

Research Article

# Loss of Advocates' Immunity Rights Due to Violations of Professional Ethics in the Case of Razman Arif Nasution

April Naufal Anggraeni <sup>1\*</sup>, Aldi Darmawan <sup>2</sup>, Ismi Rusyanti <sup>3</sup>

<sup>1-3</sup> Fakultas Hukum Universitas Islam Syekh Yusuf-Tangerang, Indonesia  
Email : [aprilinaufal48@gmail.com](mailto:aprilinaufal48@gmail.com)

\* Corresponding Author: [aprilinaufal48@gmail.com](mailto:aprilinaufal48@gmail.com)

**Abstract:** The right to immunity for advocates is an important instrument to ensure that advocates can practice their profession freely, especially in defending clients' interests in court, without being disturbed by legal threats. However, this right is not absolute and can be lost if the advocate violates the code of ethics or harms the dignity of the court, as in the case of Razman Arif Nasution, which raised questions about the balance between professional protection and ethical responsibility. This paper aims to examine the limits of the right to immunity for advocates in the context of violations of professional ethics, as well as explore its legal implications for the disciplinary mechanisms of advocate organizations. The method used is normative juridical, with a statute approach and a case study approach. The study findings indicate that advocate protection must still be linked to compliance with professional ethics, so that in practice disciplinary mechanisms have a strategic role in upholding professionalism.

**Keywords:** Advocates, Immunity Rights, Normative Juridical, Professionalism, Professional Ethics.

## 1. Introduction

### Background of the Problem

The advocate profession has a very important position in the judicial and law enforcement system in Indonesia. As one of the pillars in the judicial system (*officium nobile*), advocates function to ensure citizens' rights to obtain legal aid, assist clients at every stage of the legal process, and ensure that the principles of justice and due process of law are truly realized. In carrying out their profession, advocates have freedom guaranteed by law through the concept of advocate immunity rights, as stipulated in Article 16 of Law Number 18 of 2003 concerning Advocates. This provision emphasizes that advocates cannot be prosecuted either civilly or criminally in carrying out their professional duties in good faith in court. With the existence of advocate immunity rights that provide legal protection for advocates in carrying out their duties, on the other hand, the right to advocate immunity, which is often considered unlimited, cannot be underestimated by advocates, it is still important for advocates to keep the advocate profession from criminalization in defending clients (Khambali, 2018).

Received: November 15, 2025

Revised: November 25, 2025

Accepted: December 28, 2025

Published: December 31, 2025

Curr. Ver.: December 31, 2025



Copyright: © 2025 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY SA) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>)

This right to immunity aims to protect advocates from external pressures, including power intervention and threats from opponents, so that advocates can act independently and objectively in fighting for their clients' legal interests (Winata & Dewanto, 2020). However, this right is not an absolute protection that can be used as a shield for all forms of advocate behavior. In practice, advocate immunity only applies as long as the advocate carries out his professional duties in accordance with the advocate's code of ethics, oath of office, and applicable legal principles. If an advocate commits an act that is contrary to professional ethics, behaves disrespectfully in court, or makes a defamatory statement against another party, the right to immunity can be revoked.

The phenomenon of losing advocates' immunity rights has been in the public spotlight in recent years, especially after the emergence of the case of Razman Arif Nasution, an advocate who was deactivated from the membership of an advocate organization because he was considered to have violated the Indonesian Advocates Code of Ethics (KEAI). The case arose after Razman's various statements in the public sphere that were considered not reflective of the ethics of the advocate profession, as well as reports of violations that led to the freezing of his oath of attorney by the Supreme Court (Roshali, 2025). The case has sparked a polemic among legal practitioners about the extent to which advocates' immunity rights can be enforced and when restrictions can be lifted due to ethical violations.

In this context, the ethical dilemma of advocates arises, namely the conflict between the professional obligation to defend the interests of the client to the maximum and the moral obligation to uphold the dignity of the profession and respect the judiciary. Advocates are often in a difficult position when their harsh defense is perceived as a violation of judicial etiquette or professional ethics. This dilemma shows that the advocate profession is not only required of legal competence, but also moral integrity and ethical sensitivity in every action. Advocates often face ethical dilemmas that arise from conflicts between professional obligations and the internal ethical norms of the legal profession (Daughter et al., 2025). As a profession that receives the privilege of immunity in carrying out defense duties, advocates on the one hand have the responsibility to defend their clients wholeheartedly but on the other hand are obliged to comply with the professional code of ethics and maintain the dignity of the court. Ethical dilemmas in Indonesian advocacy practice often arise due to conflicts of interest, client pressure, and advocates' lack of understanding of professional ethical values (Brahmins et al., 2024). One of the increasingly prominent critical points is the violation of professional ethics by advocates that can remove the right to immunity.

