusion of small rural producers. (Figueira *et. all*, 2016)

Also according to Figueira, Devisate and Kohl (2016, p. 437), "after the end of World War II in 1945, Brazil left behind the Estado Novo and the dictatorship of Getúlio Vargas and decided to draft a new Constitution". The Constituent Legislator of 1946 presented a renewing stance by including a clause that explicitly conditioned the use of property to social welfare, as established in article 147, which provided that "the use of property shall be conditioned to social welfare. The law may, in compliance with the provisions of article 141, § 16, promote the fair distribution of property, with equal opportunity for all (Brasil, 1946, emphasis added).

The Land Statute (Law No. 4,504/64) was one of the main initiatives in dealing with the land issue in Brazil, although it was adopted after the Vargas government. With the seizure of properties considered unproductive and the distribution of land to family farmers and rural workers, this legislation instituted agrarian reform as a state policy. Before the 1967 Constitution, the Land Statute (Law No. 4,504/64) was the first to clearly establish the concept of the social function of property. In its article 2, paragraph 1, the law ensures the right of access to land, conditioned to the fulfillment of its social function, which is effective when the property meets certain conditions provided for in the legislation (Figueira et al., 2016)

After this period in which land issues were addressed, agrarian reform and land regularization in Brazil began to be promoted by the National Institute of Colonization and Agrarian Reform (INCRA), founded in 1970.

In addition, article 182 of the CF/88 states that "the urban development policy of the municipal government aims to order the full development of the city's social functions and promote the well-being of its citizens." This implies that property must serve the interests of society, in addition to allowing its owner the freedom to enjoy and dispose of it. Thus, the legislator of the Constitution attributed to the social function of property the character of an

independent and autonomous principle. Therefore, the constitutional guarantee of the right to property is conditioned to the fulfillment of its social function. "Although property is considered a fundamental individual right, its use and enjoyment must also meet the public interest and social objectives" (Figueira et al., 2016).

One of the pillars of fundamental rights is the social function of property, which is linked to the idea of the social purpose of the company. The goal is to ensure that the property is used for the good of the community and not in a way that is abusive or harmful to the interests of society.

In addition, other legislation has contributed to the achievement of such social purposes. The Urban Land Subdivision Law (Law No. 6,766/93) establishes general guidelines for the subdivision of urban land and governed the establishment of urban subdivisions, the City Statute - Law No. 10,257/2001 - establishes fundamental rules for urban policy, determining that municipalities should prepare master plans to coordinate urban growth and ensure the social use of property. In 2009, Law No. 11,977/2009 was enacted, which instituted the Minha Casa, Minha Vida program, defining rules for land regularization of social interest. Article 46 of this Law establishes land regularization as:

[...] a set of legal, urban, environmental and social measures aimed at the regularization of irregular settlements and the titling of their occupants, in order to guarantee the social right to housing, the full development of the social functions of urban property and the right to an ecologically balanced environment. (Brazil, 2017)

A change in the law made it possible to convert possession into property five years after its registration, which was previously inconceivable. An important change brought hope to the dispossessed. Previously, people who lived in favelas or irregular settlements only had the right of possession. Currently, the legislation allows the possession of private areas to be converted into property after five years from the registration of the legitimation of possession, according to Law No. 11,977/2009. In addition, other land regularization instruments include special adverse possession, both individual and collective, the concession of use for housing and urban demarcation. (Nalini et al., 2011).

The program consists of a public policy that seeks to encourage access to quality housing for the low-income population and has great legal relevance in Brazil. The program regulations and conditions established by the Act included criteria for choosing recipients, the amount of government grants, funding requirements, and the duties of federal agencies and other agents involved. The success of the program also led to the

creation of other initiatives to promote the right to housing, such as the Casa Verde e Amarela Program (Law 14,118/21).

Federal Law No. 13,465 of 2017, REURB - regulated by Decree No. 9,310/2018 - which improved institutes introduced by Federal Law No. 11,977/2009, as well as introduced some novelties, such as the right to slab and land legitimation, in addition to the study of other legal diplomas, plays an important normative role, to incorporate informal urban centers into urban territorial planning, bringing to this end, legal, urban, environmental and social norms.

