
The Ambiguity of Norms in Legal Protection for Advocates and the Problem of the Limits of Good Faith in the Criminal Justice System

Arih Wira Suranta*, Indah Kusuma Wardhani

Universitas Borobudur, Indonesia

Email: arihginting@yahoo.com*, indah_kwardhani@borobudur.ac.id

Keywords:

Advocate Immunity; Good Faith;
Legal Certainty; Criminalization;
Legal Protection

ABSTRACT

Legal protection for advocates is a fundamental prerequisite for the realization of fair trials, particularly in ensuring the independence of the defense function within the criminal justice system. The regulation of advocate immunity rights in Article 149 paragraph (2) of Law Number 20 of 2025 concerning the Criminal Procedure Code normatively guarantees that advocates cannot be prosecuted criminally or civilly in the exercise of their profession, but this protection is limited by the phrase "good faith," which has no operational definition or objective parameters. This gap creates normative ambiguity that generates tension between protection and restriction, with implications for legal uncertainty and the potential criminalization of advocates arising from disparate interpretations by law enforcement officials. This study aims to analyze the normative construction of advocate immunity, examine the conceptual problems of "good faith" as the boundary of immunity, and evaluate its implications for legal certainty and professional independence. The method employed is normative juridical research with statutory, conceptual, and comparative approaches. The research findings indicate that the absence of measurable indicators for assessing "good faith" leaves room for excessive discretion and weakens the effectiveness of advocate protection. This study proposes a reconstruction of the concept of "good faith" through the formulation of an operational definition grounded in the advocacy function, the use of professional standards and codes of ethics as objective parameters, and regulatory harmonization to strengthen legal certainty within the criminal justice system.

INTRODUCTION

Advocates occupy a strategic position as noble officials within the criminal justice system — a profession that not only carries out technical legal work but also bears moral and ethical responsibility in upholding justice (Saepudin, 2024). This position is normatively affirmed in Law Number 18 of 2003 concerning Advocates, specifically Article 5 paragraph (1), which states that advocates hold the status of free and independent law enforcers. This affirmation positions advocates as one of the main pillars in ensuring a fair and balanced judicial process (Nasution, 2025). The role of advocates is not limited to defending clients; they also serve as guardians of human rights before the state. The relationship between advocates and other law enforcement officials is one of equality within the framework of due process of law (Sitompul, 2026), affirming advocates as crucial actors in maintaining the integrity of the criminal justice system.

The right to immunity for advocates arose as a logical consequence of the need for professional independence. Without adequate protection, advocates face pressures that could potentially hinder their freedom to exercise their advocacy function (Nurhidayah, 2023). This immunity is normatively affirmed in Law Number 18 of 2003 concerning Advocates,

specifically Article 16, which provides advocates with protection from criminal and civil charges for carrying out their professional duties in good faith (Zebua, 2026). This function is closely related to the client's right to optimal representation. When advocates are not protected, not only is their profession threatened, but so too are the rights of citizens who require legal protection.

The strengthening of advocate immunity rights in the new Criminal Procedure Code, specifically through Article 149 of Law Number 20 of 2025, reflects legislators' efforts to consolidate the position of advocates within the criminal justice system. This provision affords broader protection for advocates' actions in the exercise of their professional duties (Prasetya, 2025), encompassing both legal actions and statements made in the client's defense. This formulation normatively signals strong recognition of advocate independence and may also be interpreted as a legislative response to previous cases of advocate criminalization.

The limiting clause of "good faith" in the regulation of advocate immunity is intended as a control mechanism to prevent the abuse of protection, while maintaining a balance between advocate freedom and the interests of law enforcement (Sugiarto, 2025). However, the absence of a clear operational definition and measurable parameters renders this concept abstract and opens wide room for interpretation at the implementation level. Divergent interpretations by law enforcement officials lead to inconsistent application of the norm, thereby creating legal uncertainty and weakening the effectiveness of protection for advocates in the exercise of their advocacy function.