This phenomenon has become evident in Indonesian legal practice, where several advocates, including Razman Arif Nasution, have faced dismissal from professional organizations due to alleged ethical violations at trials. Several previous studies have emphasized that conflicts related to advocate ethical dilemmas often give rise to practical dilemmas, where advocates must balance the interests of the client, personal integrity, and

ethical obligations. External pressures, including public opinion, the media, and high-profile cases, often reinforce the dilemma, so advocates face the risk of losing immunity if the defense is deemed to be in violation of ethics.

Several previous studies have discussed the issue of advocate immunity rights and professional ethics, but most of them have been conducted separately, there has been no research that specifically examines the direct relationship between professional ethics violations and the loss of advocates' immunity rights in the context of concrete cases such as the case of Razman Arif Nasution. This research seeks to explore the normative and factual limits of the application of advocates' immunity rights when there is a violation of professional ethics. With a normative juridical approach and case studies, this study will critically review how the mechanism of advocate organizations in imposing sanctions, how proportionality between ethical violations and the revocation of immunity rights, and the extent to which these steps are in accordance with the principles of due process of law and the protection of the advocate profession in Indonesia. Therefore, this study aims to provide a new understanding of the balance between legal protection (immunity rights) and the enforcement of the code of ethics of the advocate profession because phenomena such as the Razman case can create precedents that affect public perception of the advocate profession. If the right to immunity can be easily revoked without clear parameters, this has the potential to undermine the independence of advocates and threaten the control function of state power. On the other hand, if ethical violations are not strictly acted upon, it will reduce the authority and trust of the public in the advocate profession as a dignified law enforcer.

### **Problem Formulation**

In accordance with the background description above, the problems studied in this study are focused on two main things:

1. What are the arrangements and limitations of the rights of advocates' immunity according to Law Number 18 of 2003 concerning Advocates and its relation to the Indonesian Code of Ethics for Advocates.?
2. What is the application and loss of the right to immunity in the case of Razman Arif Nasution, as well as its implications for the protection of the advocate profession when there is a violation of professional ethics?

### **Purpose of Writing**

The purpose of this paper is to analyze the relationship between violations of the professional code of ethics and the loss of advocates' immunity rights in legal practice in Indonesia. This study aims to explain the legal basis and limitations of advocates' immunity rights according to Law Number 18 of 2003 and the Indonesian Code of Ethics for Advocates, as well as examine how the revocation of these rights is due to violations of professional ethics, such as in the case of Razman Arif Nasution.

## 2. Research Methods

The research method used in this study is normative juridical law research, which is research that focuses on positive legal norms that govern the profession of advocates and their immunity rights. This approach is carried out through an analysis of laws and regulations, doctrines, legal principles, and court decisions related to the loss of advocates' immunity rights due to violations of professional ethics, especially in the case of Razman Arif Nasution. The research data was obtained through *library research* which included primary legal materials in the form of Law Number 18 of 2003 concerning Advocates, the Indonesian Code of Ethics for Advocates (KEAI), and Supreme Court decisions; secondary legal materials such as books, scientific journals, and legal articles; as well as tertiary legal materials such as legal dictionaries and legal encyclopedias. The purpose of this method is to normatively examine the limits of the application of the right to immunity of advocates when there is a violation of professional ethics, as well as to understand how the mechanism of code of ethics enforcement and the revocation of the right to immunity is applied in national legal practice as an effort to maintain the dignity and independence of the advocate profession.

## 3. Results and Discussion

### Definition and Position of Advocate

Terminologically, the term advocate comes from the Dutch *advocaat* which means "*the person who is providing legal services. The services are provided either inside or outside the courtroom*" (Zamron, 2018) "people who provide legal assistance." In the context of Ancient Roman law, the term has its roots in the word *advocatus* which comes from *advocare*, which means "to call to help."

