

The Mark of Jimenez: On the Rights of a Prospective Extraditee Pending Extradition Proceedings

Archelle F. Lagsub

48 ATENEO L.J. 119 (2003)

SUBJECT(S): CONSTITUTIONAL LAW, FOREIGN AFFAIRS

KEYWORD(S): EXTRADITION, RIGHTS OF ESTRADITEE

The bedrock of criminal jurisdiction rests on territoriality. However, with the increase in transnational and international crimes, the international community has responded by expanding mechanisms of the international criminal justice system. The system was designed to outlaw crime, afford criminal accountability, and strengthen mutual legal assistance amongst States. As part of the international judicial assistance framework, extradition proceedings remains to be an effective, albeit controversial, means of bringing fugitives to justice.

The Comment analyzes the case *Government of United States v. Purganan* which involved the contentious case of Mark Jimenez who was indicted in Florida for several charges of conspiracy to defraud, tax evasion, wire fraud, false statements, and illegal campaign contributions. The analysis of the Supreme Court's decision is taken in light of the continuing interplay of politics, legal reasoning, and factual circumstances. Thus, given the factual background and the gravity of the penalty that may be imposed on Jimenez, the Author agrees with the Court's denial of bail considering Jimenez's great likelihood of flight.

As a final note, the Comment emphasizes that extradition is a matter of factual circumstances and political consideration. As such, *Purganan* is peculiar to the case of Jimenez. While Jimenez might have thus left his mark, it would not be so much on Philippine jurisprudence but on domestic politics.