The unclear boundaries of "good faith" create the potential for the criminalization of advocates. Actions that are legitimately part of a defense strategy may be construed as violations of the law by law enforcement officials. Advocates are rendered vulnerable by the absence of clear guidelines regarding the limits of permissible conduct (Lubis, 2026), a risk that is compounded when interpretations are subjective. This situation creates a dilemma between maximizing the defense function and avoiding legal risk.

Several prior studies have examined issues related to advocate immunity and legal protection in Indonesia. Saepudin (2024) analyzed the position of advocates in the criminal justice system, finding that advocates continue to face significant challenges in exercising their professional independence. Nasution (2025) examined the reconstruction of advocate organizations within the Indonesian legal system, concluding that the absence of clear organizational frameworks contributes to legal uncertainty for advocates. Sitompul (2026) analyzed the position of advocates in the modern criminal justice system under the new Criminal Procedure Code, identifying that the recognition of advocates as equal pillars of the justice system remains incomplete in practice. Nurhidayah (2023) studied the right to immunity for advocates, finding that normative protection has not been fully effective due to weak implementation. Zebua (2026) examined the implementation of legal protection for advocate immunity rights in the criminal justice process, concluding that a gap exists between normative guarantees and practical enforcement. Prasetya (2025) analyzed the progressive developments in the Criminal Procedure Code as an effort to realize fair criminal justice, highlighting that the provision on advocate immunity still requires clearer operationalization. Sugiarto (2025) analyzed the good faith requirement as a condition for advocate immunity, finding that the lack of normative classification of good faith creates significant legal uncertainty. Lubis (2026) examined the relationship between ethics and the professional integrity of advocates in legal

practice, emphasizing the importance of strengthening internal oversight mechanisms. However, these studies tend to focus on specific aspects of advocate immunity without comprehensively analyzing the normative ambiguity of the good faith requirement and its implications for legal certainty. No prior research has specifically examined the operational definition of good faith as a limit to advocate immunity, nor proposed measurable parameters grounded in professional standards and codes of ethics.

The absence of in-depth study of the paradox between immunity and its limitations represents a gap in the development of legal scholarship. Many existing studies remain confined to normative descriptions without critically examining the disharmony present in current regulation, yet the tension between protection and limitation is a crucial issue warranting a more thorough and critical approach to understanding its root causes.

The theories of legal certainty, justice, and utility provide a relevant analytical framework for understanding this tension. Gustav Radbruch's thinking positions justice as the primary value to be prioritized when it conflicts with legal certainty — a perspective that aids in interpreting problems arising when existing norms fail to provide adequate clarity (Anisyaniawati, 2024). Hans Kelsen, meanwhile, views law as a hierarchically arranged system of norms that must be internally consistent (Rinaldi, 2025). The disharmony between immunity and its limitations can thus be understood as a failure to maintain normative consistency within the legal system.

The theory of legal profession protection emphasizes the importance of safeguarding the independence of advocates as a component of a fair justice system (Bida, 2026). The concept of *officium nobile* implies that advocates must be protected so they can carry out their duties free from pressure (Zahara, 2023). This independence is directly related to the principle of fair trial, the foundational premise of criminal justice (Fazriah, 2022). Within this framework, the right to immunity is understood as functional immunity — that is, protection inherent in the function rather than the individual (Pande, 2024) — underscoring that immunity is bounded by the professional function of advocates.

The theory of discretion and abuse of authority offers an important perspective on how vague norms can be misapplied (Putri, 2026). Law enforcement officials possess interpretive latitude, particularly when norms are not clearly formulated, and uncontrolled discretion has the potential to become abuse of authority (Aryani, 2025). This situation is further complicated by the absence of clear parameters for assessing "good faith." The principle of due process of law demands certainty and fairness in every act of law enforcement (Laksono, 2026).

The concept of good faith in law has strong roots in civil law, but its application in criminal law raises distinct challenges. In civil law, good faith is generally associated with honesty and propriety of conduct (Sinilele, 2020), whereas in criminal law its assessment is more complex, given that it involves intentions and actions carrying serious legal consequences (Christy, 2022). The subjective and objective dimensions of good faith are not always readily separable, and this ambiguity makes it difficult to establish clear boundaries in practice.