<sup>2</sup> This illustrates the main function of the advocate as a party called to assist a person in fighting for his rights before the law and the courts. An advocate in English referred to as *a lawyer*, Bogdan D. Dumitrescu in his Journal explained that:

*"The lawyer is defined as a person trained and qualified according to national law to plead and act on behalf of its clients to engage in the practice of law, to appear before courts or advise and represent clients on legal issues." (Dumitrescu, 2015)*

"A lawyer is a person who is trained and qualified under national law to defend and act on behalf of his client in the exercise of the practice of law, to appear before the court or to give advice and represent his client in handling legal cases."

Legal aid is provided inside and outside the court. The advocate profession occupies a very strategic position in the judicial system in Indonesia because advocates play the role of defenders of client rights, protectors of justice, and balancers of state power. In Law Number 18 of 2003 concerning Advocates, it is explained about the definition of advocate listed in article 1 number 1, namely;

*"An advocate is a person who provides legal services, both inside and outside the court, who meets the requirements under the provisions of this Law."*

Thus, advocate is not just a term for lawyers in general, but a profession that is normatively regulated by law, with specific conditions, namely:

1. Is a law scholar
2. Have participated in special education for the advocate profession (PKPA);
3. Pass the advocate professional exam;
4. Have been an intern for at least two years continuously in an advocate's office; and
5. He has been sworn in before the High Court in his area of legal domicile.

Advocates occupy a strategic position because they are tasked with providing legal services to the public, both inside and outside the courts, with the aim of ensuring that everyone has fair access to *justice*. In terms of the position of advocates, they are recognized as an honorable profession or *officium nobile* because they have the responsibility to protect the legal interests of clients regardless of their social and economic background, and serve as a counterweight to the power of the state in the legal order (Syarief, 2023).

In addition to having a strong legal foundation, advocates also hold a very important position in the national legal system. This is affirmed in Article 5 paragraph (1) of Law Number 18 of 2003 concerning Advocates which states:

*"Advocates have the status of law enforcement, free and independent which is guaranteed by laws and regulations."*

In the system of the state of law in Indonesia, the existence of free, independent, and responsible advocates is very important so that the trial process is carried out with integrity, fairness, and openness. Advocates have the same degree as other law enforcers such as judges, prosecutors, and police. However, unlike the three professions that work under the state structure, advocates are independent, meaning they are not subject to executive, legislative, or judicial powers. This independent position is necessary so that the advocate can act freely in defending the client's legal interests without any political pressure or intervention from any party. The position of advocates as free law enforcers is also closely related to the principles of *due process of law* and *fair trial*, where each individual is entitled to legal assistance during the judicial process. However, even so, advocates remain under the protection of the law and are limited by the professional code of ethics, so their authority and freedom do not run without moral responsibility. This shows that advocates are not under the subordination of any power, but rather stand on a par with other law enforcement agencies to maintain the balance of power in the judicial system (*checks and balances*).

Based on the provisions of article 1 number 1 of Law Number 18 of 2003 concerning Advocates, it is explained that an advocate is a profession that provides legal services in accordance with the provisions of Article 1 number 2 of Law Number 18 of 2003 concerning Advocates, it is explained that the legal services in question are in the form of providing legal consultation, legal assistance, exercising power, representing, accompanying, defending, and carrying out other legal actions for the client's legal interests. Thus, advocates have a wide

scope of roles not only defending cases in court, but also providing consultation, legal advice, and even conducting non-litigation legal actions such as the creation of contracts, the establishment of business entities, or *alternative dispute resolution*. As a legal expert, advocates must comply with the provisions in article 2 paragraph 1 of Law Number 18 of 2003 concerning Advocates where it is explained that those who can be appointed as Advocates are graduates with a background in higher education in law and after attending special education in the Advocate profession carried out by the Advocate Organization. This provision shows that the advocate profession has formal legitimacy as well as a strict professional process before a person can legally carry out his functions.

The position of advocates also has an important social dimension. Advocates play a role in ensuring that people, especially economically or socially weak groups, have access to justice through the provision of legal *aid*. According to Munir Fuady, advocates have two main responsibilities, namely *professional responsibility* to clients and *moral responsibility* to the law and society (Fuady, 2005). This means that in carrying out their profession, advocates should not only focus on the interests of the client, but must also consider the values of justice and the public interest. In the Indonesian legal system, advocates not only carry out litigation functions, but also have an important role in the field of non-litigation, including out-of-court dispute resolution, negotiation, mediation, and business law consultation. Thus, the advocate profession cannot be seen solely as a defender in the courtroom, but also as a *legal engineer* who helps organize legal relations in society.

