



Academia Review-A Multidisciplinary Online Journal

ISSN (Online): 3070-6726

Website: <https://academia.org>

Volume 2, Issue 4, April, 2026



This work is Licenced under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0).

Practical Effectiveness Of Self-Governance Mechanisms In The Legal Profession: Challenges And Development Trends

Zokirova Diyora Alibek kizi

Tashkent State University of Law

Master's student in the specialization of Advocacy

Email: mamurjonovadiyora7@gmail.com

Abstract. This article analyzes the practical effectiveness of the self-governance principle in the bar system based on an empirical approach. Drawing on judicial practice, statistical data, and real challenges encountered in lawyers' professional activity, it evaluates the functioning of this institution. While the research findings indicate that the self-governance principle generally operates effectively within the bar system, certain shortcomings in its practical application are identified. In particular, uneven professional competence among lawyers, insufficiently developed internal oversight mechanisms, and external pressures negatively affect the system's performance. The author formulates relevant scientific conclusions and practical recommendations aimed at improving the functioning of the legal profession.

Keywords: bar association, self-governance, judicial practice, empirical analysis, independence of lawyers, internal oversight, procedural rights, adversarial principle.

Introduction

Assessing how effectively the self-governance principle operates within the bar system should not be limited to a purely theoretical approach. The genuine effectiveness of any legal institution is determined by its performance in practice, its real outcomes, and the extent to which it meets the needs of society. For this reason, empirical analysis emerges as an important methodological approach when evaluating self-governance mechanisms in legal practice.



Judicial practice serves as a significant empirical source for assessing the genuine effectiveness of the self-governance principle in the bar, since it is precisely in court proceedings that a lawyer's independence, professional preparedness, and internal standards are put to the test in practice. Accordingly, statistical data accurately reflect the development dynamics of the bar institution.

Examples from judicial practice

Judicial practice is one of the most important empirical criteria for evaluating the practical effectiveness of the self-governance principle in bar activity. It is in court proceedings that a lawyer's independence, professional preparedness, and level of exercise of procedural rights are genuinely demonstrated. In this regard, the bar institution is regarded as a key institution ensuring balance in judicial proceedings by providing qualified legal assistance to citizens.¹

Analysis of practice shows that in criminal proceedings, a lawyer's active participation significantly influences the outcome of the case. In particular, there are instances where evidence has not been gathered in accordance with the lawful procedure at the investigation stage. In such situations, a lawyer identifies procedural violations during the trial and files a motion to exclude unlawfully obtained evidence. As a result, courts issue decisions either to return the case for additional investigation or to reduce the charges. These instances confirm that a lawyer's independent procedural activity leads to real legal outcomes and that the adversarial principle functions in practice.²

The active stance of lawyers is also of great importance in the practice of higher-instance courts. Cases heard on appeal are sometimes resolved differently from the first instance - the decisions of lower courts may be modified or overturned on the basis of arguments presented by lawyers. This is especially evident in situations where evidence was insufficiently assessed by the court or where an incorrect legal qualification was applied. Such practice demonstrates

¹ O'zbekiston Respublikasi. "Advokatura to'g'risida"gi Qonun. – 1996-yil 27-dekabr (keyingi o'zgartirish va qo'shimchalar bilan). – URL: <https://lex.uz/docs/54503>

² Nurumbek D. Advokatura O'zbekiston huquq tizimidagi eng muhim institutga aylanmoqda. – URL: <https://www.uzbekistan.org.ua/uz/yangiliklar/7474-advokatura-o-zbekiston-huquq-tizimidagi-eng-muhim-institutga-aylanmoqda.html>



the lawyer's role not only as a defense function but also as an important procedural actor capable of rectifying judicial errors.