The absence of standard parameters for evaluating good faith compounds existing normative problems. Advocates are left without clear guidance as to what constitutes legally compliant conduct, while law enforcement officials similarly lack a uniform reference point for making their assessments. Such disparities in interpretation can give rise to injustices in law

enforcement (Irwandani, 2026), demonstrating that the issue of good faith is not merely a matter of terminology, but goes to the fundamental structure of legal protection for advocates.

This research aims to analyze the normative construction of advocate immunity, examine the conceptual problems of "good faith" as the limit of immunity, and evaluate its implications for legal certainty and professional independence. Specifically, it focuses on the normative construction of advocate immunity rights under Indonesian law, the conceptual ambiguity of the good faith requirement, its implications for legal certainty and the potential criminalization of advocates, and the formulation of a reconstructed concept of good faith based on operational definitions derived from professional standards and codes of ethics. Theoretically, this research is expected to contribute to the development of criminal law and legal profession protection theory, particularly in understanding the relationship between immunity and its limitations. Practically, it is expected to provide recommendations for policymakers in formulating clearer operational definitions of good faith, assist law enforcement officials in establishing objective parameters for assessing advocate conduct, offer guidance for advocate organizations in strengthening professional standards and codes of ethics, and contribute to the discourse on legal reform aimed at strengthening advocate independence and legal certainty within the criminal justice system

METHOD

This research employs a normative juridical method with a statutory approach, a conceptual approach, and a comparative approach. The statutory approach focuses on analyzing the provisions of Law Number 18 of 2003 concerning Advocates and Law Number 20 of 2025 concerning the Criminal Procedure Code, particularly regarding the regulation of immunity rights and the limitations of good faith. The conceptual approach is used to deeply examine the concepts of good faith, advocate immunity, and relevant theories of legal certainty and justice. The comparative approach is carried out by examining advocate protection systems in several countries as a reflection in formulating an ideal model in Indonesia. The legal sources consist of primary, secondary, and tertiary legal materials, which are analyzed qualitatively using legal interpretation techniques to identify normative ambiguities, regulatory disharmony, and their implications in law enforcement practices.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Normative Construction of the Right to Immunity and Its Limitations

The regulation of advocate immunity rights in Indonesia is rooted in the recognition of the advocacy profession as an integral part of a fair justice system. Law Number 18 of 2003 concerning Advocates serves as the primary basis for regulating the rights and obligations of advocates, including protection in the exercise of their professional duties. Article 16 of the Advocates Law expressly states that advocates cannot be prosecuted, either civilly or criminally, for carrying out their professional duties in good faith in the defense of clients before the court. This formulation provides the initial foundation for the concept of advocate immunity in Indonesia and is designed to allow advocates to work without fear of disproportionate legal threats.

Regulatory developments demonstrate the expansion of the scope of advocate immunity, particularly through Constitutional Court Decision Number 26/PUU-XI/2013. This decision

broadens the scope of advocate immunity beyond court proceedings to include actions outside of court, provided they are related to the interests of client defense. This expansion strengthens the position of advocates in carrying out their professional functions by affording them greater latitude to take strategic steps in defending clients, emphasizing that legal protection for advocates should not be confined to formalistic boundaries.

Further strengthening is evident in the new provisions of the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP) through Law Number 20 of 2025. Article 149 of this law explicitly recognizes advocates' right to immunity in the exercise of their profession, affirming that advocates cannot be prosecuted criminally or civilly for actions taken in defense, provided they are carried out in good faith. This regulation extends the guarantee of protection for advocates across all stages of the criminal justice process and may be understood as a legislative effort to provide legal certainty for the legal profession.

The scope of advocate immunity encompasses various aspects of professional conduct, both in litigation and non-litigation contexts. Activities such as providing legal advice, drafting legal documents, and delivering statements in court fall within the scope of this protection. However, this protection is not absolute, as it remains subject to certain conditions — conditions that become a crucial point of contention in law enforcement practice.

