

ORAL ARGUMENT: MAY 14, 2026

Nos. 25-5241, 25-5265, 25-5277, 25-5310

**IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT**

PERKINS COIE LLP,
Plaintiff-Appellee

v.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, *et al.*,
Defendants-Appellants

On Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of Columbia

**BRIEF OF *AMICUS CURIAE* LAWYERS FOR LAWYERS IN SUPPORT
OF APPELLEES AND AFFIRMANCE**

Nicholas Diamand
Daniel E. Seltz
Lieff Cabraser Heimann
& Bernstein, LLP
250 Hudson Street, 8th Floor
New York, NY 10013-1413
ndiamand@lchb.com
dseltz@lchb.com
Telephone: 212.355.9500
Counsel for Amicus Curiae

**CERTIFICATION AS TO PARTIES, RULINGS, AND
RELATED CASES**

Parties and *Amicus*: As of the date of filing, Lawyers for Lawyers is not aware of other parties, intervenors, and *amici curiae* other than those who have appeared before the district court below or have appeared before the Court to date.

Ruling Under Review: References to the ruling under review appear in the parties' briefs.

Related Cases: Counsel adopts and incorporates by reference the parties' statements with respect to related cases.

/s/ Nicholas Diamand
Nicholas Diamand

CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

The *amicus curiae* herein, Lawyers for Lawyers, through its undersigned counsel, submits this Corporate Disclosure Statement pursuant to Rule 26.1(b) and 29(c) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, and Rule 26.1 and 29(c) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, and Rule 26.1 of the Rules of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

Lawyers for Lawyers is a non-stock, not-for-profit, independent non-political foundation, based in the Netherlands, which has no parent company, and no person or entity owns it or any part of it.¹

/s/ Nicholas Diamand

Nicholas Diamand

¹ All parties have consented to the filing of this amicus brief.

CERTIFICATION REGARDING SEPARATE BRIEF

Amicus curiae is filing a separate brief because it believes its experience in working on behalf of lawyers worldwide creates a unique perspective among other *amici*, and because it was not practicable to file a single brief with all other *amici*.

/s/ Nicholas Diamand

Nicholas Diamand

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
CERTIFICATION AS TO PARTIES, RULINGS, AND RELATED CASES	i
CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT	ii
CERTIFICATION REGARDING SEPARATE BRIEF	iii
GLOSSARY OF ABBREVIATIONS	ix
INTEREST OF AMICUS CURIAE	1
I. Introduction and summary of argument	2
II. Argument	2
A. The international legal community has developed consensus principles and norms intended to protect the free and independent exercise of the legal profession.	2
B. The Executive Orders are a departure from well established international norms and standards.	9
C. The Executive Orders place the United States in the company of countries like Hungary, Poland, and Russia, where attacks on the legal profession have signaled democratic decline.	11
III. Conclusion	19
CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE WITH RULE 32(a)	20
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	21

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES (continued)

Page

Cases

<i>Jenner & Block LLP v. U.S. Dep't of Just.</i> , 784 F. Supp. 3d 76 (D.D.C. 2025)	9, 10
<i>Perkins Coie LLP v. U.S. Dep't of Just.</i> , 783 F. Supp. 3d 105 (D.D.C. 2025)	9
<i>Pietrzak & Bychawska-Siniarska & Others v. Poland</i> , App. Nos. 72038/17, 25237/18 (Eur. Ct. H.R. May 28, 2025).....	11, 13
<i>Susman Godfrey LLP v. Exec. Off. of President</i> , 789 F. Supp. 3d 15 (D.D.C. 2025)	9
<i>Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale & Dorr LLP v. Exec. Off. of President</i> , 784 F. Supp. 3d 127 (D.D.C. 2025), amended sub nom., 2025 WL 2105262 (D.D.C. June 26, 2025)	10

Treatises

Model Rule of Professional Conduct 1.2(b).....	8
--	---

Other Authorities

Am. Bar Ass'n, <i>The ABA Rejects Efforts Undermine the Courts and Legal Profession</i> (Mar. 3, 2025)	18
Brody, Reed, <i>The Independence of Judges and Lawyers: A Compilation of International Standards</i> , at 4-6 (1990).....	4
Corrales, Javier, <i>The Authoritarian Resurgence: Autocratic Legalism in Venezuela</i> , 26 J. of Democracy 37, 38 (2015).....	14

