JUSTISI

Vol. 13, Issue. 1, January 2027
e-ISSN: 2686-0821, p-ISSN: 1979-7532
https://doi.org/10.33506/js.v13i1.5894
https://ejournal.um-sorong.ac.id/index.php/js/article/view/5894

Article History
Received: 12 July 2026
Reviewed: 17 Aug 2026
Accepted: 11 Oct 2026
Published: 14 Nov 2026

Violations of the Professional Code of Ethics Regarding Notaries' Personal Branding Practices on Social Media

Miranda Mazaya[1*], Diva Widiana[2]
[1,2] Faculty of Law, Universitas Airlangga, Indonesia
*correspondence email : mirandamazaya02@gmail.com

Abstract

This study aims to analyze the legal and ethical limitations of notaries' personal branding practices on social media, as well as to examine the effectiveness of oversight and the imposition of sanctions by the Notary Honorary Council regarding violations of the professional code of ethics. This study also discusses the distinction between permissible legal education and prohibited self-promotion in the digital environment.

This method uses normative legal research with a legislative and conceptual approach. Research data were obtained through a literature review of primary and secondary legal sources, specifically the Notary Office Act, the Notary Code of Ethics, and regulations related to electronic information and transactions. All legal materials obtained were then qualitatively analyzed to examine the alignment between professional ethical norms and the practice of using digital media.

The novelty of this study lies in its institutional and operational aspects, rather than merely its thematic focus. First, this study develops an updated legal framework based on the 2025 Notary Code of Ethics (KEN 2025) while retaining Article 4, paragraph (3) of the 2015 Law for the purposes of historical interpretation. Second, this study develops an operational test comprising eight factors that can be used by notaries and disciplinary bodies to classify digital content.

The findings show that personal branding practices carried out by notaries that go beyond the scope of non-commercial general legal education can be categorized as violations of Article 4(3) of the Notary Code of Ethics and are contrary to the principle of nobile officium. Although mechanisms for imposing ethical and administrative sanctions are in place, their implementation remains ineffective because the oversight system is largely reactive, based on complaints, and is not yet supported by technical guidelines specifically addressing the increasingly dynamic evolution of social media practices.

The study concludes that effective enforcement of the notary professional code of ethics requires clearer boundaries between legal education and self-promotion, the updating of digital ethics guidelines, and enhanced proactive oversight by the Indonesian Notary Association and the Notary Honorary Council to uphold the integrity and honor of the notary profession in the digital age.

Keywords: Authentic Deeds; Code of Ethics; Notary

Abstrak

Penelitian ini bertujuan *untuk menganalisis batasan hukum dan etika dalam praktik personal branding notaris melalui media sosial, serta mengkaji efektivitas pengawasan dan penerapan*

sanksi oleh Dewan Kehormatan Notaris terhadap pelanggaran kode etik profesi. Penelitian ini juga membahas perbedaan antara edukasi hukum yang diperbolehkan dengan tindakan promosi diri yang dilarang dalam lingkungan digital.
Metode Penelitian ini menggunakan penelitian hukum normatif dengan pendekatan peraturan perundang-undangan dan pendekatan konseptual. Data penelitian diperoleh melalui studi kepustakaan terhadap bahan hukum primer dan sekunder, khususnya Undang-Undang Jabatan Notaris, Kode Etik Notaris, serta peraturan yang berkaitan dengan informasi dan transaksi elektronik. Seluruh bahan hukum yang diperoleh kemudian dianalisis secara kualitatif untuk mengkaji kesesuaian antara norma etika profesi dengan praktik penggunaan media digital.
***Kebaruan** penelitian ini terletak pada aspek kelembagaan dan operasional, bukan sekadar tematik. Pertama, penelitian ini menyusun kerangka hukum terkini berdasarkan KEN 2025 sambil tetap mempertahankan Pasal 4 ayat (3) Undang-Undang Tahun 2015 untuk keperluan interpretasi historis. Kedua, penelitian ini mengembangkan uji operasional delapan faktor yang dapat digunakan oleh notaris dan badan disiplin untuk mengklasifikasikan konten digital.*
***Hasil penelitian** menunjukkan bahwa praktik personal branding yang dilakukan notaris dan melampaui batas edukasi hukum umum yang bersifat nonkomersial dapat dikategorikan sebagai pelanggaran terhadap Pasal 4 ayat (3) Kode Etik Notaris serta bertentangan dengan prinsip nobile officium. Meskipun telah tersedia mekanisme pemberian sanksi etik dan administratif, penerapannya masih belum efektif karena sistem pengawasan lebih banyak dilakukan secara reaktif berdasarkan pengaduan serta belum didukung oleh pedoman teknis yang secara khusus mengatur perkembangan praktik media sosial yang semakin dinamis.*
***Kesimpulan** penelitian ini penegakan kode etik profesi notaris yang efektif membutuhkan batasan yang lebih jelas antara edukasi hukum dan promosi diri, pembaruan pedoman etika digital, serta peningkatan pengawasan secara proaktif oleh Ikatan Notaris Indonesia dan Dewan Kehormatan Notaris guna menjaga integritas dan kehormatan profesi notaris di era digital.*
***Kata Kunci:** Akta Autentik; Kode Etik; Notaris*

1. INTRODUCTION

A notary holds the position of a public official vested with legal authority to prepare authentic deeds, except where the preparation of certain deeds has been expressly assigned to another authorized public official.[1] Pursuant to Article 1 paragraph (1) of Law Number 30 of 2004 concerning the Notary Position, hereinafter referred to as the UUJN, a notary is defined as a public official empowered to draw up authentic deeds and to exercise other authorities granted by statutory provisions. In carrying out this function, notaries perform an important role in supporting the state within the sphere of Indonesian civil law.[2] Their authority is closely connected with the state's obligation to provide legal certainty and protection in private legal relations, particularly for members of the public who require authentic deeds as legally

[1] Ali Arben and Andrew Shandy Utama, "Kedudukan Akta Notaris sebagai Akta Autentik dalam Hukum Perdata Berdasarkan Undang-Undang Jabatan Notaris," *ANDREW Law Journal* 3, no. 1 (2024): 1–11, https://doi.org/10.61876/alj.v3i1.26.
[2] Gladys Natalie Aurielle Sirait and Benny Djaja, "Pertanggungjawaban Akta Notaris sebagai Akta Autentik Sesuai dengan Undang-Undang Jabatan Notaris," *UNES Law Review* 5, no. 4 (2023): 3364, https://doi.org/10.31933/unesrev.v5i4.641.

recognized evidence.[3] Consequently, the position of a notary cannot merely be understood as a professional occupation, but must also be viewed as a public office whose exercise of authority is inseparable from legal, ethical, and institutional responsibilities.

As holders of public office whose authority originates from legislation, notaries are Given the public nature of the office and the fact that notarial authority originates from legislation, notaries are required to perform their duties in accordance with prevailing legal provisions and professional standards. Their conduct is governed not only by the UUJN but also by the Notary Code of Ethics, which functions as a normative framework for maintaining professional discipline, integrity, and ethical responsibility. Accordingly, notaries are expected to observe fundamental standards of professional conduct, including maintaining good moral character and strong personal integrity when performing professional duties in the interests of the public, as well as demonstrating honesty toward the parties appearing before them and toward themselves, thereby preserving intellectual and professional integrity.[4] These ethical obligations are particularly important because public confidence in authentic deeds is closely related to public confidence in the integrity of the notary who prepares them.

The institutionalization of these ethical standards is reflected in the existence of the Notary Code of Ethics formulated by the professional organization of notaries, namely the Indonesian Notary Association (Ikatan Notaris Indonesia), commonly abbreviated as INI. The Code of Ethics does not merely establish abstract moral principles, but also provides professional standards whose violation may result in ethical sanctions. In this respect, notarial ethics are primarily directed toward shaping the character and personal morality of notaries, which must be reflected in their conduct and actions while exercising the profession and holding public office.[5] Through the effective implementation of the Code of Ethics, notaries are expected to become professionals of good character who uphold the dignity and honor of the office and contribute responsibly to community life.[6] Thus, the ethical dimension of the notarial profession complements the legal authority granted by legislation and serves as an important mechanism for preserving the dignity of the office.

The need to maintain such dignity has become increasingly significant in the digital era, particularly as notaries have begun to use social media as a medium of communication with the public. On the one hand, Article 15 paragraph (2) letter e of the Notary Law grants notaries the authority to provide legal education to the public. This authority creates legitimate space for notaries to disseminate legal knowledge through various communication channels. On the

[3] Theo Anugrah Pakarti and Daly Erni, "Jabatan Notaris dan Kode Etik Notaris: Bagaimana Peran dan Fungsi Dewan Kehormatan Notaris?," *Kertha Semaya: Journal Ilmu Hukum* 10, no. 7 (2022): 1663, https://doi.org/10.24843/KS.2022.v10.i07.p17.

[4] Rifdah Oktavia Wibowo and Aminah Aminah, "Implementasi Peraturan Kode Etik Notaris dalam Menjalankan Profesi kepada Masyarakat," *Al-Manhaj: Jurnal Hukum dan Pranata Sosial Islam* 5, no. 2 (2023): 2143–2144, https://doi.org/10.37680/almanhaj.v5i2.3561.

[5] Betty Ivana Prasetyawati and Paramita Prananingtyas, "Peran Kode Etik Notaris dalam Membangun Integritas Notaris di Era 4.0," *Notarius* 15, no. 1 (2022): 311, https://doi.org/10.14710/nts.v15i1.46043.

