



**Observatoire ARG
ARGA Atlas**

MEDIA PRESSURE, INTERNATIONAL SEARCH, AND EXTRADITION RISKS

Public Information Framing as a Factor of Pressure in Transnational Criminal Cases and International Protection Proceedings

Author:

Sergei Khrabrykh — President of ARG, PhD

Organization: Observatoire ARG, ARG Atlas

Mailing address: 21 route de l'Aviation, 12 C, 64600 Anglet, FRANCE

Contacts: info@argaobservatory.org, +33 7 58 49 62 27

Website: www.argaobservatory.org, <https://www.arga-atlas.com/>

Anglet, 27 April 2026

Purpose of the Document

This report has been prepared to analyse media pressure as an independent institutional factor in transnational criminal cases involving international search mechanisms, extradition, and international protection procedures. The practical purpose of the report is to demonstrate that media publications in such cases are not always neutral information coverage. In certain circumstances, they may become part of a broader external pressure framework: shaping an accusatory public background, strengthening the position of the requesting state, stigmatizing the person before the completion of judicial or asylum-related procedures, and influencing the perception of the case by national and international institutions.

For ARG, this issue has direct practical relevance in cases where criminal prosecution, international search, extradition, and an application for asylum exist simultaneously. In such situations, the public information environment may affect not only the reputation of the person

concerned, but also their actual safety, right of defence, right to a fair procedure, right to family life, and protection against return to a country where there is a risk of persecution, ill-treatment, or politically motivated criminal prosecution.

This report considers media pressure not as a narrow matter of journalistic ethics, but as an element of international legal assessment. Where publications reproduce the accusatory framework of the requesting state, link the person concerned to already convicted or politically sensitive figures, emphasize international search, detention, and extradition, while placing the asylum context, the prohibition of forced return, and defence arguments in the background, such publications may become part of the overall pressure exerted on the person and on the procedure in which their case is being assessed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Executive Summary
2. Context and Problem Statement
3. Legal and Institutional Framework
4. Key Mechanisms of Media Pressure
5. Typical Development Scenarios
6. Main Risks and Vulnerable Areas
7. Institutional Gaps and Limitations of Safeguards
8. Practical Guidance and Model of Action
9. Recommendations for Legal and Institutional Assessment
10. Conclusion
11. Appendix A. Terminology
12. Appendix B. Risk, Mechanism, and Legal Consequence Matrix
13. Official and Public Sources

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Media pressure in transnational criminal cases is becoming an increasingly significant factor, especially where national criminal prosecution is combined with international search, an extradition request, and asylum proceedings. In such situations, media publications may perform not only an informational function, but also the function of external framing of the case. They shape public perception of the person concerned before the competent authorities have completed the legal assessment.

The central problem is that public accusatory framing may begin to operate before the law does. Before judicial assessment, before the examination of defence arguments, before a decision on asylum, and before the assessment of the prohibition of forced return, the person may already be publicly presented as a “wanted person,” an “associate of a convicted person,” a “fugitive,” a person “detained but not extradited,” a “figure in a corruption case,” or someone abroad awaiting surrender. Such formulas may appear journalistic, but in practice they are capable of creating a stable reputational construction.

This is particularly dangerous in cases where the person is in a state examining an extradition request and at the same time invokes a risk of politically motivated prosecution, violation of the right to a fair trial, torture, ill-treatment, or other harm in the event of return. In such cases, public publications may strengthen the position of the requesting state and weaken the perception of the person as a subject of international protection.

Media-related risks do not replace legal analysis. They do not automatically prove political motivation, misuse of INTERPOL mechanisms, or the inadmissibility of extradition. However, they may serve as an important auxiliary indicator that the case is developing not only in the procedural sphere, but also in the external public sphere. It is precisely the combination of criminal prosecution, international search, extradition pressure, public stigmatization, and a pending asylum procedure that creates a protection-sensitive context.

For international bodies, migration authorities, courts, and data-control mechanisms, it is essential to consider not only the formal documents submitted by the requesting state, but also the public environment in which the case is developing. If the person concerned is already subject to public accusatory positioning, their right to neutral assessment, effective defence, and protection against forced return may be placed under additional pressure.

2. CONTEXT AND PROBLEM STATEMENT

Modern transnational criminal cases rarely exist only within the framework of national criminal proceedings. They often involve several layers at once: national investigation, international search, an extradition request, migration status, an application for asylum, diplomatic or inter-agency communications, and public coverage in the media.

Within this system, media publications may play a dual role. On the one hand, they may represent an ordinary expression of public interest in a case. On the other hand, they may reproduce the accusatory framework established by the requesting state and thereby create an additional layer of pressure on a person who is already in a vulnerable procedural position.