### **The Right To Advocate Immunity In The Legal System In Indonesia**

The immunity possessed by an advocate can be interpreted as the right to have protection or immunity in carrying out his professional duties in order to defend the interests of the client. Immunity is one of the special rights that must be possessed by advocates, because it is part of the freedom of profession in accordance with the provisions *of the International Bar Association Standard for the Independence of the Legal Profession* (IBA Standart). However, in the field, it is still difficult to determine how much immunity an advocate has (Daryanti et al., 2017). This protection is regulated in Article 16 of Law Number 18 of 2003 concerning Advocates, which explains that an advocate cannot be punished civilly or criminally when carrying out his professional duties in good faith, namely to protect the interests of clients both in court and outside court. This provision provides a legal basis for advocates to work freely, without fear of criminal penalty, as long as all their actions are carried out in accordance with the rules of law and professional ethics. The good faith mentioned in article 16 of Law No. 18 of 2003 concerning Advocates means that performing professional duties in order to maintain justice in accordance with the law. The word good faith comes from the Latin "*bona fide*", which is the ablative form of the word "honest intention" or good faith itself.

The right to immunity is not absolute immunity but protection that is *conditional immunity*, meaning that it only applies if the advocate acts in accordance with the Indonesian Advocate Code of Ethics (KEAI) and the principle *of officium nobile* which emphasizes moral integrity and honor of the legal profession (Wijiana, 2025). If an advocate in carrying out his professional duties commits an unlawful act, the advocate will be examined by the Honorary Council in his organization as an effort to achieve accountability and transparency in the advocate profession. If the advocate is proven to have committed a criminal act, then he will be processed in accordance with the applicable laws and regulations. This immunity or immunity is implicit in the principle of *equality before the law*, but in certain considerations this immunity is needed not for the protection of a person's individual interests, but for the sake of law enforcement. Law Number 18 of 2003 concerning Advocates regulates the right of immunity or legal immunity granted to an advocate in carrying out his professional duties. The advocate profession is often still misunderstood as a person whose profession is to defend and free guilty people from a legal bondage. In fact, what they are defending is not the client's actions, but the client's legal rights. The advocate is considered a savior by his client, but is seen as an enemy by the opponent. This makes advocates sometimes trapped in legal problems because they are considered to help and protect malicious acts, and are considered to slow down the legal process, so that lawyers can face legal threats or even arrest when helping clients with their legal affairs.

However, the right of immunity of advocates does not mean that advocates are immune from the law. This right is *qualified immunity*, which is only valid when the advocate carries out his professional duties in good faith and in the context of legitimate legal defense. This is emphasized in the Constitutional Court Decision Number 26/PUU-XI/2013, where the Court stated that the right of immunity of advocates cannot be used as an excuse to avoid criminal liability if the advocate commits acts that violate the law or exceed the authority of his profession, such as insults, slander, defamation, or violations of professional ethics (Winata & Dewanto, 2020). The Court affirmed that immunity is only granted to actions directly related to the performance of the lawyer's duties in defending the client's legal interests in or out of court, not to personal conduct or statements outside the context of legal defense. Thus, the right to immunity of advocates must be understood as a guarantee of professional freedom, not absolute immunity.

Advocates in carrying out their duties remain bound by the law, there is supervision carried out by all parties related to the advocate. In Article 9 letter b of the Advocate Code of Ethics, it is stated that supervision of advocates is carried out through the application of the code of ethics by the Honorary Council, both at the branch and at the center, with procedures and sanctions determined by themselves. The granting of immunity rights to advocates aims to ensure that they are guaranteed by the law when defending the interests of clients, so that they do not feel afraid in carrying out their duties. The state must protect advocates when

performing their professional duties, therefore they are given protection in the form of immunity, provided they do not violate laws and regulations.