[6] Difqa Alvi Ramadhandiko and Kayus Kayowuan Lewoleba, "Tinjauan Yuridis Pemanfaatan Media Sosial sebagai Sarana Promosi Online oleh Notaris sebagai Pelanggaran Kode Etik," *Media Hukum Indonesia (MHI)* 3, no. 3 (2025): 390–398, https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15639227.

other hand, the Notary Code of Ethics restricts forms of publication and self-promotion that may transform the public office of a notary into an instrument of commercial marketing. Within this regulatory tension, social media platforms such as Facebook, Instagram, and TikTok have increasingly been used by notaries to communicate legal information, build professional networks, and reach wider audiences.[7] The interactive, accessible, and borderless characteristics of social media make these platforms particularly effective for disseminating legal education quickly and efficiently to the general public..[8]

Nevertheless, the use of social media by notaries also raises a fundamental question concerning the boundary between permissible legal education and prohibited self-promotion. Legal education may remain consistent with the public-service function of the notarial office when it is informative, objective, and non-commercial. However, difficulties arise when educational content is combined with personal branding strategies, promotional language, testimonials, excessive display of professional achievements, invitations to use particular notarial services, or other forms of communication intended to attract potential clients. In such circumstances, the distinction between providing legal information and commercially promoting a notarial office becomes increasingly blurred. Consequently, the issue is no longer whether notaries may use social media, but rather how the content, purpose, presentation, and effects of such use should be legally and ethically assessed.

This distinction is particularly important because promotional practices have the potential to undermine the principle of nobile officium, under which the notarial office is regarded as an honorable public office rather than a commercial profession dependent on marketing to attract clients..[9] Excessive self-promotion may therefore conflict with the fundamental character of the notarial office, which is ex officio in nature that is, based on legal appointment and public authority rather than personal commercialization.[10] As emphasized in notarial scholarship, a notary is not positioned merely as a business actor who competes for clients through advertising, but as a public official whose authority is expected to arise from professional integrity and public trust. Promotional conduct may therefore not only affect the dignity of the profession but also create potential inequality among notaries, particularly between those who engage actively in digital promotion and those who choose to comply strictly with ethical restrictions.[11]

The increasing use of social media among notaries has consequently become an important issue in discussions concerning professional ethics, institutional supervision, and

---

[7] Indah Soleha Ahmad, Rahmatul Hidayati, and Isdiyana Kusuma Ayu, "Pelanggaran terhadap Kode Etik Notaris dalam Bentuk Personal Branding," *SEIKAT: Jurnal Ilmu Sosial, Politik dan Hukum* 5, no. 2 (2026): 60–61, https://doi.org/10.55681/seikat.v5i2.1972.

[8] Arie Kurniawan, Farrel Billie Akmal Fahar Ary Hartanto, and Ariska Dewantary, "Praktik Personal Branding Notaris terhadap Batasan, Etika dan Legalitasnya Ditinjau dari Undang-Undang Jabatan Notaris dan Kode Etik Notaris," *Perspektif Hukum* 25, no. 2 (2025): 372, https://doi.org/10.30649/ph.v25i2.498.

[9] Ramadhandiko dan Lewoleba, *loc. cit.*

[10] Habib Adjie, *Sanksi Perdata dan Administratif terhadap Notaris sebagai Pejabat Publik* (Bandung: Refika Aditama, 2008), 47.

[11] Indonesia, Undang-Undang Nomor 2 Tahun 2014 tentang Perubahan atas Undang-Undang Nomor 30 Tahun 2004 tentang Jabatan Notaris, Pasal 85 ayat (1).

legal accountability. This development has also attracted growing academic attention. Several previous studies have examined the relationship between notarial ethics, social media utilization, and personal branding practices from different perspectives. For example, Ahmad, Hidayati, and Ayu (2026) analyzed violations of the Notary Code of Ethics arising from personal branding activities and emphasized the distinction between legitimate legal education and promotional activities intended to enhance personal reputation or attract clients.[12] Their study demonstrates that personal branding may constitute an ethical violation where the form, purpose, or substance of the communication contains elements of self-promotion that are inconsistent with the dignity and honor of the notarial office.

Other studies have similarly contributed to identifying the legal and ethical boundaries of notarial activity in digital environments. Previous scholarship has addressed, among other matters, the promotion of notarial offices through Instagram, the legal consequences of online self-promotion, cooperation between notaries and third parties in managing social-media activities, comparative restrictions on publication and advertising, and the relationship between personal branding and the principle of nobile officium. Collectively, these studies provide an important doctrinal foundation for understanding why digital promotion by notaries may raise ethical concerns. However, the majority of the existing literature remains concentrated on identifying prohibited conduct and determining whether particular forms of personal branding constitute violations of professional ethics.

As a result, several important questions remain insufficiently addressed. Existing studies have not yet comprehensively integrated: (i) the post-2025 ethical framework governing notarial conduct; (ii) a clear allocation of supervisory authority among the INI Honorary Council, the Notary Supervisory Council (Majelis Pengawas Notaris or MPN), and the Notary Honorary Council (Majelis Kehormatan Notaris or MKN); (iii) an operational test capable of distinguishing legitimate legal information from prohibited promotional content; (iv) the relationship between organizational ethical sanctions and administrative sanctions attached to the notarial office; and (v) the legal safeguards required when digital supervision employs technological or automated monitoring tools. Accordingly, the principal research gap does not merely concern the substantive prohibition of personal branding, but also concerns the absence of an integrated institutional and operational framework for supervising notarial conduct in digital environments.

Against this background, the present study seeks to move beyond the conventional question of whether personal branding by notaries is permissible or prohibited. Instead, it develops an institutional-operational reconstruction of digital notarial ethics under the current legal framework. The study integrates the 2025 Notary Code of Ethics with operational indicators for assessing digital content, clarifies the respective institutional roles of the INI Honorary Council, MPN, and MKN, examines the relationship between ethical and

[12] Ahmad, Indah Soleha, Rahmatul Hidayati, and Isdiyana Kusuma Ayu. "Pelanggaran terhadap Kode Etik Notaris dalam Bentuk Personal Branding." *SEIKAT: Jurnal Ilmu Sosial, Politik dan Hukum* 5, no. 2 (2026): 60–69. https://doi.org/10.55681/seikat.v5i2.1972

administrative sanctioning mechanisms, incorporates legal limitations arising from electronic-information and personal-data-protection regimes, and evaluates the possibility of technology-assisted supervision subject to appropriate procedural and data-protection safeguards. In addition, a comparative analysis of Dutch notarial regulation is employed not merely as descriptive comparative material, but as a basis for identifying regulatory approaches that may inform the development of a more coherent model of digital notarial supervision in Indonesia.

The position and contribution of the present research in relation to earlier studies can therefore be illustrated more systematically in the following state-of-the-art table**.**

Table 1. State of the art and unresolved research gap

Previous study	Principal contribution	Remaining limitation relevant to this study	Position of this study
Fahmi, Aprilianda & Wisnuwardhani (2020)[13]	Examines sanctions for publication or self-promotion through print/electronic media.	Predates KEN 2025; does not map DK INI, MPN and MKN or develop a current digital-content test.	Updates the sanction architecture and separates ethical membership sanctions from statutory administrative sanctions.
Pakarti & Erni (2022)[14]	Explains the role and function of the Dewan Kehormatan in notarial ethics.	Institutional discussion is not centred on social-media personal branding and the 2025 code.	Clarifies DK INI competence after KEN 2025 and its relationship with MPN and MKN.
Renaldi & Allagan (2024)[15]	Compares publication and self-promotion of notaries in Indonesia and the Netherlands.	Comparative insight is not fully connected to a digital-monitoring model or post-2025 Indonesian norms.	Uses a functional comparison to derive limited lessons on truthful presentation, proportionality and risk-based oversight.

[13] Fadhil Fahmi, Nurini Aprlianda, and Dyah Aju Wisnuwardhani. "Pemberian Sanksi bagi Notaris yang Melakukan Publikasi atau Promosi Diri di Media Cetak maupun Media Elektronik." *Jurnal Cakrawala Hukum* 11, no. 2, 2020,: 157–165.https://doi.org/10.26905/idjch.v11i2.4450. .

[14] Theo Anugrah Pakarti and Daly Erni. "Jabatan Notaris dan Kode Etik Notaris: Bagaimana Peran dan Fungsi Dewan Kehormatan Notaris?" *Kertha Semaya: Journal Ilmu Hukum* 10, no. 7, 2022,: 1663–1676. https://doi.org/10.24843/KS.2022.v10.i07.p17.

[15] Ferdinand Renaldi and Tiurma M. Pitta Allagan. "Perbandingan Publikasi dan Promosi Diri oleh Notaris di Indonesia dan di Belanda." *Unes Journal of Swara Justisia* 8, no. 1, 2024: 52–68. https://doi.org/10.31933/ujsj.v8i1.478. (2024, April 7).

Ramadhandiko & Lewoleba (2025)[16]	Analyses social media as a promotional medium and its incompatibility with notarial ethics.	Focuses mainly on prohibition and juridical consequences under the earlier framework.	Reconstructs the current norm under KEN 2025 and avoids assuming all visibility is promotional.
Kurniawan, Hartanto & Dewantary (2025)[17]	Examines ethical and legal limits of notarial personal branding and the education/promotio n distinction.	Does not provide a systematic institution-and-sanction matrix or a detailed attribution model for third-party account management.	Creates an operational eight-factor test and an attribution/supervision model.
Ahmad, Hidayati & Ayu (2026)[18]	Discusses personal branding as a potential Code of Ethics violation and the boundary with legal education.	The boundary remains primarily descriptive and requires integration with current enforcement competence and data-governance issues.	Connects substantive boundaries to institutional jurisdiction, evidence, sanctions and preventive oversight.

