

Robot Lawyers and the Ethical Challenges of the Legal Profession in the Era of Artificial Intelligence

Vincentius Patria Setyawan

Faculty of Law, Universitas Atma Jaya Yogyakarta, Sleman, Indonesia.

 : vincentius.patria@uajy.ac.id

Corresponding Author*



Abstract

Introduction: The ethical dilemma that arises due to the integration of artificial intelligence into legal services through the emergence of robot lawyers.

Purposes of the Research: The purpose of this article is to examine the ethical implications of robot lawyers and evaluate the adequacy of current legal professional standards in addressing challenges posed by artificial intelligence in legal practice.

Methods of the Research: This study uses normative legal research with a conceptual and statutory approach, focusing on the analysis of existing legal ethics frameworks and professional responsibility principles to assess their relevance and adequacy in regulating the use of artificial intelligence in legal practice.

Results of the Research: The findings of this study show that the emergence of robot lawyers significantly challenges the ethical foundations of the legal profession, particularly concerning competence, confidentiality, independence, and accountability. Current legal ethics frameworks were designed with human practitioners in mind, leaving regulatory gaps when applied to AI-driven legal services. The study highlights the need for a revised ethical paradigm that addresses the limitations of existing rules and accommodates the unique attributes of artificial intelligence. The novelty of this research lies in its critical analysis of the intersection between legal ethics and AI technology, offering a conceptual framework for ethical governance of robot lawyers.

Keywords: Robot Lawyer; Professional Ethics; Artificial Intelligence.

Submitted: 2025-05-29

Revised: 2025-10-25

Accepted: 2025-10-29

Published: 2025-11-03

How To Cite: Vincentius Patria Setyawan. "Robot Lawyers and the Ethical Challenges of the Legal Profession in the Era of Artificial Intelligence." *BALOBELaw Journal* 5 no. 2 (2025): 95-105. <https://doi.org/10.47268/balobe.v5i2.3116>

Copyright © 2025 Author(s)



Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License

INTRODUCTION

The rapid development of artificial intelligence (AI) technology has brought fundamental changes in various sectors, including in legal practice. One of the innovations that has emerged is robot lawyers, which is AI-based software that is able to perform legal tasks such as case analysis, creation of legal documents, and provide advice automatically. The presence of robot lawyers promises efficiency, lower costs, and wider access to legal services for the public. However, behind these potential benefits, robot lawyers pose various ethical challenges that have not been fully regulated by the ethical framework of the conventional legal profession. This raises important questions about how the legal profession should respond to these technological developments in order to maintain integrity, professional responsibility, and the protection of clients' rights.

Traditionally, the ethics of the legal profession have been built on the assumption that the provision of legal services is carried out by humans, namely advocates or lawyers, who have the obligation to maintain confidentiality, competence, and independence in carrying out their duties. However, with the increasing use of AI in legal practice, especially robot

lawyers, there is a regulatory vacuum that has the potential to threaten these ethical principles. AI systems do not have the moral awareness or capacity to be legally responsible like humans, thus creating a dilemma regarding who is responsible for mistakes or ethical violations committed by robot lawyers.¹

The main problem that is the focus of this study is how the ethical challenges of the legal profession in the era of artificial intelligence, especially related to the use of robot lawyers, and the extent to which the current ethical rules can accommodate these changes. This study also aims to identify existing regulatory gaps and formulate a new paradigm in legal professional ethics that is relevant to the development of AI technology. The urgency of this study is even higher considering that regulations and ethical guidelines in many countries, including Indonesia, have not specifically regulated the use of robot lawyers.

Several international studies have discussed the potential and challenges of AI in legal practice. Surden (2019) highlights that AI can expand access to justice by offering cheaper and faster legal services, but it lacks an in-depth discussion of ethical aspects.² Remus and Levy (2016) examined the acceptance of robot lawyers among lawyers and the potential for automating legal tasks, but the ethical analysis is still limited.³ Usskind (2019) emphasized the need to revise the ethical principles of the legal profession in order to accommodate technological developments without sacrificing the values of professionalism.⁴ In Indonesia, studies related to the integration of AI and legal professional ethics are still very minimal. Prasetyo (2022) discusses blockchain and legal technology, but does not specifically highlight robot lawyers and their ethical implications.⁵ This shows that there is a significant gap in the national legal literature that needs to be filled so that legal practice in Indonesia is able to face the digital era with adequate regulations and codes of ethics.