In civil judicial practice as well, lawyers' participation directly affects the quality of court decisions. In particular, in cases involving property disputes or contractual obligations, the active use of procedural instruments - such as commissioning expert examinations, analyzing counter-arguments, and employing procedural tools - ensures that cases are examined on an adversarial basis. This contributes to the soundness and impartiality of court decisions and serves the effective protection of citizens' rights.³

At the same time, judicial practice also reveals problems within the bar system. In some cases, lawyers fail to make sufficient use of procedural rights, participate passively in court proceedings, or do not thoroughly develop a defense strategy. As a result, the adversarial principle is not fully realized, which may negatively affect the quality of the court's decision. These instances indicate the uneven level of professional competence among lawyers and the insufficient effectiveness of internal oversight mechanisms.⁴

Moreover, external factors affecting lawyers' independence are also encountered in practice. In particular, indirect pressure from investigative bodies or other interested parties may hinder a lawyer's freedom to operate. However, the professional activity of lawyers must be based on the principles of independence and the rule of law, and these principles serve to ensure that lawyers act impartially.⁵

In general, analysis of judicial practice demonstrates that while the self-governance principle exists within the bar system, its practical effectiveness is directly dependent on the professional level of lawyers, the quality of internal oversight mechanisms, and the actual operation of guarantees ensuring lawyers' independence. For this reason, in evaluating this principle, the primary criterion should not be its formal existence but rather its real outcomes in judicial practice.

³ The Independence of the Bar and its Role in the Judicial System: International and National Legal Frameworks // Modern Science and Research. – URL: <https://inlibrary.uz/index.php/science-research/article/view/137575/138902>

⁴ O'zbekiston Respublikasi. "Advokatura to'g'risida"gi Qonun. – URL: <https://lex.uz/docs/54503>

⁵ Davlyatov V. "O'zbekiston Respublikasi Advokatlar palatasining maqomi va uning asosiy vazifalari tavsifi" // Cyberleninka, 2025 (*murojaat sanasi 21.04.2026*)



Real challenges in the practice of lawyers

In evaluating the effectiveness of self-governance in the bar system, it is important to analyze, on an empirical and source-based basis, the real challenges that lawyers face. Practice and academic sources show that these challenges manifest in several key areas and directly affect the professional activity of lawyers.

First, there are institutional challenges. Although the Bar Association, as the main governing body of the bar system, holds significant powers, in some cases the practical exercise of those powers is not sufficiently effective. Academic research has noted that the effective functioning of the bar system depends primarily on the proper organization of its governing bodies and the full implementation of their functions.⁶

At the same time, in practice, certain bureaucratic procedures in the internal governance system may complicate decision-making processes and reduce the system's flexibility.

Second, professional challenges are also pressing. This may increase the workload on lawyers and affect the quality of services. Furthermore, academic and practical sources note the varying levels of professional competence among lawyers and the uneven degree of adherence to professional ethics. Some lawyers' failure to fully comply with professional standards negatively affects the overall reputation of the bar institution.

Third, external factors that hinder lawyers' professional activity are also present. Practical publications note that lawyers often encounter such problems as the failure of state bodies or officials to provide information in a timely manner or to respond to their requests.⁷

This restricts a lawyer's ability to gather evidence and consequently has a negative impact on the effectiveness of the defense. At the same time, although

⁶ "O'zbekiston advokaturasining dolzarb muammolari" // Anhor.uz

⁷ Rustambayev M.X., To'xtasheva U.A. O'zbekiston Respublikasida advokatlik faoliyati. Oliy o'quv yurtlari uchun darslik. – T.: "Ilmziyo", 2012. – 408 b.



liability for unlawful interference in legal activity is established, in practice such situations have not been fully eliminated.⁸

In addition, as a systemic issue, the insufficient functioning of monitoring and quality control mechanisms for lawyers' activities is also highlighted. According to normative documents, bar structures are required to submit regular statistical reports on their activities, however, this system is largely formal in nature and cannot fully ensure real oversight of the quality of services.⁹

The above analyses demonstrate that while the self-governance principle exists within the bar system, its practical effectiveness is constrained by a number of factors. In particular, shortcomings in institutional governance, the uneven professional competence of lawyers, and the influence of external pressures impede the full functioning of this system. It is therefore necessary to improve self-governance mechanisms, strengthen internal oversight, and reinforce guarantees protecting lawyers' professional activity.