The novelty of this research is accordingly institutional and operational rather than merely thematic. First, it constructs a current-state legal framework based on KEN 2025 while retaining Article 4(3) of the 2015 Code for historical interpretation. Second, it develops an eight-factor operational test that can be used by notaries and disciplinary bodies to classify digital content. Third, it distinguishes the legal consequences of the same digital act across three different normative planes: INI ethical discipline, UUJN administrative discipline, and general law such as the ITE Law. Fourth, it proposes a limited form of preventive digital oversight that is consistent with competence, due process, proportionality, and the Personal Data Protection Law rather than recommending indiscriminate automated surveillance.

On that basis, the research questions are: (1) how should the legal boundary between permissible notarial legal education/professional communication and prohibited personal branding on social media be interpreted under the UUJN and KEN 2025; (2) how are the functions and sanctioning powers of DK INI, MPN and MKN legally distinguished; and (3) what form of preventive digital oversight can be normatively justified without converting ethical supervision into excessive technological surveillance?

[16] · Difqa Alvi Ramadhandiko and Kayus Kayowuan Lewoleba. "Tinjauan Yuridis Pemanfaatan Media Sosial sebagai Sarana Promosi Online oleh Notaris sebagai Pelanggaran Kode Etik." *Media Hukum Indonesia (MHI)* 3, no. 3, 2025: 390–398. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15639227.

[17] Arie Kurniawan, Farrel Billie Akmal Fahar Ary Hartanto, and Ariska Dewantary. "Praktik Personal Branding Notaris terhadap Batasan, Etika dan Legalitasnya Ditinjau dari Undang-Undang Jabatan Notaris dan Kode Etik Notaris." *Perspektif Hukum* 25, no. 2, 2025: 365–387.https://doi.org/10.30649/ph.v25i2.498.

[18] Indah Soleha Ahmad, Rahmatul Hidayati, and Isdiyana Kusuma Ayu. "Pelanggaran terhadap Kode Etik Notaris dalam Bentuk Personal Branding." *SEIKAT: Jurnal Ilmu Sosial, Politik dan Hukum* 5, no. 2, 2026: 60–69. https://doi.org/10.55681/seikat.v5i2.1972.

2. METHOD

This research adopts a normative juridical method that focuses on examining legal norms, statutory provisions, and relevant legal doctrines concerning the ethical limitations of notaries in utilizing social media platforms. The research applies a statutory approach (statute approach) by analyzing regulations related to notarial authority and professional obligations, including Law Number 30 of 2004 concerning the Position of Notary as amended by Law Number 2 of 2014 concerning Amendments to Law Number 30 of 2004 concerning the Position of Notary, the Indonesian Notary Code of Ethics, and Law Number 1 of 2024 concerning the Second Amendment to Law Number 11 of 2008 concerning Electronic Information and Transactions. Furthermore, a conceptual approach is used to examine legal concepts related to professional ethics, public office integrity, nobile officium, and the distinction between legitimate legal education and prohibited self-promotion practices conducted through digital media.[19]

The specification of this research is descriptive-analytical, which aims to describe and analyze legal issues concerning the practice of notarial personal branding on social media and its compatibility with existing ethical and legal frameworks. The research utilizes secondary legal materials collected through library research, consisting of primary, secondary, and tertiary legal sources. Primary legal materials include statutory regulations, professional codes of ethics, and other binding legal instruments governing notarial conduct. Secondary legal materials consist of scholarly books, international journal articles, and academic studies discussing legal ethics, professional responsibility, and digital transformation within legal professions. Meanwhile, tertiary legal materials are obtained from legal dictionaries, encyclopedias, and supporting references to strengthen the conceptual understanding of the research topic.[20]

The collected legal materials are analyzed using qualitative legal analysis by interpreting and evaluating the relationship between applicable legal norms and the development of notarial practices in the digital environment. This analysis is conducted by examining whether social media activities carried out by notaries remain within the scope of their authority to provide general legal education as regulated under Article 15 paragraph (2) letter e of the Notary Law or have shifted into self-promotion activities prohibited under Article 4 paragraph (3) of the Notary Code of Ethics. Through this analytical method, the research seeks to provide a comprehensive understanding of the effectiveness of ethical enforcement mechanisms and the need for adaptive regulatory frameworks to preserve the integrity, independence, and dignity of the notarial profession in the era of digital transformation.[21]

---

[19] Mark Van Hoecke, *Methodologies of Legal Research: Which Kind of Method for What Kind of Discipline?* (Oxford: Hart Publishing, 2011), 1–3.

[20] William H. Putman and Jennifer R. Albright, *Legal Research, Analysis, and Writing* (Boston: Cengage Learning, 2020), 45–48.

[21] Mireille Hildebrandt, *Law for Computer Scientists and Other Folk* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020), 12–15, https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198860877.001.0001.

3. DISCUSSION

Based on the issues outlined above, the following discussion examines the forms of ethical violations in notaries' personal branding practices on social media, the regulations governing sanctions, and the effectiveness of oversight and enforcement of sanctions by the Notary Honorary Council.[22]

The increasing use of social media by notaries has created new forms of professional exposure that may indirectly develop into personal branding. Such practices can be identified through various types of digital content, including client testimonials, congratulatory or condolence messages, and office-related publications that prominently display a notary's name and professional title on platforms such as Instagram, Facebook, and TikTok.[23] From an ethical perspective, Article 4 paragraph (3) of the Notary Code of Ethics restricts notaries from using their professional identity for publication or self-promotional purposes through either printed or electronic media. This prohibition covers advertisements, ceremonial messages, expressions of gratitude, marketing activities, and sponsorship arrangements that may create a promotional impression.[24]

Nevertheless, the use of social media by notaries cannot automatically be regarded as an ethical violation. Article 15 paragraph (2) letter e of the Notary Law recognizes the authority of notaries to provide legal education to the public. Accordingly, digital platforms may be used as a medium for sharing legal knowledge, provided that the information is general in nature, educational in purpose, and does not contain commercial elements intended to attract clients.

The main difficulty lies in determining the boundary between public legal education and personal promotion. Social media content frequently combines professional identity, individualized storytelling, and interactive features designed to increase audience engagement. These characteristics may gradually shift the purpose of legal education toward the construction of a notary's personal image. When social media is used to strengthen professional visibility for competitive or commercial purposes, such conduct may contradict the principle of *nobile officium*. The notarial office is fundamentally based on state appointment and public trust rather than market competition or promotional strategies commonly employed by business actors..[25]

3.1. Normative Boundaries of Notarial Personal Branding on Social Media and the Legal Consequences of Ethical Violations

The supervision of notaries constitutes an essential element in preserving the credibility, dignity, and public legitimacy of the notarial office. Article 1 paragraph (6) of the Notary Law

---

[22] Nanda Nadia, Rizanizarli, and Yanis Rinaldi, "Factors That Difficult the Law Enforcement Process to Notaries That Infringed Notary Code of Ethics," *Jurnal IUS Kajian Hukum dan Keadilan* 9, no. 2 (2021): 332–350, https://doi.org/10.29303/ius.v9i2.786.

[23] Ikatan Notaris Indonesia, *Kode Etik Notaris*, Pasal 4 ayat (3).

[24] Indonesia, *Undang-Undang Nomor 2 Tahun 2014 tentang Perubahan atas Undang-Undang Nomor 30 Tahun 2004 tentang Jabatan Notaris*, Pasal 15 ayat (2) huruf e.

[25] Theo Anugrah Pakarti and Daly Erni, "Jabatan Notaris dan Kode Etik Notaris: Bagaimana Peran dan Fungsi Dewan Kehormatan Notaris?," *Kertha Semaya: Journal Ilmu Hukum* 10, no. 7 (2022): 1663–1676, https://doi.org/10.24843/KS.2022.v10.i07.p17.

identifies the Notary Supervisory Council as the institution vested with the authority to provide guidance and exercise supervision over notaries. Such supervision should not be understood narrowly as being confined solely to acts performed in the formal exercise of notarial authority. Rather, the supervisory function may also extend to conduct occurring outside official duties insofar as such conduct is capable of affecting the honor, dignity, integrity, or public confidence attached to the office of a notary. This broader scope of supervision reflects the particular legal status of a notary as a public official (*openbaar ambtenaar*), whose professional identity cannot always be completely separated from personal conduct in the public sphere.[26]

From a theoretical perspective, this position demonstrates that the notarial profession is founded not merely upon legal competence, but also upon the principle of professional integrity. The authority granted by the state to a notary to produce authentic deeds necessarily entails a corresponding ethical responsibility. Consequently, public confidence becomes an important element in sustaining the legitimacy of the notarial office.[27] Conduct that appears personal may therefore acquire professional relevance when it is publicly associated with the individual's status as a notary. This issue becomes particularly significant in the context of social media, where the boundaries between private identity, professional identity, and commercial representation are increasingly difficult to distinguish.[28]

In relation to professional discipline, Article 6 of the Notary Code of Ethics provides several forms of sanctions for violations of ethical obligations. These sanctions are imposed progressively and may consist of a reprimand, a formal warning, temporary suspension from organizational membership, or dishonorable dismissal from the Indonesian Notaries Association. Before the imposition of a sanction, the Honorary Council generally examines the relevant report or complaint, evaluates the available evidence, and provides the notary concerned with an opportunity to submit an explanation or defense.[29] In cases involving activities conducted through social media, electronic materials, including screenshots, uploaded posts, advertisements, videos, or other forms of digital traces, may become relevant evidentiary materials in determining whether a violation of the Code of Ethics has occurred.[30]

KEN 2025 further clarifies the substantive boundaries of permissible digital conduct. Article 5(2)(b) prohibits several forms of publication, including certain promotional content and client testimonials concerning the quality of notarial services, publication of office photographs, disclosure of deeds where confidentiality may be compromised, and publication of activities connected with deed execution or other official functions. At the same time, Article

[26] Ramadhandiko and Kayowuan Lewoleba, *loc. cit.*

[27] Tara Sklar, Jennifer Schulz Moore, Marie M. Bismark, and Yamna Taouk, "Vulnerability to Legal Misconduct: A Profile of Problem Lawyers in Victoria, Australia," *International Journal of the Legal Profession* 27, no. 3 (2020): 269–289, https://doi.org/10.1080/09695958.2020.1751166.