The formulation of "good faith" as a normative requirement in the new KUHAP is a crucial element in determining the limits of advocate immunity. Article 149 of Law Number 20 of 2025 does not provide a detailed definition of good faith; the phrase is mentioned merely as a condition without clear indicators, thereby opening wide room for interpretation by law enforcement officials, with each party potentially arriving at a different understanding.

The absence of an operational definition of good faith creates uncertainty in the application of the law. Advocates lack clear guidelines regarding the standards of conduct deemed to satisfy this requirement, while law enforcement officials similarly lack standard parameters for assessing advocates' actions. Divergent interpretations can trigger conflicts in the law enforcement process, revealing a normative gap that warrants more detailed legislative attention.

A comparison with civil law provides insight into how the concept of good faith can be understood more systematically. Article 1338 paragraph (3) of the Civil Code emphasizes that agreements must be executed in good faith — a concept generally interpreted as honesty and propriety of conduct, assessed using an objective approach that considers common societal standards. This difference in approach raises questions about the relevance of transposing this concept into the criminal law context.

An analysis of normative disharmony reveals a conflict between immunity protection and the restrictions imposed by the good faith requirement. The right to immunity is designed to afford advocates the freedom to carry out their duties, yet restrictions imposed by an unclear concept have the potential to undermine the effectiveness of this protection. The imbalance between protection and control creates normative instability, and this ambiguity may be characterized as a form of normative vagueness with direct implications for legal certainty.

This ambiguity also has the potential to produce inconsistent law enforcement practices. Law enforcement officials may interpret the limits of good faith according to their own perspectives, leaving advocates exposed to legal risks even when they have performed their duties in accordance with professional standards. This situation creates tension between the

need for professional protection and oversight, and its consequences are not merely theoretical but are felt in practice.

A comparison with the legal systems of the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, and the United States offers an instructive perspective. The United Kingdom recognizes a form of advocate immunity limited to actions in court, though this has been curtailed by the decision in *Hall v. Simons* [2002] UKHL 38. The Netherlands provides protection to advocates through a legal system that emphasizes professional independence, without explicitly using the term "good faith" as a primary requirement. The United States adopts an approach grounded more firmly in professional standards, codes of ethics, and internal disciplinary mechanisms. Notably, none of these systems relies primarily on the concept of "good faith" as the principal normative boundary; instead, they employ more measurable professional standards. An important lesson to be drawn is the need to formulate more concrete boundaries in Indonesian law, so as to avoid the ambiguity that currently undermines law enforcement practice.

Practical Implications and Implementation Problems

The practice of law enforcement against advocates in Indonesia demonstrates dynamics that do not always align with the spirit of professional protection. A number of cases show advocates facing criminal proceedings while carrying out their defense duties. This situation is often associated with accusations of exceeding professional authority. Advocates who take strategic steps in the interests of clients are often perceived as disrupting the legal process. This reality raises concerns about the safe space for advocates in carrying out their profession.

Accusations of obstruction of justice are one form of legal pressure often directed at advocates. Activities such as advising clients not to provide certain information or criticizing the investigative process can be interpreted as attempts to obstruct law enforcement. However, these actions are often part of a legitimate defense strategy. Tensions arise when law enforcement officials perceive these actions as violations of the law. This difference in perspective complicates the relationship between advocates and law enforcement officials.

The role of advocates in aggressive defense is often a source of debate. Aggressive defense is necessary to maximally protect clients' interests, especially in criminal cases. This strategy can include examining evidence, criticizing procedures, and even exposing weaknesses in the investigative process. These actions are legitimate within the framework of due process of law. Negative perceptions of aggressive advocacy have the potential to blur the line between an advocate's function and a violation of the law.

The ambiguity of the concept of good faith is further exacerbated when the norm is applied in practice. Police, prosecutors, and judges have differing perspectives when assessing an advocate's actions. These differing interpretations often result in conflicting decisions. An advocate may be deemed reasonable by one party, but deemed unlawful by another. This situation creates uncertainty that directly impacts advocates' courage in carrying out their duties.