Article 2 of Decree 9,310/2018 elucidates the objectives of REURB, to be observed by the Union, the States, the Federal District and the Municipalities, such as:

I - to identify the informal urban centers to be regularized, to organize them and to ensure the provision of public services to their occupants, in order to improve the urban and environmental conditions in relation to the previous informal occupation situation; II - to create real estate units compatible with urban territorial planning and to constitute real rights over them in favor of their occupants; III – to expand access to urbanized land by the low-income population, so as to prioritize the permanence of occupants in their own regularized informal urban centers; IV - to promote social integration and the generation of employment and income; V – to encourage the extrajudicial resolution of conflicts, in order to reinforce consensuality and cooperation between the State and society; VI – to guarantee the social right to decent housing and adequate living conditions; VII – to ensure the effectiveness of the social function of property; VIII – to order the full development of the city's social functions and to ensure the well-being of its inhabitants; IX – to implement the constitutional principle of efficiency in the occupation and use of the land; X – to prevent and discourage the formation of new informal urban centers; XI - to grant real rights, preferably in the name of the woman; and XII - to allow the participation of interested parties in the stages of the land regularization process. (Brazil, 2018).

Land regularization has been an ongoing challenge for Brazil throughout its history, as the acquisition and occupation of land often occurred in a disorganized manner and without proper legal protection. Over time, the country has implemented laws and programs aimed at ensuring access to land and legal security for residents, promoting advances in public policies for land regularization. However, despite the progress, there is still much to be done so that all citizens have access to properly regularized land. Thus, it is essential that the government continues to work in partnership with society to improve public policies and foster fairer and more sustainable territorial development.

THE SOCIAL FUNCTION OF PROPERTY AND THE RIGHT TO HOUSING

As stated in CF/88, land regularization in Brazil is directly linked to the social function of property. This means that the landowner must use his land in a way that promotes collective well-being and serves the interests of the community. The social function of property is a crucial aspect of land regularization, as it ensures that everyone has fair access to land and can legitimately enjoy it. In addition, land regularization is an essential tool to fulfill this function, as it enables the legalization and use of irregular housing in accordance with local urban and environmental standards.

Historically, real estate property, as it is known, only became recognized and stabilized with the formation of more organized societies, as the right over real estate began to be formalized through official records. Without state control, only possession is recognized. The right to property has evolved with multiple influences, especially economic, social and, more recently, environmental. The social function of property, which opposes the absolute individual right to property, has gradually been shaped, reflecting the growing recognition of the importance of the collective interest, which aims to meet the needs of urban communities (Pedroso, 2013)

The right to property was fully recognized in the Constitutions of 1824, 1891 and 1937, allowing expropriation only in cases of public utility, without taking into account social or collective aspects. It was only with the 1946 Constitution that the social function of property was reintroduced, and this process is called by scholars as the "relativization" of private property. This change aimed to meet the interests of society and promote a fairer and more equal distribution, reinforcing agrarian reform, as established in article 147, which stated that "the use of property shall be conditioned to social welfare" and that the law could promote an equitable distribution of property. Despite previous attempts, the creation of the bases for the social function of property only materialized with the 1988 Constitution, motivated by redemocratization and the need to organize urban centers. Figueira, Devisate and Kohl (2018) analyze the social function of property in the light of the Constitution, highlighting its dual nature: as a fundamental right in Article 5 and as a principle of economic order in Article 170. As a fundamental right, the social function of property has become a guiding norm, influencing the interpretation and application of infra-constitutional norms.

[...] The provision of the social function of property in the current constitutional text, in Article 5, as a Fundamental Right, and in Article 170, III, as a principle of the economic order, was also reaffirmed in the current Civil Code of 2002. In

this, the socio-environmental nature of the social function of property, implicit in the constitutional text, was made explicit in § 1 of article 1,228: Art.1,228. The owner has the faculty to use, enjoy, and dispose of the thing, and the right to recover it from the power of whoever unjustly possesses or detains it. Paragraph 1 - The right to property must be exercised in accordance with its economic and social purposes and in such a way that flora, fauna, natural beauty, ecological balance and historical and artistic heritage are preserved, in accordance with the provisions of a special law, as well as avoiding air and water pollution. [...] (Brazil, 2002, emphasis added).