[28] Judita Kasperiuniene and Vilma Zydziunaite, "A Systematic Literature Review on Professional Identity Construction in Social Media," *SAGE Open* 9, no. 1 (2019): 1–11, https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244019828847.

[29] Andrew Boon and Avis Whyte, "Lawyer Disciplinary Processes: An Empirical Study of Solicitors' Misconduct Cases in England and Wales in 2015," *Legal Studies* 39, no. 3 (2019): 455–478, https://doi.org/10.1017/lst.2018.45.

[30] Alyce Zawacki, "Social Media Use in the Legal Profession," *Alternative Law Journal* 43, no. 2 (2018): 120–125, https://doi.org/10.1177/1037969X18765202.

5(4) recognizes limited circumstances in which the dissemination of notarial information and knowledge may be permissible. The Code therefore does not impose an absolute prohibition on a notary's presence in the digital sphere. Rather, it distinguishes between legitimate professional communication and communication that becomes promotional, commercially oriented, confidentiality-threatening, or otherwise inconsistent with the dignity of the office.[31]

This distinction is particularly important in assessing personal branding. Not every communication that increases public visibility should automatically be classified as prohibited self-promotion. Educational explanations concerning legal concepts, the role of a notary, requirements for authentic deeds, or public legal protection may serve legitimate informational and educational purposes. By contrast, the ethical risk increases where content is structured primarily to attract clients, differentiate the notary commercially from other practitioners, convert professional reputation into client acquisition, or encourage the audience to use the notary's services.

For this reason, the classification of social-media content should consider its overall purpose and structure rather than relying exclusively on isolated words or visual elements. Several operational indicators may assist disciplinary bodies in distinguishing informational communication from prohibited promotional conduct.

Table 2. Operational indicators for classifying notarial social-media content

Indicator	Lower-risk / educational characteristics	Higher-risk / promotional or prohibited characteristics
1. Purpose of content	Explains legal concepts, notarial role, deed requirements or public legal protection without directing the audience to choose a particular notary.	Primary purpose is client acquisition, competitive differentiation, reputation conversion, lead generation or service solicitation.
2. Form and substance	Abstract/general explanation, scientific commentary, public-interest information, neutral Q&A.	Service advertisement, testimonial, before/after claim, superiority claim, repeated office-showcase, client-facing marketing format.
3. Use of identity/title	Identity is used only as proportionate author/source identification where permitted by the applicable rule.	Name and title are emphasized as a commercial brand, slogan, logo-equivalent or repeated persuasive device.
4. Call to action	No request to appoint, book, contact or move a transaction to the author.	"Contact/DM us", booking links, "use our notarial service", lead forms, urgency/scarcity language.

[31] Ikatan Notaris Indonesia, Kode Etik Notaris 2025, art. 1(11) and art. 1(32), and art. 5(2)(b), especially items 3 and 12–16, together with art. 5(4).

5. Commercial element	No paid targeting, sponsorship tied to notarial service acquisition, commission or commercial collaboration.	Paid advertisement, referral arrangement, sponsored lead generation, influencer-style collaboration aimed at acquiring clients.
6. Fees/pricing	Explanation of statutory principles of honorarium without competitive offer.	Discounts, price-comparison claims, fee publication designed to undercut peers or attract clients, contrary to applicable ethical rules.
7. Client testimonial	No client endorsement or case-based claim of superior service.	Testimonial, rating, success story or endorsement about the quality/speed/superiority of the notary's service.
8. Office/deed/client exposure	No disclosure of confidential deed information; avoids content specifically prohibited by KEN 2025.	Office-photo uploads, signing-scene content, deed images or client-identifiable material where prohibited or confidentiality is endangered.

The factors are not a substitute for express prohibitions. Where KEN 2025 directly prohibits a category, such as uploading certain office photographs or deed-signing scenes, the absence of commercial intent does not automatically make the content permissible. The factors are most useful in the residual area where content combines educational speech, professional identification, and platform-specific engagement techniques. They also create a transparent reasoning structure for disciplinary bodies: rather than merely asserting that a post 'looks promotional', the decision can identify which features transformed the communication into solicitation or a prohibited form of publication.

Three zones can therefore be distinguished. The permitted zone consists of genuine notarial knowledge, scientific writing, teaching, and public explanations that are accurate, proportionate, confidentiality-safe, and non-soliciting. The prohibited zone contains conduct expressly captured by KEN 2025 or a clear marketing architecture designed to attract clients. Between them lies a risk zone: posts with legitimate legal substance but strong branding, repetitive title placement, engagement bait, commercial collaboration, or calls to action. In this zone, context and cumulative indicators are decisive.

The progressive nature of these sanctions theoretically reflects the principle of proportionality in professional disciplinary law. A sanction should not merely serve a punitive function, but should also perform preventive, corrective, and educational functions. Accordingly, the determination of sanctions should take into account the nature of the violation, its frequency, the intention behind the conduct, its impact on the dignity of the profession, and whether the conduct creates unfair competition among notaries. This

approach is particularly important in cases of personal branding because not every form of professional visibility on social media can automatically be equated with prohibited promotion. A distinction must therefore be drawn between legitimate public legal education and content that, either explicitly or implicitly, functions as commercial solicitation.

Ethical violations involving self-promotion may also have implications beyond organizational discipline and potentially affect the notary's official position. Under the relevant provisions of the Notary Law, administrative sanctions may include written warnings, temporary suspension, or dishonorable dismissal from office through the supervisory mechanisms prescribed by law. Nevertheless, in practice, promotional activities carried out through social media have often been treated as minor or moderate ethical violations, with sanctions generally taking the form of reprimands or warnings. Such a practice raises an important normative question concerning the effectiveness of existing sanctions in responding to contemporary forms of digital promotion.[32]

This issue is particularly relevant because social media promotion differs substantially from conventional forms of advertising. Digital platforms enable promotional content to be disseminated repeatedly, algorithmically, and to audiences far beyond the geographical area in which a notary operates. Consequently, even content that appears subtle may generate a significant promotional effect. If disciplinary authorities consistently impose only mild sanctions without considering the reach, frequency, commercial intent, and impact of digital content, the deterrent function of the Notary Code of Ethics may become weakened. Therefore, the assessment of social media violations should focus not only on the formal appearance of the content, but also on its substance, purpose, audience, and potential consequences for fair professional competition.

The examination of personal branding activities undertaken by notaries through social media must furthermore be situated within Indonesia's broader legal framework governing electronic information and digital activities. In this respect, Law Number 11 of 2008 concerning Electronic Information and Transactions and its subsequent amendments become relevant. Once a notary publishes content through a social media platform, such conduct can no longer be assessed exclusively through the perspective of professional ethics. Instead, it potentially operates within two interconnected normative frameworks: the special rules governing the notarial profession as lex specialis and the more general legal regime governing electronic information and digital activities as lex generalis.

The application of the lex specialis–lex generalis principle, however, should not be interpreted as meaning that the two regimes necessarily exclude one another. The Notary Law and the Notary Code of Ethics primarily regulate the professional status, obligations, prohibitions, and disciplinary responsibility of notaries, whereas the ITE Law regulates legal consequences arising from the use and dissemination of electronic information. Therefore, a single act committed through social media may simultaneously produce different forms of

[32] Kenneth Hamer, "Proportionality," in *Hamer's Professional Conduct Casebook*, 4th ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2023), 967–976, https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780192883384.003.0066.

legal responsibility where the constituent elements of each applicable legal regime are independently satisfied. Ethical liability consequently does not automatically eliminate the possibility of administrative, civil, or other legal consequences arising from the same digital conduct.[33]

From the perspective of normative legal analysis, content uploaded to social media may qualify as Electronic Information and/or an Electronic Document within the meaning of Article 1 points 1 and 2 of the ITE Law. This classification is significant, particularly in relation to evidentiary matters and the enforcement of the Notary Code of Ethics by the Honorary Council. Social media content should therefore not be regarded merely as informal online communication, but as electronic material capable of acquiring legal relevance in the examination of alleged professional misconduct. Several legal implications may be identified as follows:

Validity of Digital Evidence: Pursuant to Article 5(1) of the ITE Law, electronic information and its printouts constitute valid legal evidence. Therefore, the Notary Honorary Council should not hesitate to use verified screenshots, screen recordings, or digital footprints as primary evidence when adjudicating cases of alleged covert promotion.[34]

Content Responsibility: Under the principles of cyberlaw, the account owner (in this case, the notary in question) bears full responsibility for all material content published through their account. Defenses frequently raised by notaries such as claiming that the account is managed by a social media management agency (a third party) or office staff cannot legally negate the unlawful nature (wederrechtelijk) of such ethical violations. The notary is deemed negligent in supervising the representation of their office in the public sphere.

Legal Risk Analysis: From a legal risk perspective, personal branding content may give rise to broader consequences when it presents inaccurate or misleading information or indirectly promotes reduced notarial service fees as a means of attracting clients. Such practices may create unhealthy fee competition or a form of "price war" among notaries. In these circumstances, the conduct is not limited to a potential breach of Article 4 paragraph (3) of the Notary Code of Ethics concerning self-promotion. Where the published information is false or misleading and causes losses to consumers in electronic transactions, the content may also fall within the scope of Article 28 paragraph (1) of the ITE Law. Furthermore, the dissemination of such material may raise issues under consumer protection law, particularly when the information communicated through digital platforms affects the interests or decisions of service users.