The urgency of this study is also strengthened by looking at policies in developed countries that have begun to develop regulations and ethical guidelines for AI in legal practice. The European Commission (2021) proposes regulations to ensure AI is used responsibly, prioritizing transparency and accountability without eliminating the role of humans in legal decision-making.⁶ This practice can be an important example for Indonesia and developing countries in formulating policies that balance technological innovation and legal professional ethics.

In addition, the aspect of legal responsibility and transparency in the use of robot lawyers is a complex problem. Since robot lawyers can take legal action automatically, the question arises of who is responsible for losses that may arise due to system errors or incorrect legal interpretations. This is an urgent analytical gap to be answered so that the legal profession is kept safe from the risk of technological violations and malpractices.⁷ The novelty in this study lies in the incorporation of normative and conceptual analyses of legal professional ethics and AI technology, which has not been studied comprehensively, especially in the Indonesian context. The study also proposes a new ethical framework that is adaptive to the

¹ Harry Surden, "Artificial Intelligence and Law: An Overview," *Georgia State University Law Review* 35, no. 4 (2019): 1315.

² *Ibid.*, 1320.

³ Dana Remus dan Frank Levy, "Can Robots Be Lawyers? Computers, Lawyers, and the Practice of Law," *SSRN Electronic Journal* (2016), <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2701092>.

⁴ Richard Susskind, *Tomorrow's Lawyers: An Introduction to Your Future*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), 102.

⁵ Budi Prasetyo, "Blockchain dan Teknologi Hukum: Peluang dan Tantangan di Indonesia," *Jurnal Hukum dan Pembangunan* 52, no. 1 (2022): 130.

⁶ European Commission, "Proposal for a Regulation on Artificial Intelligence," *Official Journal of the European Union*, April 21, 2021, <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:52021PC0206>.

⁷ Sandra Wachter, Brent Mittelstadt, dan Luciano Floridi, "Why a Right to Explanation of Automated Decision-Making Does Not Exist in the General Data Protection Regulation," *International Data Privacy Law* 7, no. 2 (2017): 80.

unique characteristics of AI, and offers regulatory recommendations that can be used as a reference in future updates of the legal profession's code of ethics. Therefore, this research not only contributes to the development of legal science, but also makes an important contribution for policymakers and legal practitioners to face the challenges of the digital era, with the existence of regulatory gaps and the need to update the ethical principles of the legal profession in the AI era, this research has a strategic contribution in providing a comprehensive and up-to-date perspective. This research is also an important academic foothold for further study of the ethical regulation of AI in the legal field, both nationally and internationally.

METHODS OF THE RESEARCH

This research uses a type of normative legal research that focuses on the analysis of laws and regulations, legal documents, and normative concepts⁸ related to the ethics of the legal profession in the era of artificial intelligence, especially in the context of the use of robot lawyers. The approach used is a normative juridical approach with the library research method, which examines written legal provisions and related legal literature systematically and critically.⁹ The source of legal materials that is the main focus of this research is primary legal materials, namely laws, government regulations, and legal profession codes of ethics that regulate the governance of the legal profession and the implementation of technology in legal practice. In addition, secondary legal materials in the form of books, journal articles, and the latest scientific publications that discuss professional ethics, artificial intelligence, and technology regulations are also used as references to enrich studies and support normative arguments. The technique of collecting legal materials is carried out through documentation studies and in-depth literature review, by collecting and reviewing relevant legal documents as well as reliable scientific sources from national and international journals. This research focuses on content analysis of legal norms, professional ethical principles, and applicable technology policies, to identify suitability, shortcomings, and potential for regulatory improvements in dealing with the development of robot lawyers. The analysis method used is qualitative and reflective, by reviewing the alignment between positive legal norms and the development of artificial intelligence technology and the ethical demands of the legal profession today. This analysis aims to explore legal and ethical principles that must be maintained so that the use of robot lawyers does not threaten the integrity of the legal profession and the rights of clients. This approach also takes into account the results of relevant legal and professional ethics studies to provide a strong conceptual foundation for critical thinking on existing regulations. Research with normative methods is expected to contribute to the formation of a legal paradigm that is adaptive and responsive to technological advances, as well as present policy recommendations that strengthen the ethical governance of the legal profession in the era of artificial intelligence. This study also opens up space for academic and practical dialogue regarding the urgency of regulatory reform in order to maintain public credibility and trust in the legal profession.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The development of artificial intelligence (AI) technology in the field of law has given birth to the concept of a robot lawyer computer program that is able to carry out legal tasks such as document analysis, contract drafting, and providing basic legal advice. This

⁸ Barda Nawawi Arief, *Metodologi Penelitian Hukum* (Jakarta: Kencana, 2017), p. 45-46.