According to Figueira, Devisate and Kohl (2018), the environment has become an essential element of the social function of property, according to article 186, II, of the Federal Constitution of 1988, which determines the proper use of natural resources and the preservation of the environment. In addition, article 170 of the Constitution highlights the importance of private property, the social function of property, and environmental defense as fundamental principles. The Constitution also addresses the social function of property in other sections, such as in urban and rural policy (articles 182 to 191), and in the tax system, allowing tax penalties for those who do not comply with the rules related to the social function (Pedroso, 2013).

Not every human settlement is worthy and appropriate. In the context of land regularization, the social function of property is fundamental to ensure the legal security of families that irregularly occupy urban or rural areas. Land regularization is a process of legalizing the possession of a property, which involves several steps, such as identifying the occupied area, verifying the ownership of the property, environmental regularization, and defining the conditions of use of the area.

According to Martins (2022), the dignity of the human person would be the source of all the fundamental rights and guarantees that a natural person has. If human beings are holders of rights and guarantees, it is because they should be treated with dignity. The principle of the dignity of the human person has two main functions: one to legitimize the State and the legal order, stating that both exist to serve the human person, and another hermeneutic, which guides the interpretation of constitutional norms in various areas, such as economics, taxation, and private law. Human dignity, therefore, must be considered in the reading of all legal precepts, being, for example, essential for the interpretation of article 226, § 3, of the Federal Constitution, which expanded the concept of stable union to same-sex couples. In summary, the dignity of the human person is the basis of all fundamental rights and guarantees, ensuring that human beings are treated with respect. (Sarmiento *apud* Martins, 2022)

Federal Law No. 13,465/2017, which establishes REURB, defines land regularization as a process of legalization of real estate ownership, which involves steps such as identifying the area, verifying ownership, environmental regularization, and defining the conditions of use. In this context, the social function of property is crucial to ensure the legal security of families that occupy areas irregularly, both urban and rural.

The dignity of the human person is also applied as a criterion to resolve conflicts between constitutional interests, as Daniel Sarmiento points out, being a parameter to balance fundamental rights and the interests of the majority. Human dignity guides the application of proportionality, helping to resolve conflicts between constitutional principles. (Nunes apud Martins, 2022).

In the land regularization process, it is essential to consider the social function of the property to ensure that the occupation is adequate and compatible with the collective interest, not limited to the transfer of ownership alone. In this way, regularization can contribute to social justice, promoting access to decent housing and sustainable land occupation in accordance with the legislation.

REURB, HOUSING AND DIGNITY: TRANSFORMATIVE EXPERIENCES IN ACCESS TO HOUSING

Housing is essential for human development, being considered one of the basic necessities of life. The right to housing is guaranteed by the Federal Constitution of 1988, in article 6, and involves the responsibility of the Union, States and Municipalities to promote housing improvements and implement housing and basic sanitation projects. This right was already recognized by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) and was formally incorporated into the Brazilian Constitution through Constitutional Amendment No. 26, in 2000, reaffirming its importance for human dignity.

Despite being made explicit late, the right to housing was already implicit in the 1988 Constitution, reflecting the historical need of the needy population, especially in a context of government neglect of the poorest. Urban land regularization (REURB), instituted by Federal Law No. 13,465/2017, offers residents of irregular areas the opportunity to obtain legal security of possession and the formalization of ownership, ensuring access to decent housing.

Therefore, REURB aims to ensure that residents of irregular areas have the rights of possession and ownership, promoting the social function of property and allowing access

to citizenship and a more dignified and secure life. Law No. 13,465/17, sanctioned on July 11, 2017, establishes the new legislation on land regularization, consisting of 109 articles. In Title II, which covers articles 9 to 82, the law deals with Urban Land Regularization, dividing it into two modalities: REURB-S, aimed at settlements of low-income population and social interest, and REURB-E, aimed at the regularization of settlements formed by medium and high-income populations, of specific interest. (Almeida, 2018).