The existence of normative prohibitions and sanction mechanisms, however, does not necessarily guarantee effective ethical compliance. The central problem in the digital

[33] Emily Hancox, "A Normative Case for the Principle of Lex Specialis in EU Law," in *The Reasoning of the Court of Justice of the EU: A Normative Assessment*, ed. Luigi Lonardo and Alezini Loxa (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2026), 81–104, https://doi.org/10.1093/9780198983002.003.0006.

[34] Sri Yuniati and Sri Endah Wahyuningsih, "Mekanisme Pemberian Sanksi terhadap Notaris yang Melakukan Pelanggaran Kode Etik Jabatan Notaris," *Jurnal Akta* 4, no. 4 (2017): 585–590, https://doi.org/10.30659/akta.v4i4.2501.

environment lies not only in determining whether particular content constitutes prohibited self-promotion, but also in ensuring that such violations can be identified, assessed, and addressed consistently. Consequently, the discussion must move beyond the normative formulation of ethical boundaries toward an examination of the institutional capacity, regulatory clarity, and professional culture that determine the effectiveness of notarial ethical supervision in the digital environment.

3.2. The Effectiveness of Oversight and Enforcement of Sanctions by the Notary Honorary Council

The enforcement of professional ethics within the notarial profession involves the District, Regional, and Central Honorary Councils of the Indonesian Notary Association (Ikatan Notaris Indonesia/INI). In this discussion, the Notary Honorary Council refers specifically to Dewan Kehormatan INI. Its institutional role encompasses safeguarding professional dignity, examining alleged ethical violations, and imposing sanctions within its authority. Pakarti and Erni emphasize the importance of this role and coordination with the Notary Supervisory Council in addressing professional misconduct.[35] Article 6 of the Notary Code of Ethics provides sanctions ranging from reprimands and warnings to suspension or termination of association membership. These organizational sanctions must be distinguished from removal from notarial office, for which the Central Honorary Council may submit a recommendation to the competent minister. Accordingly, enforcement effectiveness should be assessed through the Council's ability to identify violations, conduct fair examinations, and secure compliance with its decisions.

A central issue concerns the relationship between the Council's formal authority and its practical capacity to supervise digital conduct. Article 8 of the Notary Code of Ethics permits the Honorary Councils to investigate suspected violations on their own initiative or following a written complaint. Consequently, proactive oversight already has a normative basis. Nevertheless, Nadia, Rizanizarli, and Rinaldi identify weaknesses in the broader system of notarial oversight, including limited resources, insufficient supervision, and passive public participation.[36] Applied to social media, these findings suggest that excessive dependence on complaints may leave suspected violations undetected when users lack awareness of professional restrictions or reporting procedures. Such dependence may also delay intervention while promotional content continues to circulate. The relevant concern is therefore how existing supervisory powers are exercised and supported institutionally. Establishing the extent of complaint dependence within particular Honorary Councils would, however, require evidence from their monitoring activities and disciplinary records.

Another challenge concerns the interpretation of ethical restrictions when legal

[35] Theo Anugrah Pakarti and Daly Erni, "Jabatan Notaris dan Kode Etik Notaris: Bagaimana Peran dan Fungsi Dewan Kehormatan Notaris?," *Kertha Semaya: Journal Ilmu Hukum* 10, no. 7 (2022): 1663–1676, https://doi.org/10.24843/KS.2022.v10.i07.p17.

[36] Nanda Nadia, Rizanizarli, and Yanis Rinaldi, "Factors That Difficult the Law Enforcement Process to Notaries That Infringed Notary Code of Ethics," *Jurnal IUS Kajian Hukum dan Keadilan* 9, no. 2 (2021): 332–350, https://doi.org/10.29303/ius.v9i2.786.

education and self-promotion appear within the same digital content. Ramadhandiko and Lewoleba identify weaknesses in the supervision of online ethical violations and question the deterrent effect of existing sanctions.[37] Building on these concerns, this study proposes that content assessment should examine its substance, presentation, and surrounding context. Relevant indicators could include direct invitations to engage a particular notary, claims of professional superiority, promotional fee offers, and the use of client testimonials to attract prospective clients. Describing a post as educational should not, by itself, determine its ethical classification. The Council should explain how the specific content corresponds to the applicable prohibition and consider the evidence supporting that assessment. Without sufficiently clear operational guidance, comparable conduct may receive different interpretations across regions, creating a risk of inconsistent sanctions and reducing the predictability of professional ethical standards.

Improving enforcement therefore requires coordinated preventive measures and a consistent approach to disciplinary decision-making. Renaldi and Allagan's comparison of Indonesia and the Netherlands provides a useful basis for examining how professional rules distinguish the provision of information from prohibited self-promotion.[38] Drawing on that discussion, this study recommends that the Central Honorary Council develop practical guidance containing contextual indicators and illustrative examples of digital conduct. Such guidance should support periodic monitoring of publicly accessible professional content, accessible reporting channels, and continuing education on social media ethics. Disciplinary examinations should also rely on verifiable digital evidence and preserve the notary's opportunity to provide an explanation and defence. Sanctions should reflect the seriousness and recurrence of the violation, supported by clear reasons connecting the evidence to the ethical rule. This combination would strengthen early detection, improve consistency between regions, and encourage sustained compliance. The effectiveness of oversight would consequently depend on the Council's capacity to prevent and correct misconduct while maintaining procedural fairness and public confidence in the notarial profession.

3.3. Weaknesses in the Legal Structure

The effectiveness of the INI Honorary Council's oversight of social media may be constrained by reliance on complaints, although the ethical framework permits investigations on the Council's own initiative. Dependence on formal reports from fellow notaries or the public can hinder timely responses to potential violations in a rapidly evolving digital environment. Professional solidarity may also discourage notaries from reporting colleagues' TikTok or Instagram content, particularly when reporting is perceived as disproportionate or damaging to professional relationships. Where no dedicated digital monitoring team exists,

[37] Difqa Alvi Ramadhandiko and Kayus Kayowuan Lewoleba, "Tinjauan Yuridis Pemanfaatan Media Sosial sebagai Sarana Promosi Online oleh Notaris sebagai Pelanggaran Kode Etik," *Media Hukum Indonesia (MHI)* 3, no. 3 (2025): 99–115, https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15639227.

[38] Ferdinand Renaldi and Tiurma M. Pitta Allagan, "Perbandingan Publikasi dan Promosi Diri oleh Notaris di Indonesia dan di Belanda," *Unes Journal of Swara Justisia* 8, no. 1 (2024): 52–68, https://doi.org/10.31933/ujsj.v8i1.478.

the absence of routine reviews of publicly accessible notarial accounts may further limit the Council's ability to identify covert promotional practices and intervene promptly.

3.3.1. Lack of Legal Substance

The current Notary Code of Ethics is the result of the INI Extraordinary Congress held in Banten in 2015. Chronologically speaking, in 2015, the social media ecosystem was not as complex as it is today; short-form video algorithms (such as Reels and TikTok) and influencer marketing trends had not yet dominated the industry.

Regulatory Gap: The Code of Ethics only generally prohibits promotion via "electronic media" without specifying the technical limitations on social media content. There is no clarity regarding the legality of including popular hashtags, engaging in content collaborations (collab posts) with third parties who are not notaries (such as real estate agents or content creators), and using live streaming features while in the office workspace.[39]

3.3.2. Challenges in Legal Culture

There has been a fairly sharp paradigm shift among young notaries. There is economic pressure and intense competition due to the imbalance between the number of graduates from the Master's program in Notarial Studies and the market demand quotas in certain regions.[40]

Commercialization of the Profession: To accelerate the recovery of office operating capital and attract corporate clients, some young notaries have adopted a "growth hacking" mindset typical of startup entrepreneurs. They view personal branding as a necessity in the modern era for survival, thereby disregarding traditional moral values that consider self-promotion taboo. This permissive legal culture is gradually eroding internal adherence to the professional code of ethics.[41]

To address this persistent ineffectiveness, professional organizations must restructure and modernize their approach. The author outlines several strategic steps that must be taken immediately:

Development of Technical Guidelines for Notaries on Social Media: INI, together with the Ministry of Law and Human Rights, needs to issue specific and practical implementing regulations. These regulations must outline what notaries are permitted (DOs) and prohibited (DON'Ts) from doing on social media. For example: it is permissible to share legal educational infographics, but it is strictly prohibited to display visuals of the office, document handover activities with clients, or use commercial background music intended to increase view traffic. Transition to Active AI-Based Oversight: Shift the oversight model from reactive to preventive-

---

[39] Theo Anugrah Pakarti and Daly Erni, "Jabatan Notaris dan Kode Etik Notaris: Bagaimana Peran dan Fungsi Dewan Kehormatan Notaris?," *Kertha Semaya: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum* 10, no. 7 (2022): 1663–1676, https://doi.org/10.24843/KS.2022.v10.i07.p17.

[40] Nanda Nadia, Rizanizarli, and Yanis Rinaldi, "Factors That Difficult the Law Enforcement Process to Notaries That Infringed Notary Code of Ethics," *Jurnal IUS Kajian Hukum dan Keadilan* 9, no. 2 (2021): 332–350, https://doi.org/10.29303/ius.v9i2.786.