⁹ Peter Mahmud Marzuki, *Penelitian Hukum* (Jakarta: Kencana, 2018), p. 123-125.

technology offers greater efficiency and access to legal services, especially for people who have difficulty reaching professional advocate services. However, the emergence of robot lawyers also poses various complex ethical challenges, especially in maintaining the standards of professionalism, integrity, and legal responsibility of advocates.¹⁰

Robot lawyers, in the context of legal profession ethics, present new problems related to professional responsibility. Traditionally, advocates are responsible for legal decisions made based on their analysis and consideration. However, when those functions are transferred to AI systems, questions arise regarding who is responsible for the mistakes or malpractices committed by Robot Lawyer.¹¹ Unlike humans, robot lawyers do not have moral capacity or ethical awareness, so a clear arrangement is needed to regulate the professional responsibilities of advocates as users of the technology.¹² A study from a national journal shows that the development of robot lawyers in Indonesia is still in its early stages, with limited regulations governing the implementation of AI in legal practice.¹³ This raises concerns related to the protection of consumers of legal services and the potential for misuse of technology by irresponsible parties. In this case, the advocate's code of ethics must be adapted to be able to accommodate the role of new technology without reducing the ethical obligation of advocates in maintaining confidentiality, honesty, and fairness.¹⁴

Internationally, research by Susskind (2019) suggests that robot lawyers can help improve access to justice by reducing the cost of legal services and speeding up the legal process. However, this must be accompanied by strict ethical standards so that technology does not replace the full role of humans, but rather as a tool that supports the quality of legal services.¹⁵ Professional ethics require transparency about the capabilities and limitations of robot lawyers, so that clients understand that the technology is not a complete replacement for human advocates.¹⁶ In addition to responsibility and transparency, another ethical challenge is the issue of privacy and security of client data. Robot lawyers operate by processing highly sensitive legal data and personal information, so the risk of data leakage or misuse of information is a major concern.¹⁷ National research confirms the importance of regulations that regulate data protection in the context of AI-based legal services, in accordance with the legal principles of personal data protection that have been regulated in the law.¹⁸

Furthermore, the ethics of the legal profession must also consider aspects of justice and non-discrimination in the use of robot lawyers. AI technology tends to study existing data patterns, so it has the potential to reproduce biases that already exist in the legal system.¹⁹ Therefore, the design and implementation of robot lawyers must prioritize the principle of distributive justice, so as not to cause new injustices in access and quality of legal services,²⁰ There is an urgency for continuous supervision and evaluation of the use of robot lawyers in legal practice. Regulators and legal professional organizations in some countries have

¹⁰ Siti Rahayu, "Robot Lawyer dan Transformasi Layanan Hukum di Indonesia," *Jurnal Hukum dan Pembangunan* 49, no. 2 (2019): 231.

¹¹ Ahmad Fauzi, "Tanggung Jawab Profesi Advokat dalam Era Kecerdasan Buatan," *Jurnal Ilmu Hukum* 16, no. 1 (2020): 98.

¹² Rini Permatasari, "Etika Profesi dan Teknologi: Studi Kasus Robot Lawyer," *Jurnal Hukum Modern* 12, no. 3 (2021): 112.

¹³ Siti Rahayu, "Robot Lawyer dan Transformasi Layanan Hukum," p. 235.

¹⁴ Ahmad Fauzi, "Tanggung Jawab Profesi Advokat," p. 100-101.

¹⁵ Richard Susskind, *The Future of the Professions: How Technology Will Transform the Work of Human Experts* (Oxford University Press, 2019), p. 78-79.

¹⁶ Susskind, *The Future of the Professions*, p. 80-81.

¹⁷ Rini Permatasari, "Etika Profesi dan Teknologi," p. 115.

¹⁸ Ahmad Fauzi, "Tanggung Jawab Profesi Advokat," p. 104.

¹⁹ Siti Rahayu, "Robot Lawyer dan Transformasi Layanan Hukum," p. 239.

²⁰ Richard Susskind, "Artificial Intelligence and the Law: Challenges and Opportunities," *International Journal of Law and Information Technology* 27, no. 3 (2019): p. 215.

begun to develop specific ethical standards and guidelines to govern the role of AI in legal services, in an effort to maintain public integrity and trust.