The lack of a uniform assessment standard exacerbates this situation. The assessment of good faith tends to depend on the subjectivity of each law enforcement officer. Advocates find it difficult to predict whether an action will be deemed legitimate or actually pose a legal risk. This ambiguity fosters excessive caution, which can hamper the effectiveness of advocacy. The lack of clear guidelines is a major weakness in existing regulations.

The impact on legal certainty becomes particularly significant when advocates are in a vulnerable position. The unclear boundaries of permissible actions force advocates to constantly anticipate potential risks. This situation not only impacts individual advocates but also the quality of their advocacy for clients. Advocates may choose not to take certain steps to avoid potential legal problems that may harm those who are seeking justice.

The chilling effect on the legal profession is a consequence that cannot be ignored. Fear of possible criminalization can diminish advocates' courage in carrying out their duties optimally. The legal profession, which should be free and independent, becomes overly cautious. The long-term impact can weaken the function of advocates in the criminal justice system. The quality of advocacy can decline due to unseen but real pressures.

The paradox of advocate protection is evident when normatively strong immunity is easily breached in practice. Regulations guarantee broad protection, but implementation is not always consistent. Advocates can still be prosecuted when interpretations of good faith are not in their favor. This discrepancy between norms and practice creates tensions that are difficult to resolve. The situation highlights the gap between written law and the reality of law enforcement.

The imbalance between freedom and restrictions is a major issue in regulating advocate immunity. Freedom is necessary for advocates to effectively carry out their advocacy functions. Restrictions are necessary to prevent abuse of the profession. When restrictions are formulated vaguely, this balance becomes difficult to achieve. Advocates may feel incompletely protected, even when norms provide guarantees.

The potential for abuse of authority by law enforcement officers increases when norms lack clarity. Excessive discretion can be used to unilaterally interpret an advocate's actions. The risk of criminalization based on subjective interpretations poses a real threat to the legal profession. The absence of effective oversight mechanisms exacerbates this situation. This issue underscores the importance of regulatory reform that establishes clear boundaries and protects the independence of advocates.

Normative Reconstruction and Formulation of an Ideal Model for Legal Protection for Advocates

Reconstruction of the concept of good faith becomes an urgent need when existing norms no longer provide clarity in practice. The term has been positioned as a boundary, but lacks concrete measures. Advocates need certainty regarding what constitutes legitimate actions in carrying out their profession. Without an operational definition, this concept will remain in a gray area prone to misinterpretation. Reform efforts must be directed at formulating a more measurable meaning that can be applied consistently.

An operational definition of good faith needs to be explicitly formulated in legal norms to avoid relying on individual interpretation. This formulation can include elements of intent, the purpose of the action, and its suitability for the defense function. This approach provides a clearer framework for advocates and law enforcement officials. The assessment of good faith is no longer solely based on subjective perceptions. This clarity will help reduce the potential for conflict in the law enforcement process.

Objective parameters are an important element in measuring a more rational good faith. These standards can be drawn from the professional practice of advocates that has developed

over time. Every advocate's action can be assessed based on whether it is customary in advocacy practice. An objective approach provides a more stable boundary than an assessment based solely on intent. It also helps create consistency in the application of the law.

Professional standards for advocates play a strategic role as a reference in determining the limits of good faith. Advocacy practice does not proceed without guidelines, but is instead governed by recognized professional norms. Using professional standards as a benchmark can provide legitimacy to advocates' actions. Assessments become more focused because they are based on widely accepted practices. This approach also strengthens the position of advocate organizations in maintaining the quality of the profession.

The advocate code of ethics can also serve as a reference in formulating parameters for good faith. The code of ethics not only regulates advocate behavior but also reflects the values upheld within the profession. Violations of the code of ethics can be an indicator of a deviation from good faith. Integrating legal norms and the code of ethics will create a more comprehensive regulatory system. This approach helps bridge the moral and legal aspects within a clearer framework.