Law No. 13,465/17, which deals with land regularization, is directly connected to constitutional principles, especially the social function of property, according to article 5, item XXII, of the Federal Constitution. It aims to guarantee human dignity and ensure people's rights, especially in contexts of social vulnerability, such as in informal urban and rural areas. The social function of property, as discussed by scholars, is not only a fundamental right, but also a duty that must be exercised in order to meet collective needs. In this context, REURB facilitates the regularization of properties occupied by low-income people, allowing the legalization of possession and the insertion of these people in the legal system, guaranteeing them the right to housing. (Freitas, 2022). Human dignity, as a central principle, is seen as a fundamental right that ensures minimum conditions for a dignified life, allowing the active participation of the individual in society. This dignity is directly related to the social rights guaranteed by the Constitution, which include the right to housing. REURB is an important tool to ensure that housing goes beyond the simple possession of a house, offering security and stability for people.

The doctrine of the social function of property corresponds to a conceptual change in the traditional regime; it is not, however, a matter of essence, but rather belonging to a portion of the property that is its use. The historical process of man's appropriation of the land develops artificially, and in each epoch property constitutes different contours, according to the social and economic relations of each moment. The degree of complexity reached today by the institute of property derives undisguisedly from the degree of complexity of social relations. (Fachin, 1988, p.18)

The law allows any legitimate party to request the registration of the Land Regularization Certificate (CRF), simplifying the process and promoting the regularization of urban and rural lands. The inclusion of the CRF in the real estate registry reinforces legal certainty and social inclusion. In this way, REURB contributes to social justice, allowing the legalization of irregular occupations and promoting dignity and equality in access to housing.

The human person is considered as an individual in his singularity and from this premise the principle is obtained that he must be "free" (external freedom oppressed only by the obstacles of nature and not removed by the advance of the related sciences). In turn, as a social being, being with other individuals in a relationship of equality, the human person also begins to receive the oppressive burden of the obstacles to his will, arising from the political organization of society. (Guerra, Balmant, 2006, p.03).

The dignity of the human person goes beyond a principle, being a basis for the creation of laws that protect fundamental rights. It is an inherent quality of the human being, guaranteeing him respect and consideration by the State and society. Dignity implies a set of rights and duties that protect the person against abuse, in addition to ensuring minimum conditions for a healthy life and the possibility of actively participating in society (Sarlet, 2001).

CF/88 ensures social rights to all citizens, highlighting that the right to housing is not limited to owning a home, but rather having access to a safe, stable and dignified home. However, many still face great hardship due to homelessness, especially among low-income populations. REURB aims to facilitate the regularization of real estate ownership, ensuring the rights to housing and human dignity, as provided for in the Constitution, through simplified procedures for land regularization. With regard to the registration of Land Regularization (Reurb), any legitimate person can request the registration of the Land Regularization Certificate (CRF), accompanied by the approved regularization project, directly at the real estate registry service corresponding to the area of the urban or informal core. This registration must be carried out regardless of a court order or the Public Prosecutor's Office, according to article 42 of Law No. 13,465/2017. The legislation itself also included item "43" in the list of hypotheses of strict registration of article 167, I, of Law No. 6,015/1973, to specifically address the registration of the CRF (Humberto, 2020)

In this scenario, it is evident that Law 13,465/17 strengthens its legislative role by facilitating and regularizing the legitimization of the possession of urban and rural land throughout the country. This law arouses reflections on social justice, the right to property and housing, by promoting land regularization and ensuring legal security, in addition to fostering social inclusion.

The practical experiences of implementing REURB to guarantee decent housing, especially for low-income families, have shown the challenges and advances of this policy, highlighting how land regularization can be essential to promote social inclusion, guarantee the dignity of the human person and reduce inequalities in access to the formal city.

According to Borges (2019), **Complexo do Alemão**, one of the largest favelas in Rio de Janeiro, has been an example of REURB implementation with a focus on the regularization of informal settlements in risk areas. The City of Rio de Janeiro, together with Caixa Econômica Federal and other entities, began a process of land regularization in the Complex, which involved the titling of properties and the implementation of basic infrastructure such as water, sewage and paving. The implementation of REURB in Complexo do Alemão was challenged by the lack of documentation and the resistance of families who had already occupied these areas for decades. However, community participation was key. The experience showed that, in addition to land regularization, urbanization actions were necessary to improve the quality of life of residents. The experience in Alemão also demonstrated that when the process is coordinated with the participation of the community, the chances of success are greater (Borges, 2019).