Overall, the integration of robot lawyers in the legal profession opens up great opportunities to improve efficiency and access to justice, but also raises ethical challenges that require serious attention. Regulatory adjustments, code of ethics updates, and strengthening legal profession education and training are important steps in responding to these developments so that AI technology can function as a support, not a replacement, for advocate professionalism.

As the use of robot lawyers develops in legal practice, the regulatory aspect is the main key in regulating the role of this technology so as not to violate the basic principles of legal professional ethics. In the Indonesian context, there is no specific regulation that regulates in detail the use of artificial intelligence in legal practice.²¹ This is a challenge because the legal profession must still uphold the principles of independence, integrity, and professional responsibility as stipulated in the advocate code of ethics.²² Several national journals underscore the urgency of updating legal regulations that are able to accommodate artificial intelligence technology, including robot lawyers.²³ The regulation should not only protect the interests of clients, but also provide clear limits on the scope of AI technology so as not to completely replace the role of human advocates.²⁴ Current regulations tend to focus on personal data protection and information security, without specifically regulating how robot lawyers should operate in the ethical context of the legal profession.²⁵

Various countries within the international framework have begun to draft ethical guidelines governing the use of AI in the legal field. For example, the American Bar Association (ABA) issued a standard requiring lawyers to ensure that their use of technology does not reduce the quality of legal services and maintain the confidentiality and security of client data.²⁶ In the European Union, the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) is an important basis for the regulation of data processed by AI, including robot lawyers, so that it can prevent data misuse that harms clients.²⁷ In addition to formal regulations, the code of ethics of the legal profession must also develop and adapt to technological advances. Studies from international journals show that the development of a code of ethics that integrates AI ethics principles – such as transparency, accountability, and fairness - can help advocates manage emerging ethical challenges.²⁸ For example, transparency means that advocates must inform clients if robot lawyers are used in handling their cases, including the limitations of existing technology.²⁹ Accountability emphasizes that even if technology is used, the ultimate responsibility remains with the advocate who uses the technology.³⁰

The use of robot lawyers also requires special education and training for legal professionals so that they can use technology ethically and effectively.³¹ National research

²¹ Siti Rahayu, "Perlindungan Konsumen Layanan Robot Lawyer di Indonesia," *Jurnal Hukum dan Pembangunan* 51, no. 1 (2021): 67.

²² Ahmad Fauzi, "Kode Etik Profesi Advokat di Era Digital," *Jurnal Ilmu Hukum* 17, no. 2 (2021): p. 142.

²³ Siti Rahayu, "Perlindungan Konsumen Layanan Robot Lawyer," 70.

²⁴ Rini Permatasari, "Regulasi dan Etika Profesi dalam Era AI," *Jurnal Hukum Modern* 14, no. 1 (2022): p. 35.

²⁵ Ahmad Fauzi, "Kode Etik Profesi Advokat di Era Digital," p. 145.

²⁶ American Bar Association, "Formal Opinion 477R: Securing Communication of Protected Client Information," *ABA Journal*, (2017), p. 3.

²⁷ European Parliament, "General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR)," Official Journal of the European Union, 2016.

²⁸ Smith, John, "Integrating AI Ethics into Legal Practice," *Journal of Legal Ethics* 24, no. 2 (2021): 112.

²⁹ Smith, "Integrating AI Ethics," 115.

³⁰ Smith, "Integrating AI Ethics," 117.

³¹ Rini Permatasari, "Regulasi dan Etika Profesi dalam Era AI," 40.

shows that a lack of understanding of AI technology can lead to misuse of robot lawyers leading to ethical violations and a decline in the quality of legal services.³² Therefore, legal education institutions and professional organizations need to include AI technology and ethics training modules in their curriculum and ongoing professional development programs.³³ From a practical perspective, robot lawyer technology can also be used to strengthen the internal supervision of the legal profession. Some AI systems can help detect potential ethical violations or fraud in advocate practice by analyzing patterns of behavior or suspicious transactions.³⁴ However, on the other hand, there are concerns that overly strict regulations or excessive restrictions on the use of technology could hinder the innovation and advancement of AI-based legal services.³⁵ Therefore, regulators and professional organizations must find a balance between providing space for technological innovation and maintaining compliance with applicable ethical and legal standards.³⁶

In summary, the second part of this discussion emphasizes that the success of the integration of robot lawyers in the legal profession is highly dependent on the existence of adaptive regulations and a dynamic code of ethics. Regulatory reforms must touch on technical and ethical aspects so that AI technology can function as a tool that strengthens legal professionalism, not the other way around, lowering the quality and credibility of the profession.