[41] Sri Yuniati and Sri Endah Wahyuningsih, "Mekanisme Pemberian Sanksi terhadap Notaris yang Melakukan Pelanggaran Kode Etik Jabatan Notaris," *Jurnal Akta* 4, no. 4 (2017): 585–590, https://doi.org/10.30659/akta.v4i4.2501.

proactive by utilizing digital keyword tracking technology on public accounts that include the title "Notary/PPAT."[42]

Strengthening the Professional Ethics Curriculum Starting in College: Notarial Education (M.Kn) programs and INI new member orientation must include specific material on Cyber Ethics for the Notary Profession, so that prospective notaries understand early on that their status as public officials applies 24 hours a day, including in the digital world.[43]

To provide a broader perspective in this article, it is important to compare how the legal systems of other countries (particularly those that follow the Civil Law or Latin Notary system) regulate publication restrictions for public officials who execute legal documents. This is important to determine whether Indonesia's strict restrictions are outdated or, in fact, in line with global trends.

Practice in the Netherlands (Notary Candidates & Notaries) The Netherlands, as the country of origin of Indonesia's notarial system, has regulations that are far more dynamic yet still rigid, governed by the Koninklijke Notariële Beroepsorganisatie (KNB). In the Netherlands, notaries are permitted to maintain professional websites and share highly detailed legal articles on platforms such as LinkedIn. However, they strictly prohibit the use of persuasive or bombastic marketing language. The emphasis in the Netherlands is on transparency of information, not on personal branding.[44] In the final section of this discussion, the author frames this issue within a profound theoretical debate between upholding the sanctity of legal tradition and the necessity of adapting to digital disruption.

The doctrine of nobile officium (noble office) stems from the philosophy that justice and legal certainty, as enshrined in authentic deeds, must not be compromised. The ex officio nature of the notary's role requires them to adopt a passive stance; they await the public's initiative, driven by legal necessity and trust, rather than lured by the aesthetics of short videos or content strategies on social media.

3.4. Institutional Authority: DK INI, MPN, and MKN Must Be Separated

The earlier manuscript's use of the expression 'Notary Honorary Council' obscured three legally distinct institutions. Clear institutional allocation is indispensable because authority, procedure, sanctions and legal consequences differ. The distinctions are summarized below.

[42] Nanda Nadia, Rizanizarli, and Yanis Rinaldi, "Factors That Difficult the Law Enforcement Process to Notaries That Infringed Notary Code of Ethics," *Jurnal IUS Kajian Hukum dan Keadilan* 9, no. 2 (2021): 332–350, https://doi.org/10.29303/ius.v9i2.786.

[43] Theo Anugrah Pakarti and Daly Erni, "Jabatan Notaris dan Kode Etik Notaris: Bagaimana Peran dan Fungsi Dewan Kehormatan Notaris?," *Kertha Semaya: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum* 10, no. 7 (2022): 1663–1676, https://doi.org/10.24843/KS.2022.v10.i07.p17.

[44] Difqa Alvi Ramadhandiko and Kayus Kayowuan Lewoleba, "Tinjauan Yuridis Pemanfaatan Media Sosial sebagai Sarana Promosi Online oleh Notaris sebagai Pelanggaran Kode Etik," *Media Hukum Indonesia (MHI)* 3, no. 3 (2025): 390–398, https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15639227.

Table 3. Institutional competence in notarial supervision and discipline

Institution	Legal basis / character	Core function relevant to this article	Role in social-media personal-branding cases
Dewan Kehormatan INI (DKD/DKW/DKP)	Organ of the Indonesian Notaries Association under KEN 2025; professional-ethical body.	Guidance, prevention, supervision of behavioural track record, and independent enforcement of the Code of Ethics through reports and disciplinary adjudication.	Primary forum for determining breach of KEN 2025 and imposing ethical/organizational sanctions. DKP may recommend removal as a notary to MPN and/or the Minister, but does not itself terminate the public office.
Majelis Pengawas Notaris (MPD/MPW/MPP)	Statutory supervisory body under UUJN Articles 67 et seq.; detailed by ministerial regulations.	Supervises notarial behaviour and performance of office; examines complaints, protocol inspections, and legal facts; exercises/proposes statutory administrative discipline within its competence.	Relevant when digital conduct independently implicates UUJN duties/prohibitions, including conduct affecting honor/dignity under Article 17(1)(i), or otherwise falls within the statutory supervisory mandate.
Majelis Kehormatan Notaris (MKN)	Statutory body under UUJN Articles 66 and 66A; Regulation No. 17/2021.	Guidance and the approval mechanism connected with requests by investigators, prosecutors, or judges for copies of deed minutes/protocol documents or to summon a notary in judicial proceedings.	Not the ordinary ethical tribunal for personal branding and should not be described as the body that imposes KEN social-media sanctions.

The statutory basis for supervision of conduct outside the narrow act of drawing up a deed is stronger than a theoretical appeal to professional dignity alone. Article 67(5) UUJN expressly states that supervision includes the behaviour of the notary and the implementation of the notarial office. Article 4(2) ties the oath of office to professional ethics, honor, dignity and responsibility. Article 17(1)(i) further prohibits other work that is contrary to religious norms, morality or propriety and can affect the honor and dignity of the notarial office, with Article 17(2) providing administrative sanctions for that violation. These provisions support the proposition that publicly observable conduct may acquire statutory supervisory relevance when it is legally connected to the dignity or obligations of the office. The reach is not unlimited: the supervisory body must still identify the specific norm, the connection to notarial status, and the procedural basis for examination.

KEN 2025 provides an even more explicit internal ethical basis. Its definition of behaviour covers a wide range of observable expression, while Article 21 gives the Dewan Kehormatan powers of guidance, prevention, monitoring behavioural track records, and enforcement. Thus, personal digital conduct can fall within ethical supervision when it satisfies the Code's scope and affects the values the Code protects. The legal justification should be stated through these provisions, not through a free-standing proposition that a notary is perpetually subject to undefined professional control.

3.5. Digital Evidence, Cyberlaw Liability, Third-Party Account Management, and Technology-Assisted Oversight

The growing use of social media by notaries raises several distinct yet interconnected legal questions concerning electronic evidence, cyberlaw liability, professional responsibility, and the use of technology in supervisory mechanisms. These issues should not be treated as interchangeable because the evidentiary function of digital content, substantive liability under the Electronic Information and Transactions Law (ITE Law), professional responsibility for content managed by third parties, and technology-assisted supervision are governed by different legal principles and standards.[45]

At the evidentiary level, social-media posts, screenshots, videos, account histories, and other electronic records may constitute electronic information or electronic documents capable of supporting allegations of ethical misconduct. Indonesian electronic-information law recognizes electronic information and documents as legally relevant evidence, although their evidentiary value remains dependent upon questions of authenticity, integrity, reliability, and contextual completeness. Accordingly, a screenshot or video originating from a notary's social-media account may demonstrate how the notary represents professional services to the public, but such material should not automatically be regarded as conclusive proof of misconduct.[46]

[45] Indonesia, Law Number 11 of 2008 concerning Electronic Information and Transactions, as most recently amended by Law Number 1 of 2024, arts. 1 and 5

[46] Zawacki, "Social Media Use in the Legal Profession," Alternative Law Journal, Volume 43, Issue 2 120–125. https://doi.org/10.1177/1037969X187652.

The assessment of digital evidence requires careful verification of its source, the identity of the account holder or administrator, the date and time of publication, the completeness of the communication or post, the possibility of alteration or manipulation, and the broader context in which the content appeared. A screenshot extracted from a longer conversation, for example, may convey a substantially different meaning when separated from its surrounding context. Recognition of electronic material as evidence therefore does not remove the obligation of supervisory or adjudicatory bodies to assess its reliability and probative value. Likewise, recognition of electronic documents under the ITE Law should not be interpreted as eliminating statutory requirements governing documents that, by law, must be executed in a specific authentic form.

A further distinction must be drawn between using social-media content as evidence and treating the content itself as conduct giving rise to substantive liability under the ITE Law. The mere existence of an ethical violation in cyberspace does not automatically establish an offence or other liability under cyberlaw. This distinction is particularly important in relation to Article 28 paragraph (1) of the ITE Law, as amended by Law Number 1 of 2024. The provision concerns the intentional distribution and/or transmission of electronic information or documents containing false notification or misleading information that results in material loss to consumers in electronic transactions.[47]

Consequently, conduct such as excessive self-promotion, publication of office photographs, use of client testimonials, or other forms of communication that may contravene the Notary Code of Ethics does not, without more, satisfy Article 28 paragraph (1). Liability under that provision depends upon proof of the statutory elements, including the required mental element, the existence of false or misleading information, its connection with an electronic transaction, and material loss suffered by consumers. Ethical misconduct and liability under the ITE Law should therefore be examined separately. A particular act may violate professional ethical standards without constituting an offence under the ITE Law, while in another case the same digital activity may engage multiple legal regimes where the relevant statutory requirements are independently satisfied.

Questions of attribution become more complex where a notary's social-media account is operated by employees, administrators, marketing agencies, or other third parties. It would be overly broad to assume that the notary bears automatic and absolute responsibility for every item uploaded through an account associated with the notarial office. Responsibility should instead be determined through an examination of authorization, knowledge, control, supervision, attribution, and the applicable standard of fault.[48]

[47] Indonesia, Law Number 1 of 2024 concerning the Second Amendment to Law Number 11 of 2008 concerning Electronic Information and Transactions, art. 28(1),

[48] Vivia Chandra and Tjhong Sendrawan, "Pelanggaran Notaris yang Bekerja Sama melalui Platform Media Sosial dengan Pihak Ketiga," Jurnal Ilmu Hukum, Humaniora dan Politik 4, no. 6 (2024): 2626–2634, https://doi.org/10.38035/jihhp.v4i6.2373

Where the notary personally creates, uploads, or approves prohibited content, attribution is relatively straightforward. Similar responsibility may arise where the notary deliberately authorizes a third-party agency to operate an official professional account, approves a promotional strategy, or exercises control over the manner in which notarial services are presented to the public. In such circumstances, professional responsibility does not arise merely because the account carries the notary's name, but because the digital representation of the office results from authorization, approval, or professional control.