Limitations on advocate immunity are still necessary, but must be designed proportionately. Overly broad restrictions can erode the protections afforded to advocates. Conversely, overly narrow restrictions can open up opportunities for professional abuse. A balance between protection and oversight must be a key principle. Clearly defining boundaries will help maintain this balance.

The ideal model for advocate protection can be developed through a functional immunity approach. Immunity is granted not as a personal right, but as protection for the function performed. Advocates are protected as long as they act within the framework of legitimate defense. This approach ensures that protection is not abused for interests outside their professional function. Focusing on function provides more rational boundaries than a general approach.

Limits on immunity should be based on professional standards, not abstract moral concepts. Professional standards are easier to measure and verify than subjective moral values. The use of these standards provides certainty for advocates in carrying out their duties. Law enforcement also has clearer guidelines for making assessments. This system can reduce the potential for conflict that has arisen due to differing interpretations.

Balancing legal certainty and justice is essential in developing a model for advocate protection. Legal certainty provides security for advocates, while justice prevents the misuse of this protection. The balance must be reflected in all regulations governing the legal profession; favoring one over the other will lead to inequality. An ideal system should integrate both aspects harmoniously.

Regulatory reformulation is a crucial step to address the various issues identified. Changes to norms in the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP) need to be directed toward more detailed clarification of good faith indicators. Synchronization with Law Number 18 of 2003 concerning Advocates is also essential to avoid norm conflicts. This reform must involve various parties, including advocacy organizations and academics. The desired outcome is clearer, fairer regulations that provide effective protection for advocates.

CONCLUSION

The ambiguity of the norm regarding "good faith" is a key finding that affects the entire framework of legal protection for advocates. This lack of clarity in its formulation creates a wide and uncontrolled scope for interpretation, thereby producing disharmony between the immunity norm and its limitations. The right to immunity, which appears normatively robust, loses its protective force when confronted with divergent interpretations at the law enforcement level. This situation reflects an imbalance between the protection promised by regulation and the practical reality faced by advocates. The risk of criminalization becomes a tangible consequence when the boundary between professional conduct and violation of the law is not clearly defined. The central problem lies in the indeterminate boundary that should serve as the dividing line between protection and limitation.

Regulatory improvement is essential for establishing clearer and more effective norms, particularly with respect to the indicators of "good faith" in criminal procedure provisions. Law enforcement officials need to exercise restraint in the use of discretion to prevent it from expanding into excessive interpretations that are harmful to the legal profession. Advocate organizations have a crucial role in strengthening codes of ethics as concrete guidelines for assessing the professional conduct of their members, and the reinforcement of the profession's internal mechanisms may prove a more effective oversight instrument than a repressive approach. Academics are expected to develop a more comprehensive theoretical framework for the protection of the legal profession, thereby contributing to the formation of regulations that are more responsive and equitable.

REFERENCES

- Aryani, D. P. (2025). Pelaksanaan Kode Etik Advokat Untuk Mencegah Penyalahgunaan Wewenang. *Das Sollen: Jurnal Kajian Kontemporer Hukum Dan Masyarakat*, 3(01).
- Saepudin, A. (2024). Kajian Terhadap Kedudukan Advokat Dalam Sistem Peradilan Pidana Di Indonesia. *Milthree Law Journal*, 1(1), 1-29.
- Nasution, P. R. (2025). Rekonstruksi Organisasi Advokat Dalam Sistem Hukum Indonesia Dan Pengaruhnya Dalam Mencapai Kepastian Hukum. *Causa: Jurnal Hukum Dan Kewarganegaraan*, 15(5), 91-100.
- Sitompul, S. M. (2026). Dari Kuhap 1981 Ke Kuhap 2025: Meneguhkan Advokat Sebagai Pilar Keseimbangan Kekuasaan Dalam Sistem Peradilan Pidana Yang Modern. *Staatsrecht: Jurnal Hukum Kenegaraan Dan Politik Islam*, 6(1), 71-96.
- Nurhidayah, A. (2023). Hak Imunitas Advokat Dalam Menjalankan Profesi Hukum. *Constitutum: Jurnal Ilmiah Hukum*, 2(1), 77-89.
- Zebua, A. S. (2026). Implementasi Perlindungan Hukum Terhadap Hak Immunitas Advokat Dalam Proses Peradilan Pidana. *Kertha Semaya: Journal Ilmu Hukum*, 14(2), 127-140.
- Prasetya, D. A. (2025). Lompatan Progresif Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Acara Pidana (Kuhap) Sebagai Upaya Mewujudkan Peradilan Pidana Berkeadilan: Progressive Leaps In The Criminal Procedure Code (Kuhap) As An Effort To Realize Fair Criminal Justice. *Ipshi Law Journal*, 5(2), 315-352.
- Sugiarto, E. S. (2025). Membedah Itikad Baik Sebagai Syarat Mutlak Imunitas Profesi Bagi Advokat Dalam Perspektif Klasifikasi Norma. *Sengkuni Journal (Social Science And Humanities Studies)*, 6(1), 113-122.