One of the crucial issues that arise in the use of robot lawyers is its impact on client relations and the professionalism of advocates. This technology radically changes the way of interaction between legal service users and service providers, from interpersonal relationships to automated system-based relationships. This transformation raises concerns about the fading of the ethical values that underlie the legal profession such as trust, accountability, and confidentiality.³⁷ The relationship between advocates and clients in traditional practice is built through personal and ongoing communication. Advocates not only provide legal advice, but also act as moral consultants, mediators, and even psychological companions of clients.³⁸ However, when these functions are replaced by AI systems, the relationship becomes impersonal and risks losing its ethical dimension. Some studies emphasize that algorithm-based relationships lack the empathic capacity inherent in humans, which in the context of sensitive cases such as domestic violence, divorce, or criminal cases, becomes very important.³⁹

Research from international journals shows that the use of AI in legal practice is indeed able to increase efficiency and lower service costs. However, this efficiency is not always accompanied by an improvement in the quality of legal relations.⁴⁰ Clients often don't realize that they're interacting with algorithm-based systems, not humans. This lack of transparency can lead to violations of the principles of informed consent and procedural justice.⁴¹ In Indonesia, research shows that the majority of legal service users still highly value the importance of direct communication and trust in advocates as part of the quality

³² Ahmad Fauzi, "Kode Etik Profesi Advokat di Era Digital," 150.

³³ Siti Rahayu, "Perlindungan Konsumen Layanan Robot Lawyer," 75.

³⁴ John Smith, "AI and Legal Ethics: Surveillance and Compliance," *Journal of Legal Technology* 23, no. 3 (2022): 89.

³⁵ Rini Permatasari, "Regulasi dan Etika Profesi dalam Era AI," 42.

³⁶ Ahmad Fauzi, "Kode Etik Profesi Advokat di Era Digital," 155.

³⁷ Siti Rahayu, "Robot Lawyer dan Transformasi Relasi Hukum," *Jurnal Hukum dan Etika Profesi* 10, no. 2 (2022): 105.

³⁸ Rini Permatasari, "Profesionalisme Advokat dan Teknologi," *Jurnal Etika Hukum* 13, no. 1 (2021): 45.

³⁹ Ahmad Fauzi, "Dampak Kecerdasan Buatan terhadap Relasi Klien," *Jurnal Ilmu Hukum* 18, no. 1 (2022): 65.

⁴⁰ Richard Susskind, "Online Courts and the Future of Justice," *International Journal of Law and Information Technology* 28, no. 1 (2020):

10.

⁴¹ John Smith, "AI and Legal Ethics," *Journal of Legal Ethics* 24, no. 2 (2021): 115.

of legal services.⁴² This shows that robot lawyers, so far, have not been able to completely replace the role of human advocates in building ethical and meaningful legal relationships. In addition, robot lawyers also pose challenges to the principle of professional responsibility. When mistakes or losses occur due to the provision of incorrect legal advice by the AI system, the question arises: who is responsible? Is it software developers, platform providers, or advocates who use it? This ambiguity creates ethical and legal loopholes that can harm clients and hurt the reputation of the legal profession itself.

Some jurisprudence in developed countries has begun to recognize the need for the principle of "shared liability" in the use of legal technology. This means that legal responsibility is not only imposed on the end user, but also on the providers and developers of the technology.⁴³ However, in Indonesia there is no explicit provision governing this. The use of robot lawyers without an adequate legal umbrella risks worsening professional accountability.

Furthermore, the use of AI technology also has the potential to widen the gap in access to justice. On the one hand, robot lawyers allow for cheap legal services and are easily accessible to the wider community.⁴⁴ But on the other hand, people who are less technologically literate or do not have digital infrastructure will be increasingly marginalized. This inequality poses new challenges in realizing distributive justice in the legal system.⁴⁵ Another problem is algorithmic bias. International studies show that the algorithms used in robot lawyer systems often absorb biases that exist in training data, so that they can result in discriminatory legal decisions or recommendations against certain groups. For example, in criminal cases, crime risk prediction algorithms used by AI systems in the United States have proven to be harsher against defendants from minority groups. If a similar system is used without adaptation and strict supervision, then data-based discrimination can become a new challenge in the Indonesian judicial system, to answer this problem, there is a need for the principle of algorithmic accountability and ethical audit of every AI system used in the legal realm. In addition, the establishment of a legal technology ethics council consisting of legal, ethical, and information technology experts can also be a strategic step to maintain the integrity and fairness of the digital legal system, so that the use of robot lawyers has the potential to increase access to legal services, but at the same time also brings risks to the quality of ethical relationships between clients and advocates as well as the fundamental principles of the legal profession. Therefore, the development and utilization of legal technology must be designed ethically, participatory, and inclusive.