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES (continued)

	Page
G.A. Res. 45/166, Human Rights in the Administration of Justice (Dec. 18, 1990).....	4
G.A. Res. 217 (III) A art. 11(1), (Dec. 10, 1948).....	4
G.A. Res. 2200A (XXI) art. 14(2)(d) (Dec. 16, 1966).....	4
García-Sayán, Diego, <i>Protection of Lawyers Against Undue Interference in the Free and Independent Exercise of the Legal Profession</i> , UN Doc. A/HRC/50/36 (Apr. 22, 2022).....	3, 7, 12
Int'l Bar Ass'n, <i>IBA Standards for the Independence of the Legal Profession</i> 13(c).....	7
Int'l Comm'n of Jurists, <i>Poland: ICJ Intervenes before European Court in Case of Surveillance of Lawyers and Human Rights Defenders</i> (July 28, 2020)	13
Int'l Comm'n of Jurists, <i>Poland: Treatment of Lawyer Roman Giertych Undermines Independence of Legal Profession</i> (Nov. 16, 2020)	13
Int'l Observatory of Lawyers in Danger, <i>International Day for Lawyers in Danger 2025: The Belarusian Legal Profession Under Pressure</i> (Feb. 10, 2025)	17
Kadıoğlu, Ayşe, <i>Autocratic Legalism in New Turkey</i> , 88 Soc. Res. 445, 445-71 (2021)	14
Katzarova, Mariana (Special Rapporteur on the Situation of Human Rights in the Russian Federation), <i>Situation of Human Rights in the Russian Federation</i> UN Doc. A/79/508 (Oct. 28, 2024).....	16

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES (continued)

	Page
Katzarova, Mariana (Special Rapporteur on the Situation of Human Rights in the Russian Federation), <i>Situation of Human Rights in the Russian Federation</i> , UN Doc. A/HRC/57/59 (Sept. 13, 2024).....	16
Kazai, Viktor Z., <i>Stop Soros Law Left on the Books - The Return of the “Red Tail”?</i> , VerfBlog (Mar. 5, 2019)	12
Lawyers for Lawyers, <i>25 Years - Basic Principles on the Role of Lawyers</i> (May 29, 2015)	5
Lawyers for Lawyers, <i>Initiatives in Support of the 30th Anniversary of UN Basic Principles on the Role of Lawyers</i> (July 13, 2020)	5
Lawyers for Lawyers, <i>Recent Targeting of Legal Professionals by the US Government, Joint Statement</i> (Mar. 18, 2025)	18
N.Y. City Bar Ass’n Press Release, <i>Condemning Lengthy Prison Sentences Imposed on Turkish Lawyers for Lawful Professional and Human Rights Work</i> (Feb. 19, 2026)	15
Neto, Horacio Bernandes, <i>The Principle of Independence of Lawyers: UN and IBA Reference Instruments</i> , Introduction, at 4 (2020)	8
OHCHR, <i>Basic Principles of the Role of Lawyers</i> (Sept. 7, 1990)	4
OHCHR Press Release, <i>Russia: Special Rapporteur Appalled by Prison Sentences to Punish Navalny Lawyers</i> (Jan. 21, 2025)	16
OHCHR, <i>Special Procedures of the Human Rights Council</i> (2026)	3

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES (continued)

	Page
OHCHR, <i>Statement by the UN Special Rapporteur on Independence of Judges and Lawyers</i> (Jan. 24, 2026).....	18
Pillay, Róisín & Demir, Ayşe Bingöl, <i>The Case of the Istanbul Bar Association: Justice on Trial in Türkiye?</i> , <i>Opinio Juris</i> (Sept. 9, 2025)	15
<i>Preamble of the Council of Europe Convention for the Protection of the Profession of Lawyer</i> , at 5 (CETS No. 226) (Mar. 13, 2025).....	3
Satterthwaite, Margaret L. et al., <i>Unchecking Power and Capturing Courts: How Autocratization Erodes Independent Judicial Systems</i> , 76 <i>Rutgers U.L. Rev.</i> 1147 (2024).....	5, 12
Scheppele, Kim Lane, <i>Autocratic Legalism</i> , 85 <i>U. Chi. L. Rev.</i> 545 (2018)	13, 18
Türem, Z. Umut, <i>Professional Liquidation in the Context of Autocratic Legalism: Lawyers, Class, and Status in Turkey, 2002–?</i> , <i>Law & Soc. Inquiry</i> (2025)	14, 15
UN Human Rights Comm. for the 2nd Periodic Review of Türkiye, Joint Report Submitted by Lawyers for Lawyers, Int'l Bar Ass'n Human Rights Inst., Law Soc'y of England & Wales, and Int'l Comm. of Jurists (Sept. 16, 2024)	15