In the case of Razman Arif Nasution and Hottman Paris Hutapea which occurred at the Central Jakarta District Court. At that time, Razman allegedly showed disrespectful behavior in the trial, such as speaking loudly, arguing with high emotions, and was considered to have violated professional ethics as a lawyer and trial rules (Yudi, 2025). This event caused a debate in the community and received attention from the Honorary Council of Advocate Organizations. Razman claimed that his actions were part of an effort to defend the interests of his client, so they should be protected by the right of lawyers' immunity. According to Otto Hasibuan, "the scope of immunity of advocates should also include actions outside the court, good faith of the advocate concerned and these actions are included in the scope of their professional duties. Without good faith, an advocate does not have immunity so it is worthy of legal process" (The Law online.com, 2006). The right of immunity owned by the advocate applies with the main condition, namely that the advocate carries out his duties in good faith. The concept of good faith can be understood through the way this phrase is expressed in foreign languages, namely "*in good faith*" in English and "*de bonne foi*" in French. Good faith is an important basis in the law of the covenant (Subekti, 2005).

The case of Razman Arif Nasution shows that there are still many people who misunderstand the meaning of the right to advocate immunity. The right to immunity is actually protection for carrying out the duties of the legal profession, not as personal protection. If an advocate acts outside of his professional duties, especially if he violates rules and ethics, then that right no longer applies. This reflects the application of the principle of equality before the law (*quality before the law*) as stipulated in Article 27 paragraph (1) of the 1945 Constitution that these provisions remain valid for all citizens, including advocates.

### **Professional Ethics of Advocates and the Code of Ethics of Indonesian Advocates (KEAI)**

The profession of advocate is often referred to as a noble or honorable profession (*officium nobile*), and every advocate is required to uphold moral values, integrity, and social responsibility (Fuady, 2005). The ethical principles that apply to the advocate profession in Indonesia are regulated in the Indonesian Advocate Code of Ethics (KEAI). The KEAI serves as the main guideline in carrying out his duties as an advocate, both in and out of court. In the KEAI, it is stated that advocates are obliged to carry out their profession independently, honestly, maintain confidentiality, be loyal to their clients, and respect the court and law enforcement colleagues. The principle of independence means that advocates must remain free from pressure, influence, or interference from outside parties while carrying out legal defense duties. The principles of integrity and honor of the profession ask advocates to be honest, polite, and avoid actions that can damage the reputation of the profession. The principle of confidentiality states that the advocate is obliged to maintain the client's

confidentiality as part of his or her ethical responsibility, while the principle of loyalty requires the advocate to defend the client sincerely and dedicatedly, without violating the law or ethics. However, in reality, there are often violations of these principles that cause an advocate's immunity rights to be lost. According to Article 16 of Law Number 18 of 2003 concerning Advocates, the right to immunity only applies when an advocate carries out his professional duties honestly and with good intentions. If the advocate acts dishonestly, for example by insulting, spreading slander, provocation, or showing unprofessionalism in court, then the right to immunity no longer applies. Based on Article 6 of Law No. 18 of 2003 concerning advocates, forms of violations of the ethics of the advocate profession that can eliminate the right to immunity include:

1. Ignoring or neglecting the interests of his client;
2. Acting or behaving inappropriately towards opponents or colleagues of his/her profession;
3. Attitude, conduct, speak, or make statements that show disrespect for laws, laws and regulations, or courts;
4. Do things that are contrary to the obligation, honor, or dignity and dignity of his profession;
5. Committing violations of laws and regulations and/or reprehensible acts;
6. Violating the oath of the advocate and/or the code of ethics of the advocate profession.

The case between Razman Arif Nasution and Hottman Paris Hutapea is a clear example of how an advocate can lose his legal immunity for violating the code of ethics. In 2024, at the Central Jakarta District Court, Razman was involved in a verbal altercation with Hottman in the courtroom and showed an attitude that was considered disrespectful to the judiciary (Supriatin, 2025). The recording of the event went viral and caused sharp criticism from the public and the Honorary Council of Advocate Organizations. According to the Indonesian Advocate Code of Ethics Article 4 and Article 6, an advocate is obliged to be polite to the judge, fellow lawyers, and all parties involved in the case. Therefore, Razman's confrontational and emotional attitude in the trial is considered a violation of professional ethics. This violation eliminates the legal basis to obtain the right to immunity as stipulated in Article 16 of the Advocates Law. In Razman's case, the Honorary Council has the right to evaluate whether his actions at trial violated the principle of *officium nobile* and whether he deserves to be given ethical sanctions (Sapphire & Setuningsi, 2025). If proven, the act not only damages his own reputation, but can also be a reason to revoke or limit his immunity rights in carrying out his professional duties. This is in accordance with the opinion of Otto Hasibuan, who said that "the right to immunity should not be used as an excuse for immodest acts in court, because it is related to moral responsibility, not personal power." ("Giving Briefings to 452 Advocates," 2023). Thus, it can be concluded that the principle of professional ethics is a moral barrier to maintaining the good name and image of the advocate profession. The right