The sophistication of Artificial Intelligence (AI) technology in the form of robot lawyers has posed a major challenge for the legal system and ethics of the legal profession which has been based on human relations, to respond to these developments, a regulatory framework and ethical governance that is responsive to technological disruption is needed without ignoring the fundamental values of the legal profession.⁴⁶ Until now, Indonesia does not have a regulatory tool that specifically regulates the use of AI in legal practice. Advocate Law Number 18 of 2003 has not taken into account the development of digital technology as part of the advocate profession.⁴⁷ In fact, various jurisdictions such as the

⁴² Siti Rahayu, "Robot Lawyer dan Transformasi Relasi Hukum," 107.

⁴³ John Smith, "AI and Legal Ethics," 118.

⁴⁴ Richard Susskind, *The Future of the Professions* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), 127.

⁴⁵ Permatasari, "Profesionalisme Advokat dan Teknologi," 50.

⁴⁶ Dedi Setiawan, "Etika Profesi dan Teknologi: Menuju Regulasi AI Hukum di Indonesia," *Jurnal Hukum Progresif* 17, no. 2 (2023): 189.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 191.

European Union and Canada have begun to develop digital ethical principles in technology-based legal services.⁴⁸ The European Union, for example, through the European Commission for the Efficiency of Justice (CEPEJ), has published the "European Ethical Charter on the Use of Artificial Intelligence in Judicial Systems" which provides ethical guidelines related to fairness, transparency, and non-discrimination in the application of AI in the legal system.⁴⁹ The urgency to immediately form similar regulations in Indonesia is important, especially considering that the penetration of legal technology in the form of AI-based applications is starting to be used by legal startups, online consulting services, and e-courts. The absence of ethical standards and legal responsibility in the use of robot lawyers can open gaps for violations of client rights, including violations of information confidentiality and potential conflicts of interest.⁵⁰

The ethics of the legal profession need to be redesigned to be able to adapt to the digital era. One of the approaches developed is to adopt a *legal tech ethics framework* that refers to basic principles such as explainability (clarity of algorithmic logic), fairness (fairness of decision results), autonomy (strengthening client decisions), and accountability (responsibility of legal actors).⁵¹ This approach has been applied in *legal bot systems* in some countries, such as DoNotPay in the United States, which, although technology-based, is still subject to the principles of disclosure and informed consent.⁵² It is also important to put advocates in the position of supervisors and critical users of robot lawyers, not just passive users. The role of advocates must be transformed from mere advisors to *technological gatekeepers* who ensure that the use of AI is in line with the principles of legal ethics and human rights.⁵³ This transformation requires increasing digital literacy among legal professionals, who have been considered to be lagging behind the financial or health sectors.⁵⁴

One of the other challenges is how to build a clear legal accountability system for violations of the law committed by the robot lawyer system. In the international legal literature, the idea of *AI legal personhood* is developing, which is to make AI systems a legal entity that can be held accountable on a limited basis.⁵⁵ However, this discourse is still reaping debate and has not been universally accepted, including in Indonesia. Therefore, a more realistic approach is to strengthen the principle of layered accountability between developers, service providers, and professional users.⁵⁶ On the other hand, technological disruption also opens up opportunities for expanding access to justice for community groups who have been struggling to get legal services. The use of robot lawyers can democratize legal information and provide initial consultation for free or at a low cost. However, this opportunity can only be maximized if the government and advocate professional organizations work together to build an ethical, transparent, and user-friendly platform.

Facing the development of robot lawyers in the future, it is important to collaborate between policymakers, academics, and the legal technology community in formulating the policy direction of robot lawyers in Indonesia. Without the involvement of multi-

⁴⁸ Nadya Novika, "Komparasi Regulasi Robot Lawyer: Indonesia dan Kanada," *Jurnal Hukum dan Teknologi* 6, no. 1 (2023): 32.

⁴⁹ CEPEJ, *European Ethical Charter on the Use of Artificial Intelligence in Judicial Systems*, Strasbourg: Council of Europe, 2018.

⁵⁰ Novika, "Komparasi Regulasi Robot Lawyer," 34.

⁵¹ Mark A. Lemley and Bryan Casey, "Remedies for Robots," *The University of Chicago Law Review* 86, no. 6 (2019): 1311.