GLOSSARY OF ABBREVIATIONS

G.A. General Assembly

IBA International Bar Association

OHCHR Office of the High Commissioner for Human

Rights

INTEREST OF AMICUS CURIAE

Lawyers for Lawyers (“L4L”) is an independent, non-profit and non-political foundation established in 1986 in the Netherlands. It aims to uphold the rule of law and the protection of human rights and possesses particular expertise in the monitoring and application of international (e.g., United Nations) and regional (e.g., Council of Europe) standards to promote and advocate for the independence of the legal profession worldwide. L4L was granted special consultative status by the United Nations Economic and Social Council in 2013.

L4L has worked alongside lawyers in the United States to protect and defend attorneys around the world faced with threats to the free and independent practice of law. L4L submits this *amicus* brief out of a profound commitment to the core principle, recognized under the United States Constitution and international norms, that lawyers in the United States, just like those around the world, must not be identified with the clients they represent or their clients’ causes. This principle is fundamental to independent legal counsel and the fair administration of justice.²

² No party or counsel for any party authored this brief in whole or in part or contributed funding to it or in connection with its preparation.

I. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

The Executive Orders here violate long-established consensus norms of international law designed to protect the independence of the legal profession from precisely the intimidation, repression and retaliation sought by the Appellants' sanctions against the four Appellee law firms. Set out in multiple instruments, including the United Nations' landmark Basic Principles on the Role of Lawyers, a universal consensus has developed that recognizes the indispensable role of lawyers safeguarding democracy and the rule of law. Both are threatened, if not imperiled, by intimidation and harassment of the legal profession. Indeed, similar misconduct in European nations, such as Hungary and Poland, that began, as here, by unchecked targeting of lawyers, cascaded precipitously from the erosion of democracy towards autocracy.

II. ARGUMENT

A. The international legal community has developed consensus principles and norms intended to protect the free and independent exercise of the legal profession.

International and regional institutions have developed standards

No person other than these *amici* and their counsel contributed money to fund the preparation or submission of this brief.

that together reflect a global understanding that the independence of the legal profession is not merely a professional concern or a private service, but a fundamental requirement for the protection of human rights and the rule of law.³ These efforts grew from the recognition that attorneys “play a fundamental role in the consolidation of the rule of law and the protection of human rights,” and that states have a duty to ensure that lawyers “can exercise their profession without undue restrictions.”⁴

These consensus principles are articulated most prominently and authoritatively in the UN’s “Basic Principles on the Role of Lawyers” (“UN Principles”). Adopted in September 1990 by the Eighth United Nations Congress on Prevention of Crime and the

³ See *Preamble of the Council of Europe Convention for the Protection of the Profession of Lawyer*, at 5 (CETS No. 226) (Mar. 13, 2025) (noting “the fundamental role that lawyers and their professional associations play in upholding the rule of law, securing access to justice and ensuring the protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms”).

⁴ Diego García-Sayán (Special Rapporteur on the Independence of Judges and Lawyers), *Protection of Lawyers Against Undue Interference in the Free and Independent Exercise of the Legal Profession*, UN Doc. A/HRC/50/36 (Apr. 22, 2022). Special Rapporteurs are “independent human rights experts with mandates to report and advise on human rights from a thematic or country-specific perspective.” OHCHR, *Special Procedures of the Human Rights Council* (2026), <https://www.ohchr.org/en/special-procedures-human-rights-council>.

Treatment of Offenders,⁵ they were “welcome[d]” in December 1990 by the General Assembly in a resolution that “invite[d] Governments to respect them and to take them into account within the framework of their national legislation and practice.”⁶

The UN Principles’ roots stretch back to the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948 and its statement that the accused shall have “all the guarantees necessary for his defence,”⁷ later elaborated in the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, setting out the right to defendants’ counsel of their choice.⁸ International organizations of lawyers and jurists recognized that an independent judiciary and legal profession are at the center of efforts to maintain the rule of law,⁹ and the UN Principles aimed to

⁵ OHCHR, *Basic Principles of the Role of Lawyers* (Sept. 7, 1990), <https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/basic-principles-role-lawyers>.