to immunity can only run well if it is carried out in accordance with ethics and good intentions. The case of Razman Arif Nasution is a clear example that when these principles are violated, it not only damages the good name of the judiciary, but also eliminates the legal protection that the advocate profession should have.

### **Analysis of the Case of Razman Arif Nasution**

The events that are of concern in this analysis began with the defamation trial held at the North Jakarta District Court on February 6, 2025. At that time, there was a fierce debate between a team of legal advisors representing different parties, including Hotman Paris Hutapea who acted as a lawyer for the plaintiff or witness, and Razman Arif Nasution who was present as a defendant or attorney in the case. In the video that spread widely on social media and was covered by various media, it was seen that there was a confrontation both physical and verbal where in the video Razman approached Hotman and even touched him. Several parties from the lawyer's team were seen standing on the courtroom table, creating an uncondusive atmosphere for the hearing, until the judge was forced to stop the trial to calm the situation (Ernes, 2025). This incident triggered a great reaction from the public, received attention from the Judicial Council/Judicial Commission, and was reported to law enforcement and advocate professional organizations because it was considered a violation of the rules of order and honor of the trial. The chronology of this incident starts from the chaos in the courtroom, the virality of the video show, to the formal steps taken by the relevant institutions as the basis for holding an ethics examination and administrative steps in the form of suspending the minutes of certain advocates' oaths related to the incident.

Based on the norms of the KEAI (Indonesian Advocate Code of Ethics) and court rules of conduct, there are a number of behaviors recorded and recorded by legal observers that meet the criteria for violating the code of ethics (Squirrel, 2025):

1. Derogatory acts of the congregation (standing on a table, shouting, and making inappropriate physical contact);
2. Disrespecting the judge and other parties in court;
3. Taking actions that cause a commotion so as to interfere with the course of the trial.

Based on the relevant articles of the KEAI and the Supreme Court's rules regarding discipline in the courtroom, advocates are required to maintain honor, good manners, and order when practicing law. A breach of this obligation may eliminate the good-faith basis necessary to obtain immunity. In the context of the facts in this case, Razman's actions (and some of his team members) are categorized as ethical violations because they go beyond the limits of reasonable legal defense and cause public uproar, so this behavior has the potential to eliminate immunity protections if the Honorary Council deems a serious violation (Squirrel, 2025).

In response to the incident, professional advocacy organizations and judicial agencies took official action. Through the National Leadership Council of PERADI (DPN PERADI)

summoning the relevant party for an ethics hearing and conducting an internal examination, the results of the initial investigation revealed violations, which led to the imposition of administrative/ethical sanctions (such as reprimands, summonses, or suspensions) against some of the lawyers involved (Rahman, 2025). At the same time, the Supreme Court as the supervisor of judicial institutions issued an administrative decree to maintain the authority of the court, which in this case, the Supreme Court announced the suspension of the Minutes of Oath (BAS) for the relevant advocates, so that they could not carry out the practice of advocates in the court until their status was further determined (Fawdi, 2025). These actions are based on the need to maintain the honor of the judicial institution and to have an impact on corrective behavior that undermines the order of the courts. The institutional response also includes urging from the Judicial Commission and requests for clarification from the public and the media, which together make this case an example of how disciplinary and administrative mechanisms are applied when ethical norms are violated.