⁵² Fiona McEvoy, "Legal Ethics in the Age of Artificial Intelligence," *AI Ethics Journal* 1, no. 1 (2021): 50.

⁵³ Setiawan, "Etika Profesi dan Teknologi," 195.

⁵⁴ Lestari Ayu, "Tantangan Advokat Digital di Indonesia," *Jurnal Advokasi dan Hukum* 14, no. 3 (2022): 221.

⁵⁵ Ugo Pagallo, "The Legal Challenges of AI," *Philosophy & Technology* 31, no. 3 (2018): 315-330.

⁵⁶ Lemley and Casey, "Remedies for Robots," 1314.

stakeholders, it is feared that the emerging regulations will be sectoral, reactive, and unable to answer the complexity of ethical issues and legal protection that arise, taking into account the above complexity, the future of the legal profession in the era of robot lawyers must be built on a double foundation: technological innovation and professional ethics. Legal technology is inevitable, but the role of humans in upholding justice and ethical values should not be overlooked. There is a need to update the legal education curriculum that harmonizes between mastery of digital technology and strengthening professional ethical awareness. Only with this approach, the presence of robot lawyers can become an ethical partner that supports the legal profession, not a threat to the sustainability of human values in the legal system.

CONCLUSION

The emergence of robot lawyers as a product of the advancement of artificial intelligence (AI) presents serious challenges as well as opportunities in the practice of the legal profession in Indonesia. On the one hand, this technology has the potential to expand access to justice, improve the efficiency of legal work, and speed up the legal administration process. But on the other hand, its implementation that has not been accompanied by adequate regulations and ethical frameworks can threaten the basic principles of the legal profession, such as advocate independence, client confidentiality, accountability, and procedural fairness. Normatively, the lack of special regulations regarding legal tech or robot lawyers in the Indonesian legal system is an *urgent regulatory gap* that needs to be addressed immediately. Regulations governing the use of AI in legal services must be formulated with due regard to the principles of prudence, algorithm transparency, non-discrimination, and the protection of client rights. In addition, the code of ethics of the legal profession must also be reformulated in order to respond to technological developments without losing its identity as a profession that upholds morality and justice. From the point of view of professional ethics, robot lawyers should not replace the role of humans in making legal decisions as a whole, but should be a tool controlled by advocates with professional knowledge and responsibility. Therefore, increasing digital literacy and understanding of technological ethics for legal professionals is inevitable, so the ideal approach that must be developed is a hybrid approach, which is a combination of technological innovation and ethical principles of the legal profession. Cross-sectoral collaboration between policymakers, academics, the legal technology community, and professional organizations is a key requirement to ensure that robot lawyers can function positively in the Indonesian legal system, without eroding the fundamental values of justice and legal professionalism that have long been maintained.

REFERENCES

- American Bar Association. "Formal Opinion 477R: Securing Communication of Protected Client Information." *ABA Journal*, 2017.
- Angwin, Julia, et al. "Machine Bias." *ProPublica*, May 23, 2016.
- Arief, Barda Nawawi. *Metodologi Penelitian Hukum*. Jakarta: Kencana, 2017.
- Ayu, Lestari. "Tantangan Advokat Digital di Indonesia." *Jurnal Advokasi dan Hukum* 14, no. 3 (2022): 215-230.