Cases are especially sensitive where a person has already left the country of origin, applied for international protection, contests an international search request, and is located in a state examining the question of extradition. In such a situation, the person's status cannot be reduced to the simple formula of a "wanted person." They are simultaneously a participant in a criminal case, the subject of an international search, a requested person in extradition proceedings, and a potential beneficiary of international protection.

The problem arises when public framing ignores this complexity. If the media repeats only the accusatory version, emphasizes the person's connection with already convicted figures, describes detention and extradition as almost the natural outcome of the case, but fails to address arguments concerning political pressure, asylum, procedural violations, and the prohibition of forced return, the information environment becomes asymmetrical.

Such framing may be particularly significant in cases involving allegations of corruption or misappropriation of public funds. These categories have a strong public effect: they are easily perceived as confirmation of public danger, even where the factual basis of the case is connected with administrative, budgetary, contractual, or managerial decisions. As a result, the formal criminal classification may displace a more complex analysis: whether the dispute is genuinely criminal, whether it represents a retrospective reassessment of administrative activity, whether it is linked to a political context, and whether international mechanisms are being used as instruments of pressure.

The international legal significance of the issue lies in the fact that media pressure may affect several protected interests at the same time: the presumption of innocence, the right to a fair trial, the right to an effective remedy, the right to respect for family life, the right to security, protection against arbitrary detention, and the prohibition of forced return.

In cases involving INTERPOL and extradition, the public information environment may also affect the assessment of the neutrality of the case. INTERPOL must not be used for political, military, religious, or racial purposes, and its data-processing mechanisms must comply with requirements of legality, data quality, proportionality, and respect for human rights. Where an international search is accompanied by a public accusatory campaign, this does not in itself prove a violation of INTERPOL rules, but it may be a relevant indicator of the overall context of the case.

3. LEGAL AND INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK

The normative framework for assessing media pressure in transnational criminal cases consists of several levels.

The first level consists of INTERPOL rules. The Constitution of INTERPOL provides that the Organization acts in the spirit of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and may not undertake activities of a political, military, religious, or racial character. This is relevant not only when assessing the formal criminal classification, but also when analysing the overall context of a case. If criminal proceedings and international search develop in a politically sensitive environment, are accompanied by public stigmatization, and concern a person who has applied for asylum, the question of neutrality becomes especially important.

The second level consists of INTERPOL rules on the processing of data. These rules require that data be accurate, up to date, proportionate, and consistent with the purpose of processing. The state submitting the data is responsible for its quality. In cases where public materials reproduce an incomplete or one-sided picture of the case, the question arises whether similar one-sidedness may also characterize the data transmitted for the purpose of international search.

The third level relates to asylum law and the principle prohibiting forced return. The 1951 Convention relating to the Status of Refugees prohibits the return of a person to a country where they may face persecution. The Convention against Torture prohibits the transfer of a person to a state where there are substantial grounds for believing that they would be in danger of being subjected to torture. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights protects the rights to life, liberty, personal security, fair trial, and protection against cruel or inhuman treatment.

The fourth level is extradition law. In extradition cases, the state examining the request must assess not only the formal existence of criminal charges, but also possible obstacles to extradition. These include the political character of the prosecution, the risk of torture or ill-treatment, the risk of an unfair trial, the person's status as an asylum seeker, family and humanitarian circumstances, and health condition.

The fifth level concerns the presumption of innocence and the right to a fair procedure. Public framing of a case through accusatory formulas may influence the perception of the person before the competent authorities have adopted a final decision. Even where publications formally use terms such as "suspected" or "accused," the overall narrative may create an impression of predetermination.

The sixth level concerns family life and humanitarian factors. In cases where the requested person resides with family in the state examining the extradition request, and where children are connected to that state, possible extradition affects not only the individual but also the family unit. Media pressure may intensify the stigmatization not only of the person concerned, but also of their family.

The seventh level concerns medical vulnerability. If a person has a health condition requiring monitoring and treatment, this must be taken into account when assessing detention, extradition, and possible transfer to the country of origin. Public stigmatization and prolonged procedural stress may increase the humanitarian significance of medical factors.

Thus, media pressure must not be assessed in isolation. It must be considered in connection with international search, extradition, asylum, the right of defence, family life, and humanitarian circumstances.

4. KEY MECHANISMS OF MEDIA PRESSURE

The first mechanism is the reputational consolidation of the accusatory framework. A publication may formally report on a case, but in substance it may attach a specific public image to the person concerned: “wanted person,” “associate of a convicted person,” “fugitive,” “detained abroad,” or “figure in a corruption case.” Such formulas create a rapid and stable image that may later be reproduced by other media outlets, state bodies, public commentators, and institutional recipients.