Cases involving unauthorized or partially authorized actions require a more contextual inquiry. Relevant considerations include whether the account was officially represented as belonging to or representing the notarial office; whether the notary had actual knowledge or reasonably should have known about the content; whether internal approval and monitoring procedures had been established; whether the administrator acted within the mandate granted by the notary; whether corrective measures were taken once problematic content became known; and whether the notary directly or indirectly obtained professional benefit from the publication.

An unauthorized act committed entirely outside the scope of the administrator's instructions may weaken the basis for directly attributing the specific act to the notary. Nevertheless, it may still raise a separate issue concerning professional supervision where the notary has entrusted the public representation of the office to another party without implementing reasonable safeguards. Professional responsibility in the digital environment should therefore not be constructed as strict liability based solely on account ownership. It is more appropriately understood as a responsibility grounded in professional governance, reasonable supervision, and the degree of control exercised over digital representations of the notarial office.

This distinction is particularly significant because ethical, administrative, civil, and criminal liability may impose different standards of attribution and culpability. Professional ethical rules may legitimately establish relatively demanding supervisory obligations over the manner in which the notarial office is presented to the public. Criminal responsibility, by contrast, cannot be inferred merely from ownership of a social-media account or from the professional relationship between a notary and an administrator. Criminal liability must remain dependent upon the elements of the relevant offence and the legally required form of fault or participation.

The increasing volume of digital activity also creates practical challenges for conventional supervisory mechanisms. Social-media content can be created, modified, reproduced, and distributed on a scale that makes purely complaint-based supervision increasingly limited. For this reason, technology may provide useful support for preventive and proactive professional supervision. Keyword detection, automated searching, artificial intelligence, or other digital tools could assist supervisory bodies in identifying publicly available content that may require further examination. However, such technologies should

serve only as mechanisms of preliminary detection and compliance triage rather than as substitutes for legal or ethical judgment.

The use of technology cannot independently expand the legal authority of supervisory institutions. Any monitoring mechanism must remain grounded in the competence conferred upon the relevant institution by legislation and professional rules. Article 21(c)–(d) of the 2025 Notary Code of Ethics may provide an ethical foundation for preventive supervision and monitoring of professional behavioural records, while the authority of the Notary Supervisory Council must remain connected to the supervisory framework established by the Notary Position Law and its implementing regulations.[4] These provisions, however, should not be interpreted as automatically authorizing unrestricted or continuous algorithmic surveillance of all digital activities performed by notaries.[49]

A legally appropriate system would therefore adopt a risk-based approach. Technology may be used to identify content based on predetermined indicators linked to specific ethical provisions, but it should not determine conclusively whether a violation has occurred. Automated systems are particularly vulnerable to contextual error when attempting to distinguish legitimate professional education, academic discussion, institutional information, satire, personal expression, and prohibited solicitation. The determination of ethical responsibility consequently requires human assessment of the full content, the surrounding circumstances, the applicable ethical norm, the identity of the account operator, and, where legally relevant, the intention or knowledge of the notary concerned.

The deployment of automated or semi-automated supervisory technologies must also comply with the Personal Data Protection Law. Systematic collection, indexing, profiling, scoring, or long-term monitoring of identifiable persons may constitute personal-data processing subject to the principles and obligations established by Law Number 27 of 2022. Article 34 is particularly relevant because processing involving systematic evaluation, scoring or monitoring, automated decision-making with significant consequences, large-scale processing, data matching, or the use of new technologies may constitute high-risk processing requiring a personal-data protection impact assessment.[50]

The fact that information is publicly accessible on a social-media platform does not necessarily remove all data-protection obligations. There is a material distinction between a member of the public viewing an individual post and an institution systematically collecting, organizing, analysing, scoring, and retaining large amounts of information concerning identifiable professionals. Such institutional processing must therefore be supported by an appropriate legal basis and conducted consistently with the principles of purpose limitation, transparency, data minimization, accuracy, security, proportionality, and accountability.

[49] Ikatan Notaris Indonesia, Kode Etik Notaris 2025, art. 21(c)–(d); Indonesia, Law Number 30 of 2004 as amended by Law Number 2 of 2014, art. 67; Minister of Law and Human Rights Regulation Number 15 of 2020. These norms provide supervisory functions but do not themselves establish an unlimited mandate for continuous algorithmic surveillance.

[50] Indonesia, Law Number 27 of 2022 concerning Personal Data Protection, arts. 16(2), 20, 34, and 35–39. Article 34

Accordingly, the development of technology-assisted notarial supervision should be accompanied by clearly articulated legal and procedural safeguards. At minimum, the supervisory institution should possess an explicit mandate and publicly identifiable standard operating procedure; monitoring should normally be restricted to publicly accessible professional content unless another lawful basis exists; risk indicators should be connected to clearly identifiable provisions of the Notary Code of Ethics; automated systems should not determine guilt or impose sanctions; and every flagged case should undergo meaningful human verification.

The framework should further establish secure access controls, proportionate data-retention periods, records of the technological systems or rules used in identifying content, mechanisms for auditing false positives and other errors, and procedures allowing the affected notary to explain the relevant circumstances and challenge the accuracy, authenticity, or interpretation of the electronic evidence. Where the criteria for high-risk personal-data processing under Article 34 of the PDP Law are met, a personal-data protection impact assessment should form part of the system's design and implementation. Periodic independent evaluation should additionally examine whether continued use of the technology remains necessary, effective, and proportionate to the professional-supervision objective.

On this basis, the more legally sustainable concept is not "AI-based adjudication" or unrestricted digital surveillance, but technology-assisted compliance triage. Technology may assist authorized institutions in locating and organizing potentially relevant electronic information, whereas the determination of whether a notary has breached professional standards must remain a contextual legal judgment carried out by a competent human supervisory body. This model preserves the preventive benefits of digital monitoring while maintaining evidentiary reliability, individual attribution of responsibility, due process, data protection, and the institutional limits imposed by law.

3.6. Comparative Perspective: Indonesia and the Netherlands

The Netherlands is a relevant functional comparator because both systems belong to the civil-law/Latin notarial tradition, but the contemporary Dutch approach to publicity is materially different from a categorical advertising prohibition. The KNB Verordening beroeps- en gedragsregels 2011 requires the notary, when presenting externally, to ensure a correct and complete presentation of the office (Article 19). The official commentary treats internet addresses as part of 'outward presentation'. It also notes that detailed publicity and advertising rules were abolished in 2010, leaving general standards of decency, honesty, reliability and proper notarial conduct. The same framework allows correct publication of tariffs as part of informing clients about financial consequences. Thus, the proposition that Dutch rules simply prohibit persuasive or 'bombastic' marketing would be an overstatement.[51]

[51] Koninklijke Notariële Beroepsorganisatie, Verordening beroeps- en gedragsregels 2011, arts. 10 and 19 and official commentary. The commentary to art. 19 defines 'outward presentation' to include internet addresses, while the general explanatory materials record the 2010 abolition of detailed publicity and advertising rules in favour of general standards of decency, honesty, reliability, and proper notarial conduct.

The Dutch statutory framework places strong emphasis on independence, impartiality and care. Article 17 Wna requires the notary to exercise office independently, impartially, and with the greatest possible care. Disciplinary and supervisory structures are also institutionally developed. The comparative lesson is not that Indonesia should liberalize notarial advertising to the same extent. Rather, the Dutch model illustrates three governance ideas: outward presentation can be regulated through truthfulness and completeness; supervisory design can be separated from disciplinary adjudication; and risk-based oversight can supplement reactive complaint processing.[52]

A further contemporary point is significant. The KNB commentary to Article 19 was updated in 2026 to emphasize that the notary remains responsible for how the office is presented when collaborating with intermediaries, platforms or other commercial parties, and that third-party marketing must not create a false or misleading impression concerning identity, office or services. This is functionally relevant to Indonesian questions concerning outsourced social-media administration, although the legal basis and degree of responsibility must still be determined under Indonesian law.[53]

Table 4. Functional comparison between Indonesia and the Netherlands

Issue	Indonesia (current framework)	Netherlands	Limited lesson for Indonesia
Publicity / promotion	KEN 2025 contains detailed and relatively restrictive social-media and promotional prohibitions tied to dignity of office.	Detailed advertising rules were liberalized; KNB rules emphasize correct, complete and non-misleading outward presentation plus general professional standards.	Use clearer principle-plus-example guidance rather than relying only on broad labels, while retaining Indonesia's stricter substantive choices.
Legal education / information	UUJN Article 15(2)(e) legal counselling is connected with deed-making; KEN 2025 also recognizes public explanations/scientific activity subject to non-promotion.	Professional communication is permitted subject to independence, accuracy, transparency and disciplinary standards.	Expressly distinguish public legal information from solicitation and set transparent indicators.

[52] The Netherlands, Wet op het notarisambt, art. 17(1), requiring independent and impartial exercise of the office with the greatest possible care; see also the disciplinary and supervisory framework in the Wna and KNB professional rules.

[53] Koninklijke Notariële Beroepsorganisatie, Verordening beroeps- en gedragsregels 2011, art. 19, official commentary dated 21 May 2026, stating that the obligation of correct and complete office presentation also applies when a notary cooperates with intermediaries, platforms, or other commercial parties, and emphasizing responsibility for third-party outward presentation.