- Lubis, F. K. (2026). Kode Etik Dan Integritas Profesi Advokat: Hubungan Antara Etika, Pengawasan, Dan Pembelaan Diri Dalam Praktik Hukum. *Jurnal L Pendidikan Masyarakat Indonesia Harapan*, 2026(2026).
- Anisyaniawati, A. &. (2024). Konsep Hukum Dan Keadilan Dalam Pemikiran Gustav Radbruch. *Praxis: Jurnal Filsafat Terapan*, 2(01).
- Rinaldi, S. F. (2025). Hukum Positivisme: Analisis Pemikiran Hans Kelsen Tentang Grundnorm. *Nusantara: Jurnal Pendidikan, Seni, Sains Dan Sosial Humaniora*, 3(01).
- Bida, D. N. (2026). Analisis Pengaturan Hak Imunitas Advokat Dalam Menjalankan Profesinya Ditinjau Dari Perspektif Undang-Undang Nomor 18 Tahun 2003 Tentang Advokat. *Riggs: Journal Of Artificial Intelligence And Digital Business*, 4(4), 9379-9385.
- Zahara, F. F. (2023). Transparansi Advokat Sebagai Profesi Yang Terhormat (Officium Nobile). *As-Syar'i: Jurnal Bimbingan & Konseling Keluarga*, 5(3), 874-880.
- Fazriah, D. N. (2022). Hubungan Kebebasan Dan Tanggung Jawab Dalam Profesi Advokat. *Das Sollen: Jurnal Kajian Kontemporer Hukum Dan Masyarakat*, 1(01).
- Pande, Y. N. (2024). Advocate Immunity Rights In Providing Legal Services To Clients. *International Journal Of Health, Economics, And Social Sciences (Ijhess)*, 6(3), 828-831.
- Putri, R. M. (2026). Etika Profesi Sebagai Pilar Pencegahan Penyalahgunaan Wewenang Dalam Penegakan Hukum Pidana. *Das Sollen: Jurnal Kajian Kontemporer Hukum Dan Masyarakat*, 4(02).
- Laksono, A. S. (2026). Prinsip Due Process Of Law Dalam Pembaruan Hukum Acara Pidana Terhadap Eksistensi Praperadilan. *Ensiklopedia Of Journal*, 8(2).
- Sinilele, A. (2020). Itikad Baik Dalam Perjanjian Jual-Beli Tanah Menurut Kuh-Perdata. *El-Iqthisady: Jurnal Hukum Ekonomi Syariah*, 59-67.
- Christy, M. A. (2022). Penyimpangan Asas Itikad Baik Dalam Perjanjian Sewa Menyewa Kendaraan Dalam Perspektif Hukum Pidana Dan Perdata. *Jurnal Ilmiah Dunia Hukum*, 7(1), 1-21.
- Irwandani, R. M. (2026). Pedoman Moral Hingga Instrumen Hukum: Peran Kode Etik Dalam Menjaga Profesionalisme Advokat. *Das Sollen: Jurnal Kajian Kontemporer Hukum Dan Masyarakat*, 4(02).