⁶ G.A. Res. 45/166, Human Rights in the Administration of Justice (Dec. 18, 1990), <https://docs.un.org/en/A/RES/45/166>.

⁷ G.A. Res. 217 (III) A art. 11(1) (Dec. 10, 1948), <https://www.un.org/en/about-us/universal-declaration-of-human-rights>.

⁸ See G.A. Res. 2200A (XXI) art. 14(2)(d) (Dec. 16, 1966), <https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/international-covenant-civil-and-political-rights>.

⁹ See Reed Brody, *The Independence of Judges and Lawyers: A Compilation of International Standards*, at 4-6 (1990).

strengthen the guarantees set out in instruments like the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The rule of law requires not only an independent judiciary, but a legal profession free “to play [its] role in protecting the rights of [its] clients, including by making claims against the State, without fear of interference or intimidation.”¹⁰ The Preamble to the UN Principles states that protection of universal human rights and fundamental freedoms “requires that all persons have effective access to legal services provided by an independent legal profession.”

The UN Principles’ adoption and “welcome” by the General Assembly have been called “the final steps in the accomplishment of a goal” of “promot[ing] the elaboration and adoption of universal principles to define and protect the independence of the judiciary and the legal profession.”¹¹ Decades after their adoption, the UN Principles are recognized as “the most authoritative set of norms on the position of lawyers to date.”¹²

¹⁰ Margaret L. Satterthwaite et al., *Unchecking Power and Capturing Courts: How Autocratization Erodes Independent Judicial Systems*, 76 Rutgers U.L. Rev. 1147, 1155-56 (2024).

¹¹ Brody, *supra* note 9, at 3.

¹² Lawyers for Lawyers, *25 Years – Basic Principles on the Role of Lawyers*, at 2 (May 29, 2015), <https://lawyersforlawyers.org/wp-content/uploads/Paperfinal.pdf>; *see also* Lawyers for Lawyers,

Several of the UN Principles speak directly to and caution against efforts that threaten the independence of the legal profession.

For example:

- “Governments shall ensure that lawyers (a) are able to perform all of their professional functions without intimidation, hindrance, harassment or improper interference; (b) are able to travel and to consult with their clients freely both within their own country and abroad; and (c) shall not suffer, or be threatened with, prosecution or administrative, economic or other sanctions for any action taken in accordance with recognized professional duties, standards and ethics.” (Principle 16).
- “Lawyers shall not be identified with their clients or their clients’ causes as a result of discharging their functions.” (Principle 18).

Initiatives in Support of the 30th Anniversary of UN Basic Principles on the Role of Lawyers (July 13, 2020), <https://www.lawyersforlawyers.org/initiatives-in-support-of-the-30th-anniversary-of-un-basic-principles-on-the-role-of-lawyers/> (The UN Basic Principles Standards “constitute a landmark instrument recognizing the principle of independence of the legal profession as an essential component of a democratic society and the rule of law.”).

- “Lawyers shall enjoy civil and penal immunity for relevant statements made in good faith in written or oral pleadings or in their professional appearances before a court, tribunal or other legal or administrative authority.” (Principle 20).

Along with other bodies within the UN,¹³ multinational and international legal associations have similarly affirmed the indispensable work of lawyers in ensuring the rule of law and protection of human rights. The International Bar Association Standards for the Independence of the Legal Profession, for example, emphasize that attorneys have the “right freely to seek, to receive, and, subject to the rules of their profession, to impart information and ideas relating to their professional work,” and elsewhere provide that “[l]awyers shall not by reason of exercising their profession be denied freedom of belief, expression, association and assembly.”¹⁴ And in

¹³ See *Protection of Lawyers Against Undue Interference in the Free and Independent Exercise of the Legal Profession*, *supra* note 4 (delineating statements from the UN Human Rights Committee, which guides implementation of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, UN Declaration on Human Rights Defenders, as well as regional bodies).