Individually, advocates who experience a freeze of oaths face direct limitations on their ability to appear and act in court resulting in:

1. Their clients may lose comparable legal protection or have to seek another advocate;
2. Their professional reputation is threatened,
3. Affect long-term practices as well as

Institutionally, the freeze measures indicate that professional organizations and courts are ready to uphold ethical accountability, which can strengthen public trust in the disciplinary system as long as the process is transparent and follows the principles of justice. However, there is also the possibility of risk if the disciplinary process is considered unfair or influenced by political and media factors, this can raise concerns that protection for advocates becomes vulnerable and advocates, especially those handling sensitive cases, are at risk of intimidation. Therefore, Razman's case confirms two things that are crucial for the development of the legal profession in Indonesia:

1. The right to immunity only functions effectively and legitimately when it is supported by the consistent application of professional ethics and clear disciplinary mechanisms
2. Immunity for lawyers must be balanced with fair responsibilities, so that the independence of advocates does not turn into legal immunity that undermines the integrity of the judicial system, but also does not only become a motto if protection is easily revoked without due process.

Ultimately, the freezing or revocation of immunity in this context shows how norms (*das sollen*) and practice (*das sein*) can conflict, providing a lesson that normative regulation must be complemented by strong operational procedures in order to maintain substantive and procedural justice for lawyers and the public.

#### 4. Conclusion

From the explanation and analysis of the incident involving Razman Arif Nasution, it can be concluded that the right to immunity of an advocate in Indonesia is not an absolute immunity, but a form of conditional protection that only applies when the advocate performs his duties with good intentions, respects the Indonesian Code of Ethics for Advocates, and respects the judiciary as *officium nobile*. Razman's case illustrates how an advocate's actions in the courtroom can have a direct effect on the validity and protection of his profession. The incident of chaos at the North Jakarta District Court involving Razman and Hotman Paris in February 2025 shows that if an advocate acts outside the norms that should be and violates the rules of the hearing, then the element of goodwill that underlies immunity is lost both legally and ethically. The PERADI Honorary Council and the Supreme Court then took firm action through the process of ethical examination and the revocation of the Minutes of Oath as a form of administrative and moral sanctions, which aimed to maintain the dignity of the judiciary and the integrity of the legal profession in the eyes of the public. This decision reflects the application of the principle of equality before the law, where every advocate must still comply with the law when exceeding the limits of his profession, as stipulated in the Constitutional Court Decision Number 26/PUU-XI/2013 which emphasizes that immunity cannot be used as an excuse to avoid criminal or ethical responsibility. Thus, the right to immunity of advocates should be understood as a form of protection for carrying out professional duties, not as a shield against unprofessional actions. Razman's case is an important point that the rule of law must go hand in hand with the enforcement of professional ethics, so that advocates not only function as defenders of clients, but also as guardians of the honor of the law itself.

#### References

- Daryanti, Silvia, Nyoman Serikat PJ, dan Purwoto. "Criminal Liability of Advocates of Bribery Crimes against Judges (Case Study of Decision Number 1319K/Pid.Sus/2016)." *Diponegoro Law Journal* 6, no. 2 (2017): 12.
- Dumitrescu, Bogdan D. "The Principles and the Legal Responsibility of the Lawyer, Guarantees of National Security." *Economics and Finance* 32 (2015): 884-890. [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/S2212-5671\(15\)01537-3](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/S2212-5671(15)01537-3).
- Ernes, Yogi. "Sitting in the Chaotic Case of Hotman Paris vs Razman Nasution in the Courtroom." *detikNews*, 2025. <https://news.detik.com/berita/d-7768443/duduk-perkara-ricuh-hotman-paris-vs-razman-nasution-di-ruang-sidang>.
- Fawdi, Maulana Ilhami. "MA: Razman cannot practice as an advocate in court after the oath is frozen." *detikNews*, 2025. <https://news.detik.com/berita/d-7776604/ma-razman-tak-bisa-praktik-advokat-di-pengadilan-usai-sumpah-dibekukan>.
- Fuady, Munir. *Noble Profession: Ethics of the Legal Profession for Judges, Prosecutors, Advocates, Notaries, Curators, and Administrators*. Bandung: PT Citra Aditya Bakti, 2005.
- Khambali, Muhammad. "THE RIGHT TO IMMUNITY OF ADVOCATES IS NOT UNLIMITED." *Legal Horizon* 14, no. 1 (2018): 18-29.
- Kumalasari, Galuh Wahyu. "The minutes of the oath of Advocate Firdaus Oibowo and Razman are frozen!" *MARINews*, 2025. <https://marinews.mahkamahagung.go.id/berita/sumpah-advokat-firdaus-oibowo-dan-razman-dibekukan-0br>.