The Vila União neighborhood, in São Paulo, has also been a relevant example in the application of REURB-S (for social purposes). This land regularization project was focused on an area inhabited by low-income families, where many lived without any legal documentation of ownership. The City of São Paulo began the regularization with the objective of providing the titling of properties and the installation of basic infrastructure, such as water supply and sewage networks. (São Paulo City Hall, 2020). For Silva (2018) The experience in Vila União highlighted the crucial role of education and awareness of the population about the benefits of land regularization. In addition, the project had the partnership of agencies such as the Public Defender's Office and NGOs, which helped ensure the legal follow-up of the families during the titling process.

The city of Porto Alegre has implemented REURB in several of its peripheral communities, focusing on the most needy and vulnerable areas. REURB was applied in both **the REURB-S and REURB-E modalities**, addressing both communities with families in situations of social vulnerability and areas occupied by families in need of regularization, but without the same conditions of extreme vulnerability. For Santos, (2020) the implementation in Porto Alegre included an in-depth diagnosis of the social and urban conditions of the areas to be regularized. The experience showed that the support of the community was essential to overcome bureaucratic challenges and ensure adherence to the project. In addition, partnerships with Caixa Econômica Federal allowed the financial feasibility of urban infrastructure works, essential to improve living conditions in the region. (Brazil, 2021)

Despite successful experiences, the implementation of REURB faces several challenges. For Rolnik (2017), the major obstacle is the **resistance of private and real estate sectors** that oppose regularization, especially in areas of high market value. In addition, there is a lot of **bureaucracy and slowness** in issuing documents and records necessary for titling. On the issue, Gómez *et. all* (2023) suggests that a major obstacle is the **lack of financial resources** for the execution of infrastructure works necessary for the complete urbanization of regularized areas. Rabelo (2019) adds the difficulty of **articulation between the different spheres of government** (municipal, state, and federal), which can delay the process and reduce its effectiveness.

Above all, for the guarantee and effectiveness of the process, there needs to be a real **active participation of the community** to ensure adherence to the regularization process and ensure that the benefits really reach the most vulnerable families.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

Throughout this study, the importance of land regularization in Brazil was explored, from the enactment of the Land Law in 1850 to the challenges faced by the country today. Despite legislative advances and public policies aimed at land regularization and agrarian reform, problems such as land concentration, irregular occupation and limited access to land persist. CF/88 enshrined essential principles, such as the social function of property and the dignity of the human person, but the practical implementation of these principles remains a challenge.

One of the points discussed in this work includes a comprehensive overview of the historical evolution of land regularization in Brazil, the emphasis on the social function of property as a fundamental principle, and the analysis of recent policies and programs aimed at ensuring adequate housing and access to housing. Law No. 13,465/17 simplifies the process of legitimizing tenure, mainly benefiting areas occupied by people in situations of social vulnerability, allowing municipalities to guarantee the right to housing for these communities and, simultaneously, promote the social function of property.

In this way, land regularization, especially REURB, is aligned with the principle of human dignity, ensuring that fundamental rights, such as the right to housing, are protected and promoted in Brazil. REURB has a significant social impact by granting property title and legal security, facilitating access to financing and credit, in addition to having a positive environmental impact by promoting the implementation of basic infrastructure in

regularized settlements, such as drinking water supply, sewage and waste collection, contributing to environmental health and the reduction of deforestation, by avoiding the disorderly expansion of cities in areas of vegetation and thus preserving the environment.

Therefore, REURB emerges as a crucial tool in the realization of human dignity, aligning with constitutional principles and creating an environment conducive to improving the quality of life and well-being of the population. Despite the challenges, land regularization is essential to promote the right to decent housing and reduce social inequalities in cities. The active participation of communities and collaboration between the different levels of government are key to ensuring the success of these projects. However, for REURB to reach its full potential for social transformation, it will be necessary to overcome obstacles such as the resistance of real estate sectors, excessive bureaucracy and scarcity of resources.