The second mechanism is associative pressure. A person may be publicly linked to another figure who has already been convicted, is politically toxic, or is negatively perceived by the public. As a result, the reputation of one person is transferred to another, even where the legal situation of the second person has not yet been resolved. This is particularly dangerous in cases where the connection to a politically sensitive figure is itself part of the argument concerning pressure.

The third mechanism is the shift of focus from defence to accusation. A publication may describe in detail the alleged amount of damage, the criminal article, the position of the prosecution, detention, and the extradition request, while mentioning asylum, allegations of pressure, procedural violations, the administrative nature of the dispute, or the risk of forced return only briefly or secondarily. This distribution of attention creates an unbalanced picture.

The fourth mechanism is the normalization of extradition. If publications describe a person as “detained but not extradited” or as someone abroad awaiting surrender, this may create an expectation that extradition is the normal and desirable outcome of the case. At the same time, the extradition procedure itself, the right of defence, and the need to assess the risk of return remain in the background.

The fifth mechanism is public reinforcement of international search. References to INTERPOL or international search are often perceived by the audience as confirmation of the seriousness and validity of the allegations. However, international search is not a conviction and must not replace an assessment of the political, procedural, and humanitarian context.

The sixth mechanism is pressure through repetition. Even if each individual publication appears to be an information report, a series of publications may create a stable public environment. In this environment, the person gradually ceases to be perceived as a subject of rights and begins to be perceived as the established bearer of an accusatory role.

The seventh mechanism is institutional reinforcement of the media narrative. If, at the same time as publications appear, the requesting state is active through extradition, diplomatic, anti-corruption, or inter-agency channels, the media framework may be perceived not as incidental information activity, but as part of broader pressure.

The eighth mechanism is the impact on the status of an asylum seeker. A person seeking international protection must be assessed in light of the risk of persecution, not through the

public image of a fugitive. If the media systematically forms a perception of the person as evading justice, this may complicate the perception of that person as someone in need of protection.

5. TYPICAL DEVELOPMENT SCENARIOS

The first typical scenario is a criminal case after departure from the country. A person leaves the country following conflict, pressure, threats, or a politically sensitive event. After some time, a criminal case is initiated against them, often under economic, budgetary, corruption, or official-duty-related provisions. The case is then used for international search and extradition.

The second scenario is a criminal case as a retrospective reassessment of administrative activity. Actions previously performed within official powers, state programmes, budget administration, or contractual relations are later reclassified as a criminal offense. At the same time, a clear distinction is not always made between a managerial mistake, an administrative dispute, a budgetary conflict, and a criminal act.

The third scenario is a connection with a politically sensitive figure. The person is not pursued in isolation, but in connection with a former minister, political ally, senior official, business group, or other actor around whom public and criminal pressure has already formed. Through such a connection, the case acquires a broader political or institutional context.

The fourth scenario is international search as an accelerator of pressure. After initiating the case, the requesting state initiates an international search. As a result, the person may be detained in a third state, deprived of liberty, restricted in movement, drawn into extradition proceedings, and placed in a state of constant legal uncertainty.

The fifth scenario is parallel asylum and extradition. The person applies for asylum in the state of stay while simultaneously becoming the subject of an extradition request. This creates a conflict between criminal-law cooperation and international protection. In such circumstances, the prohibition of forced return must be the central principle of assessment.

The sixth scenario is public publications during pending procedures. Media outlets begin publishing materials about the case while extradition has not yet been decided, asylum proceedings have not been completed, and international assessment is ongoing. These publications may influence both the public and institutional environment.

The seventh scenario is the anti-corruption narrative as an instrument of legitimation. Allegations of corruption, misappropriation, or abuse of office possess strong reputational force. They may be used to create the image of a socially dangerous person even where the factual basis of the case is connected with managerial decisions, contractual relations, or a politically sensitive context.

The eighth scenario is humanitarian factors as a secondary but important layer. Health condition, family, children, integration in the state of stay, and prolonged residence within a protection procedure may not replace legal analysis, but they significantly affect the assessment of proportionality, risks, and consequences of extradition.

6. MAIN RISKS AND VULNERABLE AREAS

The first risk is the substitution of legal assessment by public accusatory framing. If a person is repeatedly presented in the media through accusatory formulas, competent authorities may operate in an environment where neutral assessment is made more difficult. Even if courts and

authorities are formally independent, the public environment may influence the perception of the importance and character of the case.