- Putri, Marshanda Indriani, Laika Fisabililla, dan Sarassati Garnita. "Professional Ethics of Advocates: Challenges and Solutions." *Scientific Journal of Education Forum* 11, no. 6.C (2025): 105-9. <https://doi.org/https://jurnal.peneliti.net/index.php/JIWP/article/view/10658>.
- Rahman, Abdul. "In the aftermath of the chaos in the courtroom, the Peradi DPN United imposed sanctions on Razman Arif Nasution." *Jawapos*, 2025. <https://www.jawapos.com/entertainment/015647822/buntut-kisruh-di-ruang-sidang-dpn-peradi-bersatu-jatuhkan-sanksi-ke-razman-arif-nasution>.
- Roshali, Riyan Rizki. "The oath of advocates Razman Nasution and Firdaus Oiwobo is frozen, MA: cannot practice in court." *SindoNews*, 2025.
- S.Brahmana, Febi Febonecci, Helmalia Putri, Dhea Ananda Puspita Yusuf, Halimatusaddiah Siregar, Habibi Irham Buana Nasution, dan Nazri Adhlani Nasution. "ETHICAL PROBLEMS IN ADVOCACY PRACTICE IN CASES IN INDONESIA." *Causa: Journal of Law and Citizenship* 8, no. 4 (2024). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3783/causa.v8i4.7449>.
- Safitri, Kiki, dan Novianti Setuningsih. "The Razman-Hotman Paris Conflict, Peradi: If It Is True, That Behavior Is Not Justified." *Kompas.com*, 2025. <https://nasional.kompas.com/read/2025/02/16/19551391/konflik-razman-hotman-paris-peradi-jika-benar-perilaku-itu-tak-dibenarkan>.
- Subject. *Covenant Law*. Jakarta: Intermasa, 2005.
- Supriatin. "The Chronology of the Razman Nasution vs Hotman Paris Hot Conflict Ends in 1.5 Years." *Liputan6*, 2025. <https://www.liputan6.com/news/read/6172801/kronologi-konflik-panas-razman-nasution-vs-hotman-paris-berujung-bui-15-tahun>.
- Syarief, Vidi Galenso. "THE POSITION OF ADVOCATE ORGANIZATIONS IN THE JUDICIAL POWER SYSTEM." *Published Scientific Journal* 11, no. 1 (2023): 42-51. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.33603/publika.v11i1.8200>.
- The law online.com. "Advocates' Immunity Rights Depend on Good Faith," 2006. <https://www.hukumonline.com/berita/a/hak-imunitas-advokat-tergantung-iktikad-baik-hol15478/>.
- The law online.com. "Giving Briefings to 452 Advocates, Otto Hasibuan Emphasizes Advocates' Immunity Rights," 2023. <https://www.hukumonline.com/berita/a/beri-pembekalan-pada-452-advokat--otto-hasibuan-tegaskan-hak-imunitas-advokat-lt64f1e027d3c32/>.
- Wijiana, Riana. "The Urgency of the Code of Ethics for the Advocate Profession in Maintaining Existence as a Respectable Profession." *Journal of Social, Political and Humanities Research Group* 4, no. 2 (2025): 113-24. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.55606/jurrih.v4i2.4563>.
- Winata, Oey Valentino, dan Wisnu Aryo Dewanto. "LIMITATIONS ON THE IMMUNITY OF ADVOCATES ARE EXPANDED BASED ON THE DECISION OF THE CONSTITUTIONAL COURT NUMBER 26/PUU-XI/2013." *DiH: Journal of Law* 16, no. 1 (2020): 38-48. <https://doi.org/10.30996/dih.v16i1.2974>.
- Yudi, Anastasya Lavenia. "Advocate Razman Arif Nasution's oath frozen, following chaos at the North Jakarta District Court." *TEMPO*, 2025. <https://www.tempo.co/hukum/sumpah-advokat-razman-arif-nasution-dibekukan-buntut-kericuhan-di-pn-jakarta-utara-1206612>.
- Zamron, M. "EXISTENCE OF INDONESIAN ADVOCATE PROFESSION." *International Journal of Engineering & Technology* 7, no. 3.21 (2018): 317-20. <https://doi.org/10.14419/ijet.v7i3.21.17180>.