REFERENCES

1. Amore, C. S., Shimbo, L. Z., & Rufino, M. B. C. (2015). *Minha casa... e a cidade? Avaliação do programa Minha Casa Minha Vida em seis estados brasileiros*. Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Letra Capital.
2. Angelo, V. A. (2009). Lei de Terras – Lei de 1850 contribuiu para manter concentração fundiária. UOL Educação. Recuperado em 19 de maio de 2024, de <https://educacao.uol.com.br/disciplinas/historia-brasil/lei-de-terras-lei-de-1850-contribuiu-para-manter-concentracao-fundiaria.htm>
3. Borges, F. (2019). Regularização fundiária no Rio de Janeiro: O caso do Complexo do Alemão. *Revista Brasileira de Planejamento Urbano*.
4. Brasil. (1988). *Constituição da República Federativa do Brasil*. Brasília, DF: Senado Federal. Recuperado em 2 de maio de 2024, de https://www2.senado.leg.br/bdsf/bitstream/handle/id/518231/CF88_Livro_EC91_2016.pdf
5. Brasil. (2009, 7 de julho). Lei nº 11.977, de 7 de julho de 2009. Dispõe sobre o Programa Minha Casa, Minha Vida - PMCMV e a regularização fundiária de assentamentos localizados em áreas urbanas. *Diário Oficial da União*. Recuperado em 2 de maio de 2024, de http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_Ato2007-2010/2009/Lei/L11977.htm
6. Brasil. (2017, 11 de julho). Lei nº 13.465, de 11 de julho de 2017. Dispõe sobre a regularização fundiária rural e urbana. *Diário Oficial da União*. Recuperado em 2 de maio de 2024, de http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_ato2015-2018/2017/lei/L13465.htm
7. Brasil. Presidência da República. (2018, 15 de março). Decreto nº 9.310, de 15 de março de 2018. Regulamenta a Lei nº 11.445, de 5 de janeiro de 2007, e a Lei nº 13.529, de 4 de dezembro de 2017. *Diário Oficial da União*. Recuperado em 2 de maio de 2024, de http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_ato2015-2018/2018/decreto/D9310.htm
8. Cherubim, N. (2017). *Reforma agrária no Brasil: Uma história não contada*. São Paulo, SP: Geração Editorial.
9. Figueira, P. S. S., Devisate, R. R., & Kohl, P. R. (2016). *Regularização fundiária: Experiências regionais* (Edições do Senado Federal, 304). Brasília, DF: Senado Federal.
10. Gómez, R. V., & Vieira Filho, J. E. R. (2023). *Regularização fundiária no Brasil: Avanços e desafios*. Brasília, DF: IPEA. Recuperado em 12 de dezembro de 2024, de https://repositorio.ipea.gov.br/bitstream/11058/11773/1/TD_2851_web.pdf
11. Governo do Estado do Rio Grande do Sul. (2021). *Relatório de regularização fundiária em Porto Alegre*. Porto Alegre, RS: Autor.

12. Marques Neto, A. (2013). Direito agrário (5ª ed.). São Paulo, SP: Atlas.
13. Meirelles, H. L. (2014). Direito agrário brasileiro. São Paulo, SP: Malheiros.
14. Moraes, A. D. (2021). Direitos humanos fundamentais (12ª ed.). São Paulo, SP: Grupo GEN. Recuperado de Minha Biblioteca.
15. Nalini, J. R., & Levy, W. (2011). Regularização fundiária. São Paulo, SP: Editora Revista dos Tribunais.
16. Pedroso, A. G. de A., & outros. (2013). Regularização fundiária. Rio de Janeiro, RJ: Editora Forense.
17. Prefeitura de São Paulo. (2020). Relatório de regularização fundiária no Bairro Vila União. São Paulo, SP: Autor.
18. Rabelo, F. (2019). O processo de regularização fundiária no Brasil: Obstáculos e soluções. Revista de Administração Pública, 53(1).
19. Rodrigues, C. (2020). Experiências de regularização fundiária em Campinas. Revista de Direito Imobiliário.
20. Rolnik, R. (2017). O direito à cidade e a questão da regularização fundiária no Brasil. Revista Brasileira de Direito Urbanístico, 13(1), 21-39.
21. Santos, R. L. (2020). Regularização fundiária em Porto Alegre: Desafios e resultados. Revista Brasileira de Política Urbana.
22. Silva, A. M. (2015). Reforma agrária e desenvolvimento rural no Brasil: Uma análise crítica. Revista de Ciências Sociais, 56(2).
23. Silva, E. de M. (2018). A regularização fundiária e os direitos humanos: O caso de São Paulo. Revista de Direito Urbanístico.