¹⁴ Int’l Bar Ass’n, *IBA Standards for the Independence of the Legal Profession* 13(c), at 14 (adopted 1990), <https://www.ibanet.org/MediaHandler?id=F68BBBA5-FD1F-426F-9AA5-48D26B5E72E7>. Together, the UN Principles and IBA Standards “are considered to be the baseline standards for the

2025, the Council of Europe, citing the UN Principles as a touchstone document, adopted the Convention on the Protection of the Profession of Lawyer, its first-ever treaty addressing the protection of the legal profession. It cited as its genesis “increasing attacks, threats, harassment, and intimidation reported against lawyers as well as improper hindrance and interference in their professional activities,” and like the UN Principles, cautions against governmental actions that conflate lawyers with their clients’ causes. International norms are also reflected in lawyers’ codes of professional conduct in the United States. For example, the ABA’s Model Rule of Professional Conduct 1.2(b) provides that: “A lawyer’s representation of a client, including representation by appointment, does not constitute an endorsement of the client’s political, economic, social or moral views or activities.”

Together, these form a consensus set of principles, developed in response to periodic threats from state interests, that lawyers should not be identified with their clients and should be able to practice their

independence of lawyers and have been referred to as such by states, lawyers, and courts worldwide, as well as UN human rights mechanisms.” Horacio Bernandes Neto, *The Principle of Independence of Lawyers: UN and IBA Reference Instruments*, Introduction, at 4 (2020), <https://www.ibanet.org/MediaHandler?id=3b458c65-53f4-41b1-a1b2-0f765a7c39b3>.

profession without interference and on behalf of interests disfavored by the government.

B. The Executive Orders are a departure from well established international norms and standards.

In enjoining the enforcement of each of the Executive Orders at issue in this appeal, the courts below focused on the Executive Orders’ multiple constitutional infirmities. But the Executive Orders just as clearly and directly violate the international legal community’s consensus norms and principles described above. The courts below all highlighted the Executive Orders’ explicit targeting of the law firms based on the clients they represent. *See Jenner & Block LLP v. U.S. Dep’t of Just.*, 784 F. Supp. 3d 76, 88 (D.D.C. 2025) (stating that the Executive Order “makes no bones about why it chose its target: it picked Jenner because of the causes Jenner champions, the clients Jenner represents, and a lawyer Jenner once employed”); *Susman Godfrey LLP v. Exec. Off. of President*, 789 F. Supp. 3d 15, 30 (D.D.C. 2025) (noting that the Executive Order “references Susman’s representation of Dominion Voting Systems and state election officials in connection with litigation concerning the 2020 election”); *Perkins Coie LLP v. U.S. Dep’t of Just.*, 783 F. Supp. 3d 105, 152 (D.D.C. 2025) (referencing Perkins’ “representation of a political

opponent of the current President and involvement in election litigation and lawsuits against the Trump Administration”); *Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale & Dorr LLP v. Exec. Off. of President*, 784 F. Supp. 3d 127, 152 (D.D.C. 2025), amended sub nom., 2025 WL 2105262 (D.D.C. June 26, 2025) (highlighting that the Executive Order “characterizes WilmerHale’s representation of certain causes as ‘harmful,’ ‘egregious,’ and ‘partisan’”). In targeting the law firms because of the clients they represent, the Executive Orders violate Principle 18 of the UN Principles, which states that “[l]awyers shall not be identified with their clients or their clients’ causes as a result of discharging their functions.”

The courts below also readily found that the set of punitive actions directed at Appellees – suspension of security clearances, termination of government contracts, limitations on access to federal government buildings, and barriers to hiring the law firms’ employees – resulted in concrete harms and violated the First Amendment. *See, e.g., Jenner & Block*, 784 F. Supp. 3d at 102. Those actions also clearly run afoul of Principle 16 of the UN Principles, which requires that lawyers “are able to perform all of their professional functions without intimidation, hindrance, harassment or improper interference .

. . and shall not suffer, or be threatened with, prosecution or administrative, economic or other sanctions for any action taken in accordance with recognized professional duties, standards and ethics.”

The Administration’s actions are also contrary to Principle 20, providing for immunity “for relevant statements made in good faith in written or oral pleadings or in their professional appearances before a court, tribunal or other legal or administrative authority.”

C. The Executive Orders place the United States in the company of countries like Hungary, Poland, and Russia, where attacks on the legal profession have signaled democratic decline.