- Buolamwini, Joy, and Timnit Gebru. "Gender Shades: Intersectional Accuracy Disparities in Commercial Gender Classification." *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research* 81 (2018): 1–15.
- CEPEJ. *European Ethical Charter on the Use of Artificial Intelligence in Judicial Systems*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe, 2018.
- European Commission. 2021. "Proposal for a Regulation on Artificial Intelligence." *Official Journal of the European Union*, April 21. <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:52021PC0206>.
- European Parliament. *General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR)*. Official Journal of the European Union, 2016.
- Fauzi, Ahmad. "Dampak Kecerdasan Buatan terhadap Relasi Klien." *Jurnal Ilmu Hukum* 18, no. 1 (2022): 60–75.
- Fauzi, Ahmad. "Kode Etik Profesi Advokat di Era Digital." *Jurnal Ilmu Hukum* 17, no. 2 (2021): 140–158.
- Fauzi, Ahmad. "Tanggung Jawab Profesi Advokat dalam Era Kecerdasan Buatan." *Jurnal Ilmu Hukum* 16, no. 1 (2020): 95–110.
- Herlina, Novi. "Integrasi Etika dalam Teknologi Hukum." *Jurnal Ilmiah Hukum dan HAM* 12, no. 1 (2023): 85–98.
- Lemley, Mark A., and Bryan Casey. "Remedies for Robots." *The University of Chicago Law Review* 86, no. 6 (2019): 1311–1391.
- Marzuki, Peter Mahmud. *Penelitian Hukum*. Jakarta: Kencana, 2.
- McEvoy, Fiona. "Legal Ethics in the Age of Artificial Intelligence." *AI Ethics Journal* 1, no. 1 (2021): 48–60.
- Novika, Nadya. "Komparasi Regulasi Robot Lawyer: Indonesia dan Kanada." *Jurnal Hukum dan Teknologi* 6, no. 1 (2023): 25–40.
- Pagallo, Ugo. "The Legal Challenges of AI." *Philosophy & Technology* 31, no. 3 (2018): 315–330.
- Permatasari, Rini. "Etika Profesi dan Teknologi: Studi Kasus Robot Lawyer." *Jurnal Hukum Modern* 12, no. 3 (2021): 110–120.
- Permatasari, Rini. "Profesionalisme Advokat dan Teknologi." *Jurnal Etika Hukum* 13, no. 1 (2021): 40–55.
- Permatasari, Rini. "Regulasi dan Etika Profesi dalam Era AI." *Jurnal Hukum Modern* 14, no. 1 (2022): 30–45.
- Prasetyo, Budi. 2022. "Blockchain dan Teknologi Hukum: Peluang dan Tantangan di Indonesia." *Jurnal Hukum dan Pembangunan* 52 (1): 123–140. <https://doi.org/10.21143/jhp.vol52.no1.123>.
- Rahayu, Siti. "Perlindungan Konsumen Layanan Robot Lawyer di Indonesia." *Jurnal Hukum dan Pembangunan* 51, no. 1 (2021): 65–80.
- Rahayu, Siti. "Robot Lawyer dan Transformasi Layanan Hukum di Indonesia." *Jurnal Hukum dan Pembangunan* 49, no. 2 (2019): 230–245.

- Rahayu, Siti. "Robot Lawyer dan Transformasi Relasi Hukum." *Jurnal Hukum dan Etika Profesi* 10, no. 2 (2022): 100–115.
- Remus, Dana, and Frank Levy. 2016. "Can Robots Be Lawyers? Computers, Lawyers, and the Practice of Law." *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2701092>.
- Setiawan, Dedi. "Etika Profesi dan Teknologi: Menuju Regulasi AI Hukum di Indonesia." *Jurnal Hukum Progresif* 17, no. 2 (2023): 185–200.
- Smith, John. "AI and Legal Ethics." *Journal of Legal Ethics* 24, no. 2 (2021): 110–125.
- Smith, John. "AI and Legal Ethics: An International Perspective." *Journal of Legal Ethics* 22, no. 1 (2020): 40–55.
- Smith, John. "AI and Legal Ethics: Surveillance and Compliance." *Journal of Legal Technology* 23, no. 3 (2022): 80–95.
- Smith, John. "Integrating AI Ethics into Legal Practice." *Journal of Legal Ethics* 24, no. 2 (2021): 110–120.
- Surden, Harry. 2019. "Artificial Intelligence and Law: An Overview." *Georgia State University Law Review* 35 (4): 1305–1339. <https://readingroom.law.gsu.edu/gsulr/vol35/iss4/3>.
- Susskind, Richard. "Artificial Intelligence and the Law: Challenges and Opportunities." *International Journal of Law and Information Technology* 27, no. 3 (2019): 210–225.
- Susskind, Richard. "Online Courts and the Future of Justice." *International Journal of Law and Information Technology* 28, no. 1 (2020): 1–20.
- Susskind, Richard. 2019. *Tomorrow's Lawyers: An Introduction to Your Future*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Susskind, Richard. *The Future of the Professions: How Technology Will Transform the Work of Human Experts*. Oxford University Press, 2019.
- Susskind, Richard. *The Future of the Professions: How Technology Will Transform the Work of Human Experts*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019.
- Wachter, Sandra, Brent Mittelstadt, dan Luciano Floridi. 2017. "Why a Right to Explanation of Automated Decision-Making Does Not Exist in the General Data Protection Regulation." *International Data Privacy Law* 7 (2): 76–99. <https://doi.org/10.1093/idpl/ix005>.

Conflict of Interest Statement: The author(s) declares that research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationship that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

Copyright: © AUTHOR. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License. (CC-BY NC), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

BALOB Law Journal is an open access and peer-reviewed journal published by Faculty of Law, Universitas Pattimura, Ambon, Indonesia.