Analysis of statistics and practical cases

According to data from the Bar Association, as of January 1, 2024, lawyers participated in 85,339 cases. This figure confirms that the role of the bar institution in the judicial system continues to grow year by year. At the same time, as of mid-2023, 5,665 lawyers were practicing in the country, which means that on average there is 1 lawyer for every 6,460 citizens. According to other data, the number of lawyers exceeds 6,000, with this ratio remaining even lower in certain regions. This statistical situation demonstrates that, alongside qualitative issues, the bar system also faces quantitative challenges.¹⁰

Analysis of practical cases shows that a higher level of procedural fairness is observed in court cases where lawyers are involved. The active participation of lawyers serves to conduct a thorough analysis of evidence, make effective use of procedural rights, and ensure equality between the parties. For this reason, the growing number of lawyers is regarded not only as a statistical indicator but also as a factor affecting the quality of the judicial system.

⁸ O'zbekiston Respublikasi Adliya vazirining 2018-yil 5-yanvardagi buyrug'i (advokatlik statistik hisobotlari) // Lex.uz

⁹ Advokatura faoliyati bo'yicha statistik ma'lumotlar // Uzbekistan.org.ua

¹⁰ Advokatlar soni va taqsimoti bo'yicha ma'lumot // Uz24.uz



However, statistical data also demonstrate the existence of problems within the bar system. For example, the low number of lawyers relative to the population restricts access to legal assistance in some regions. Furthermore, although bar structures are obligated to regularly submit statistical data, this system is largely oriented toward reporting purposes and cannot fully ensure real oversight of service quality.

Furthermore, the development dynamics of the bar system also constitute an important empirical indicator. For example, while the number of lawyers was 3,919 at the beginning of 2020, this figure has increased considerably in subsequent years. This indicates that a positive growth trend exists within the bar system, although it has not yet reached the level of fully meeting the needs of society.

At the same time, the state-funded legal aid system also provides important empirical data. For instance, during the period from 2023 to 2025, lawyers provided free legal assistance to more than 266,000 citizens. This demonstrates the growing social significance of the bar institution. However, the fact that lawyers' activities are not always effective in practice indicates that internal oversight mechanisms are not functioning with sufficient efficiency.

Conclusion

Empirical analysis demonstrates that while the self-governance principle in the bar is generally functioning effectively, certain challenges persist in practice. Judicial practice and statistical data indicate the necessity of improving the system, enhancing the professional competence of lawyers, strengthening internal oversight, and consolidating independence. For this reason, while this principle is of significant importance, its full effectiveness requires a comprehensive approach and systematic reforms.

REFERENCES:

1. Advokatura to'g'risida. – O'zbekiston Respublikasi Qonuni. 1996-yil 27-dekabr (o'zgartirish va qo'shimchalar bilan). URL: <https://lex.uz/docs/54503>
2. United Nations. Basic Principles on the Role of Lawyers. – Havana, 1990. – URL: <https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/basic-principles-role-lawyers>



3. Council of Bars and Law Societies of Europe. Charter of Core Principles of the European Legal Profession. Brussels, 2006. URL: https://www.ccbe.eu/fileadmin/speciality_distribution/public/documents/DE_ONTOLOGY/EN_Charter_of_core_principles.pdf
4. International Commission of Jurists. The Independence of Lawyers in Eastern Europe. Geneva, 2016.
URL: <https://www.icj.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/Europe-independence-of-lawyers-Publications-Reports-2016-ENG.pdf>
5. OECD. Regulatory Policy in Transition Economies. Paris: OECD Publishing, 2010. URL: <https://www.oecd.org/gov/regulatory-policy/44529124.pdf>
6. Baldwin R., Cave M., Lodge M. Understanding Regulation: Theory, Strategy, and Practice. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
7. Abel R.L., Lewis P.S.C. (eds). Lawyers in Society: The Common Law World. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.
8. Pilipenko Yu.S. Professionalnaya etika advokata: kommentariy. Moskva, 2016.
9. Legal Services Board. Annual Report and Accounts 2023–2024. URL: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/68ca9cc3c6df905ce77084bf/L_SB_ARA_2023-24.pdf
10. European Commission. Communication on Reform Recommendations for Regulation in Professional Services. – Brussels, 2017. URL: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:52016DC0820>
11. World Bank. Improving Commercial Justice in Transition Economies. Washington, DC.