If allowed to stand, the consequences of the Executive Orders extend beyond the individual firms targeted. Targeting lawyers follows predictable patterns across political contexts. In each instance, lawyers face escalating reprisals for representing clients or causes disfavored by governing authorities, part of a systematic erosion of the independence essential to democratic governance. Events in Hungary, Poland, Russia, and Belarus illustrate the cascading effects of state interference in the legal profession on democratic governance, from efforts to discourage representation of disfavored clients to the

use of the legal profession as an instrument of repression by the ruling regime.¹⁵

In Hungary, the adoption of the “Stop Soros” legislation in 2018 exemplifies this pattern. The legislation was a direct attack on legal independence, criminalizing legal assistance by immigration lawyers and legal NGOs to undocumented migrants. Under the legislation, which was vaguely worded to allow maximum chilling effect on protected speech, those providing legal advice to undocumented migrants faced jail time. Despite the legislation’s clear impact on lawyers’ independence, the Hungarian Constitutional Court ruled the legislation constitutional in February 2019. That court had already been the target of capture by ruling interests, reflecting the cascading effects of efforts to undermine the legal profession’s independence.¹⁶

¹⁵ Attacks on the legal profession are not limited to these countries. The Special Rapporteur on the independence of judges and lawyers has documented a “global increase in practices that undermine, limit, restrict and hinder the practice of law.” *See Protection of Lawyers Against Undue Interference in the Free and Independent Exercise of the Legal Profession*, *supra* note 4.

¹⁶ Satterthwaite et al., *Unchecking Power*, *supra* note 10, at 1162; Viktor Z. Kazai, *Stop Soros Law Left on the Books – The Return of the “Red Tail”?*, *VerfBlog* (Mar. 5, 2019), <https://verfassungsblog.de/stop-soros-law-left-on-the-books-the->

Poland provides another parallel case study in the dismantling of legal safeguards. There, retaliatory actions have become normalized tools for restricting legal professionals' independence, exemplified by the cases of Polish lawyers Mikołaj Pietrzak and Roman Giertych. Pietrzak, a leading criminal lawyer and former Dean of the Warsaw Bar, was subjected to secret surveillance under Polish legislation that the European Court of Human Rights found violated privacy rights and lacked safeguards for attorney-client privilege.¹⁷ Giertych, who represented prominent opposition figures including then, and current, Prime Minister Donald Tusk, was detained on money laundering accusations just one day before a politically sensitive hearing. He was arrested without the chance to make a voluntary appearance, and his law practice was suspended by prosecutors without proper procedural safeguards.¹⁸

return-of-the-red-tail/; Kim Lane Scheppele, *Autocratic Legalism*, 85 U. Chi. L. Rev. 545, 550-52 (2018).

¹⁷ See Judgment, *Pietrzak & Bychawska-Siniarska & Others v. Poland*, App. Nos. 72038/17, 25237/18 (Eur. Ct. H.R. May 28, 2025), <https://hudoc.echr.coe.int/eng?i=002-14333>.

¹⁸ Int'l Comm'n of Jurists, *Poland: Treatment of Lawyer Roman Giertych Undermines Independence of Legal Profession* (Nov. 16, 2020), <https://www.icj.org/poland-treatment-of-lawyer-roman-giertych-undermines-independence-of-legal-profession/>; Int'l Comm'n of Jurists, *Poland: ICJ Intervenes before European Court in Case of Surveillance of Lawyers and Human Rights Defenders* (July

Outside of the European Union, Turkey exemplifies the systematic targeting of lawyers as part of what has been termed “autocratic legalism.”¹⁹ Following the failed coup of July 15, 2016, Turkish authorities undertook a major crackdown on fundamental rights and freedoms that particularly devastated the legal profession. Scholars have described this as “professional liquidation,” achieved through both institutional attacks and socio-economic measures.²⁰ Since 2020, the AKP-led government has taken aim at professional associations, altering laws for electing the chairman of the Turkish Union of Bar Associations and authoring the establishment of additional bars in major cities, aiming to fragment the legal profession and undermine existing bar associations that have traditionally been

28, 2020), <https://www.icj.org/poland-icj-intervenes-before-european-court-in-case-of-surveillance-of-lawyers-and-human-rights-defenders/>.