Supervision	DK INI and MPN have distinct ethical/statutory roles; KEN 2025 strengthens prevention; specific digital-monitoring protocol remains underdeveloped.	Integrated supervisory institutions and disciplinary mechanisms operate under Wna/KNB framework; risk-based approaches are used in oversight.	Develop risk-based, institutionally bounded monitoring rather than blanket scraping.
Third-party presentation	KEN/UUJN duties apply to the notary, but attribution for external admins should be reasoned through authorization and supervision.	KNB Article 19 commentary stresses responsibility for office presentation through intermediaries/platforms.	Require written account-governance and approval protocols for outsourced communication.

The comparative approach therefore supports calibrated reform. Indonesia can adopt the Dutch emphasis on accurate presentation, role clarity, third-party communication governance, and risk-based supervision without importing a market-oriented conception of notarial publicity that would conflict with KEN 2025. Comparative law is used here to identify functions and safeguards, not to claim institutional equivalence.

4. CONCLUSION

This study concludes that notaries may use social media for legal education and professional information, provided that their content respects ethical restrictions, confidentiality, independence, and the dignity of the notarial office. The proposed eight-factor test provides a contextual basis for distinguishing legitimate educational communication from prohibited promotion, without overriding express ethical prohibitions. Effective enforcement requires clear institutional roles: DK INI handles ethical discipline, MPN exercises statutory supervision, and MKN performs its distinct functions concerning judicial requests involving notaries and notarial documents. Organizational sanctions must be distinguished from sanctions affecting public office, while ethical violations do not automatically establish liability under the ITE Law. Digital evidence requires verification of authenticity, integrity, and context, and responsibility for third-party content depends on authorization, knowledge, control, and reasonable supervision. Strengthening enforcement therefore requires practical digital ethics guidelines, continuing professional education, proportionate sanctions, and proactive monitoring directed toward identifiable risks. Relevant lessons from the Netherlands support accurate professional communication and clearer accountability for outsourced content. Technology may assist detection, subject to meaningful human assessment, procedural fairness, and personal-data protection. This integrated approach would strengthen legal certainty, professional accountability, and public trust while preserving access to legal knowledge.

REFERENCE

Adjie, Habib. *Sanksi Perdata dan Administratif terhadap Notaris sebagai Pejabat Publik*. Bandung: Refika Aditama, 2008.

Ahmad, Indah Soleha, Rahmatul Hidayati, and Isdiyana Kusuma Ayu. "Pelanggaran terhadap Kode Etik Notaris dalam Bentuk Personal Branding." *SEIKAT: Jurnal Ilmu Sosial, Politik dan Hukum* 5, no. 2 (2026): 60–69. https://doi.org/10.55681/seikat.v5i2.1972.

Andrew Boon and Avis Whyte, "Lawyer Disciplinary Processes: An Empirical Study of Solicitors' Misconduct Cases in England and Wales in 2015," *Legal Studies* 39, no. 3 (2019): 455–478, https://doi.org/10.1017/lst.2018.45.

Arben, Ali, and Andrew Shandy Utama. "Kedudukan Akta Notaris sebagai Akta Autentik dalam Hukum Perdata Berdasarkan Undang-Undang Jabatan Notaris." *Andrew Law Journal* 3, no. 1 (2024): 1–15. https://doi.org/10.61876/alj.v3i1.26.

Chandra, Vivia, and Tjhong Sendrawan. "Pelanggaran Notaris yang Bekerja Sama melalui Platform Media Sosial dengan Pihak Ketiga." *Jurnal Ilmu Hukum, Humaniora dan Politik* 4, no. 6 (2024): 2626–2634. https://doi.org/10.38035/jihhp.v4i6.2373.

Emily Hancox, "A Normative Case for the Principle of Lex Specialis in EU Law," in *The Reasoning of the Court of Justice of the EU: A Normative Assessment*, ed. Luigi Lonardo and Alezini Loxa (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2026), 81–104, https://doi.org/10.1093/9780198983002.003.0006.

Fahmi, Fadhil, Nurini Aprilianda, and Dyah Aju Wisnuwardhani. "Pemberian Sanksi bagi Notaris yang Melakukan Publikasi atau Promosi Diri di Media Cetak maupun Media Elektronik." *Jurnal Cakrawala Hukum* 11, no. 2 (2020): 157–165. https://doi.org/10.26905/idjch.v11i2.4450.

Ikatan Notaris Indonesia. *Kode Etik Notaris*. Hasil Kongres Luar Biasa Ikatan Notaris Indonesia, Banten, 29–30 Mei 2015.

Indonesia. *Undang-Undang Nomor 11 Tahun 2008 tentang Informasi dan Transaksi Elektronik sebagaimana Diubah dengan Undang-Undang Nomor 19 Tahun 2016*.

Indonesia. *Undang-Undang Nomor 2 Tahun 2014 tentang Perubahan atas Undang-Undang Nomor 30 Tahun 2004 tentang Jabatan Notaris*. Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2014 Nomor 3.

Indonesia. *Undang-Undang Nomor 30 Tahun 2004 tentang Jabatan Notaris*. Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2004 Nomor 117.

Kenneth Hamer, "Proportionality," in *Hamer's Professional Conduct Casebook*, 4th ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2023), 967–976, https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780192883384.003.0066.

Kurniawan, Arie, Farrel Billie Akmal Fahar Ary Hartanto, and Ariska Dewantary. "Praktik Personal Branding Notaris terhadap Batasan, Etika dan Legalitasnya Ditinjau dari Undang-Undang Jabatan Notaris dan Kode Etik Notaris." *Perspektif Hukum* 25, no. 2 (2025): 365–387. https://doi.org/10.30649/ph.v25i2.498.

Mark Van Hoecke, *Methodologies of Legal Research: Which Kind of Method for What Kind of Discipline?* (Oxford: Hart Publishing, 2011).

Mireille Hildebrandt, *Law for Computer Scientists and Other Folk* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020), https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198860877.001.0001.

Nadia, Nanda, Rizanizarli, and Yanis Rinaldi. "Factors That Difficult the Law Enforcement Process to Notaries That Infringed Notary Code of Ethics." *Jurnal IUS Kajian Hukum dan Keadilan* 9, no. 2 (2021): 332–350. https://doi.org/10.29303/ius.v9i2.786.

Noviyanti, T., and E. Ratna. "Akibat Hukum Notaris Mempromosikan Diri di Sosial Media Instagram." *Notarius: Jurnal Kenotariatan* (2022).

Pakarti, Theo Anugrah, and Daly Erni. "Jabatan Notaris dan Kode Etik Notaris: Bagaimana Peran dan Fungsi Dewan Kehormatan Notaris?" *Kertha Semaya: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum* 10, no. 7 (2022): 1663–1676. https://doi.org/10.24843/KS.2022.v10.i07.p17.

Prasetyawati, Betty Ivana, and Paramita Prananingtyas. "Peran Kode Etik Notaris dalam Membangun Integritas Notaris di Era 4.0." *Notarius* 15, no. 1 (2022): 310–323. https://doi.org/10.14710/nts.v15i1.46043.

Ramadhandiko, Difqa Alvi, and Kayus Kayowuan Lewoleba. "Tinjauan Yuridis Pemanfaatan Media Sosial sebagai Sarana Promosi Online oleh Notaris sebagai Pelanggaran Kode Etik." *Media Hukum Indonesia (MHI)* 3, no. 3 (2025): 390–398. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15639227.

Renaldi, Ferdinand, and Tiurma M. Pitta Allagan. "Perbandingan Publikasi dan Promosi Diri oleh Notaris di Indonesia dan di Belanda." *Unes Journal of Swara Justisia* 8, no. 1 (2024): 52–68. https://doi.org/10.31933/ujsj.v8i1.478.

Sirait, Gladys Natalie Aurielle, and Benny Djaja. "Pertanggungjawaban Akta Notaris sebagai Akta Autentik Sesuai dengan Undang-Undang Jabatan Notaris." *Unes Law Review* 5, no. 4 (2023): 3364–3374. https://doi.org/10.31933/unesrev.v5i4.641.

Tara Sklar, Jennifer Schulz Moore, Marie M. Bismark, and Yamna Taouk, "Vulnerability to Legal Misconduct: A Profile of Problem Lawyers in Victoria, Australia," *International Journal of the Legal Profession* 27, no. 3 (2020): 269–289, https://doi.org/10.1080/09695958.2020.1751166.

Vigo, S., and F. Prihatini. "Promosi Jabatan Notaris melalui Media Instagram sebagai Bentuk Pelanggaran Kode Etik Profesi Notaris." *Kertha Semaya* 9, no. 11 (2021): 2033–2046.

Vivia Chandra and Tjhong Sendrawan, "Pelanggaran Notaris yang Bekerja Sama melalui Platform Media Sosial dengan Pihak Ketiga," Jurnal Ilmu Hukum, Humaniora dan Politik 4, no. 6 (2024): 2626–2634, https://doi.org/10.38035/jihhp.v4i6.2373.

Wibowo, Rifdah Oktavia, and Aminah. "Implementasi Peraturan Kode Etik Notaris dalam Menjalankan Profesi kepada Masyarakat." *Al-Manhaj: Jurnal Hukum dan Pranata Sosial Islam* 5, no. 2 (2023): 2143–2152. https://doi.org/10.37680/almanhaj.v5i2.3561.

William H. Putman and Jennifer R. Albright, *Legal Research, Analysis, and Writing* (Boston:

Cengage Learning, 2020).
Yuniati, Sri, and Sri Endah Wahyuningsih. "Mekanisme Pemberian Sanksi terhadap Notaris yang Melakukan Pelanggaran Kode Etik Jabatan Notaris." *Jurnal Akta* 4, no. 4 (2017): 585–590. https://doi.org/10.30659/akta.v4i4.2501
Zawacki, "Social Media Use in the Legal Profession," Alternative Law Journal, Volume 43, Issue 2 120–125. https://doi.org/10.1177/1037969X187652.