¹⁹ Autocratic legalism is the “use, non use or abuse of laws” to solidify authoritarian rule and conceal the authoritarian character of the regime. Javier Corrales, *The Authoritarian Resurgence: Autocratic Legalism in Venezuela*, 26 J. of Democracy 37, 38 (2015); see also Scheppele, *supra* note 16.

²⁰ Ayşe Kadioğlu, *Autocratic Legalism in New Turkey*, 88 Soc. Res. 445, 445-71 (2021); Z. Umut Türem, *Professional Liquidation in the Context of Autocratic Legalism: Lawyers, Class, and Status in Turkey, 2002–?*, Law & Soc. Inquiry (2025).

critical of the government.²¹ The entire executive board of the Istanbul Bar Association, including its president, was dismissed, and faced criminal prosecution merely for issuing a statement calling for an effective investigation into the deaths of two Kurdish journalists.²²

In a similar vein, the Kremlin has used legislation on “foreign agents” or “misinformation” to criminalize or restrict the work of lawyers and legal NGOs, disbaring attorneys who handle government-sensitive cases. The targeting of lawyers representing political opposition figures reached alarming levels when three of Alexei Navalny’s lawyers were sentenced in January 2025, with two

²¹ *Id.*; see also UN Human Rights Comm. for the 2nd Periodic Review of Türkiye, Joint Report Submitted by Lawyers for Lawyers, Int’l Bar Ass’n Human Rights Inst., Law Soc’y of England & Wales, and Int’l Comm. of Jurists, at 17-20 (Sept. 16, 2024), <https://www.lawyersforlawyers.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/09/Turkiye-CCPR-Submission.pdf>.

²² Róisín Pillay & Ayşe Bingöl Demir, *The Case of the Istanbul Bar Association: Justice on Trial in Türkiye?*, *Opinio Juris* (Sept. 9, 2025), <https://opiniojuris.org/2025/09/09/the-case-of-the-istanbul-bar-association-justice-on-trial-in-turkiye/>. The president and members of the board were ultimately acquitted but now face a lengthy appeal; soon after, another set of lawyers were convicted and sentenced to terms of imprisonment for their professional work. See N.Y. City Bar Ass’n Press Release, *Condemning Lengthy Prison Sentences Imposed on Turkish Lawyers for Lawful Professional and Human Rights Work* (Feb. 19, 2026), <https://www.nycbar.org/press-releases/condemning-lengthy-prison-sentences-imposed-on-turkish-lawyers-for-lawful-professional-and-human-rights-work/>.

remaining in exile after having been charged and arrested in absentia.²³ The UN Special Rapporteur on human rights in the Russian Federation has documented that lawyers have been imprisoned, prosecuted, disbarred and intimidated simply for carrying out their professional duties.²⁴ The widespread use of intentionally vague legal definitions and unpredictable interpretations has allowed Russian authorities to misuse counter-extremism legislation to punish and endanger defense lawyers. As the UN Special Rapporteur noted, “since the start of the full-scale invasion of Ukraine, the number of lawyers convicted and imprisoned in Russia has reached an all-time high.”²⁵ This persecution serves to intimidate all lawyers who consider taking on politically sensitive cases, effectively depriving clients of effective counsel and undermining the rule of law.²⁶

²³ OHCHR Press Release, *Russia: Special Rapporteur Appalled by Prison Sentences to Punish Navalny Lawyers* (Jan. 21, 2025), <https://www.ohchr.org/en/press-releases/2025/01/russia-special-rapporteur-appalled-prison-sentences-punish-navalny-lawyers>.

²⁴ See Mariana Katzarova (Special Rapporteur on the Situation of Human Rights in the Russian Federation), *Situation of Human Rights in the Russian Federation*, UN Doc. A/HRC/57/59 (Sept. 13, 2024).

²⁵ OHCHR Press Release, *supra* note 23.

²⁶ See Mariana Katzarova (Special Rapporteur on the Situation of Human Rights in the Russian Federation), *Situation of Human Rights in the Russian Federation* UN Doc. A/79/508 (Oct. 28, 2024).

The most extreme form of this repression has played out in Belarus. Since the 2020 elections, Belarusian authorities have systematically dismantled legal representation through prosecutions, lengthy prison sentences, and arbitrary disbarments targeting lawyers who represented political opposition to President Alexander Lukashenko's regime. Over 139 lawyers have been deprived of their right to practice, with five currently detained and dozens forced into exile. The chilling effect has been so profound that those facing politically sensitive charges have virtually no access to legal counsel, creating what human rights organizations describe as a complete paralysis of the legal profession.²⁷

These events should serve as cautions for the United States. On the occasion of the 2026 edition of the International Day of the Endangered Lawyer, the UN Special Rapporteur on the independence of judges and lawyers warned that US lawyers “are now facing unprecedented attacks by the Executive.”²⁸ The Executive Orders did

²⁷ Int'l Observatory of Lawyers in Danger, *International Day for Lawyers in Danger 2025: The Belarusian Legal Profession Under Pressure* (Feb. 10, 2025), <https://protect-lawyers.org/en/international-day-for-lawyers-in-danger-2025-the-belarusian-legal-profession-under-pressure/>.

²⁸ *Supra* note 26.

not emerge in isolation; they followed another Executive Order that imposed sanctions on members of the International Criminal Court, as well as administration interference with the traditionally independent prosecutors within the Department of Justice,²⁹ part of what the American Bar Association called a “clear and disconcerting pattern” of targeting lawyers for representation of clients disfavored by the government.³⁰ Scholars of democratic decline describe its gradual nature, allowing its first signs to go unnoticed until they accumulate and calcify.³¹ The Executive Orders are that unmistakable signal. In the United States as in other countries, attempts to compromise the legal profession, once begun, will only accelerate if they are not challenged and reversed.

²⁹ OHCHR, *Statement by the UN Special Rapporteur on Independence of Judges and Lawyers, Margaret Satterthwaite* (Jan. 24, 2026), <https://www.ohchr.org/sites/default/files/documents/issues/ijudiciary/statements/20260122-stm-day-endangered-lawyer-en.pdf>; Lawyers for Lawyers, *Recent Targeting of Legal Professionals by the US Government, Joint Statement* (Mar. 18, 2025), https://www.lawyersforlawyers.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/03/Joint-statement-on-US-actions-against-lawyers-180325_Final.pdf.

³⁰ Am. Bar Ass’n, *The ABA Rejects Efforts Undermine the Courts and Legal Profession* (Mar. 3, 2025), <https://www.americanbar.org/news/abanews/aba-news-archives/2025/03/aba-rejects-efforts-to-undermine-courts-and-legal-profession/>.

³¹ See Scheppele, *Autocratic Legalism*, *supra* note 16.

III. CONCLUSION

Targeting lawyers based on clients' identities or their causes violates universally recognized principles and threatens the foundations of democratic governance. It undermines the legal profession's autonomy, threatens due process and fair trial rights, and compromises the structural integrity of the rule of law. We urge affirmance of the district courts' orders enjoining the enforcement of the Executive Orders.

Dated: April 2, 2026

/s/ Nicholas Diamand

Nicholas Diamand

Daniel E. Seltz

Lieff Cabraser Heimann &
Bernstein, LLP

250 Hudson Street, 8th Floor

New York, NY 10013-1413

Telephone: 212.355.9500

Facsimile: 212.355.9592

Counsel for Amicus Curiae

Lawyers for Lawyers

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE WITH RULE 32(A)

IT IS HEREBY CERTIFIED:

1. That the foregoing Brief *Amicus Curiae* of Lawyers for Lawyers in Appellees and Affirmance complies with the type-volume limitation of Rule 29(a)(5), Federal Rules of appellate Procedure, because this brief contains 3,603 words, excluding the parts of the brief exempted by Rule 32(f).

2. The brief complies with typeface requirements of Fed. R. App. P. 32(a)(5) and the type style requirements of Fed. R. App. P. 32(a)(6) because this brief has been prepared in a proportionally spaced typeface using Word version Microsoft Office Professional Plus 2016 in 14-point Times New Roman.

/s/ Nicholas Diamand

Nicholas Diamand

Attorney for *Amicus Curiae*

Dated: April 2, 2026

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on April 2, 2026, I filed the foregoing using the Court's ECF system. Service on all counsel of record for all parties was accomplished electronically using the Court's CM/ECF system.

/s/ Nicholas Diamand

Nicholas Diamand

Attorney for *Amicus Curiae*

Dated: April 2, 2026