The second risk is the weakening of the person's status as a protection seeker. Public presentation of a person as a fugitive, a figure in a corruption case, or an associate of a convicted person may compete with their status as a person alleging political pressure, threats, human rights violations, and risk upon return.

The third risk is the strengthening of the requesting state's position. If the media predominantly reproduces the accusatory version, the requesting state obtains an additional public resource. Its version begins to appear as an already accepted reality, rather than the position of one party.

The fourth risk is stigmatization through INTERPOL. References to international search or INTERPOL may be perceived as proof of guilt, although by their nature they do not constitute a judicial finding of guilt. This creates the risk of symbolic and improper strengthening of the accusation.

The fifth risk is underestimation of the prohibition of forced return. When the public narrative concentrates on surrender and allegations, the risk of return to a country of possible persecution may move into the background. This is especially dangerous where the asylum procedure has not yet been completed.

The sixth risk is pressure on family life. Extradition of a person who has family and children in the state of stay may lead to the disruption of family life or place the family before a forced choice. Public stigmatization further increases the vulnerability of the family.

The seventh risk is deterioration of health under the influence of stress and procedural uncertainty. Even if a medical condition is at an early or controlled stage, detention, risk of transfer, stress, interruption of treatment, and uncertainty may have independent significance for humanitarian assessment.

The eighth risk is institutional pressure outside judicial review. If the case is simultaneously advanced through extradition, anti-corruption, diplomatic, or international channels, it becomes necessary to assess not only the judicial process, but also the broader institutional framework.

The ninth risk is cumulative effect. International search may be formally permissible in isolation. Media coverage may be lawful in isolation. Anti-corruption cooperation may be normal in isolation. But their combination in the case of a person seeking protection may create a broader pressure framework that must be subject to international assessment.

7. INSTITUTIONAL GAPS AND LIMITATIONS OF SAFEGUARDS

The first institutional gap is that media pressure is often not considered as an independent factor in extradition and INTERPOL procedures. Authorities assess documents, criminal charges, procedural decisions, and formal guarantees, while the public environment may remain outside the analysis.

The second gap is fragmentation of procedures. INTERPOL assesses the admissibility of data processing. The extradition court assesses the surrender request. The migration authority assesses asylum. Medical circumstances may be assessed separately. Family life may be considered in yet another context. As a result, the cumulative risk may become invisible because each authority sees only part of the problem.

The third gap is insufficient attention to the timing of publications. The content of publications is important, but so is the moment of their appearance. If publications appear during pending extradition proceedings, pending asylum proceedings, or consideration of an INTERPOL-related request, their significance is greater than that of ordinary archival materials.

The fourth gap is overreliance on formal criminal classification. In economic, budgetary, and corruption cases, international bodies may treat the formal criminal article as a sufficient indicator of the ordinary criminal character of the case. However, in a politically sensitive context, it is necessary to analyse the factual nature of the allegations and the history of their emergence.

The fifth gap is weak protection against associative stigmatization. Public association of a person with an already convicted or politically toxic figure may seriously affect the perception of the case, but it is rarely assessed as an independent pressure factor.

The sixth gap is insufficient attention to the humanitarian consequences of prolonged international search. Even without actual extradition, international search may restrict freedom of movement for years, intensify stress, complicate family life, and create health risks.

The seventh gap is the absence of a unified standard for assessing public pressure. Unlike formal evidence, the media environment does not always have a clear procedural status. Precisely for this reason, it must be described, documented, and analysed in international dossiers and communications.

8. PRACTICAL GUIDANCE AND MODEL OF ACTION

The first step is systematic documentation of publications. Links, dates, screenshots, headlines, authors' names, key wording, language of publication, information about the media outlet, and the context of publication should be preserved. Not only the facts matter, but also the framing.

The second step is narrative analysis. It is necessary to determine which roles the publication assigns to the person: suspect, fugitive, associate of a convicted person, corrupt official, person subject to extradition, asylum seeker, or object of political pressure. The distribution of roles shows whether the material is neutral or pressure-oriented.

The third step is comparison with procedural reality. If a publication creates an impression of predetermination while extradition has not yet been decided, asylum has not yet been examined, and guilt has not been established, this must be documented.

The fourth step is comparison with international search. It should be analysed whether the publication strengthens the effect of the INTERPOL-related request by creating the public impression that international search is equivalent to proven guilt.

The fifth step is inclusion of publications in an international master dossier. Media materials should not be treated as annexes added for quantity. They should form a separate analytical section: how they appeared, what they reproduce, what image they form, and what risks they create.

The sixth step is notification of competent authorities. If publications appear during active extradition or asylum proceedings, the relevant authorities should be informed of the risk of public pressure and the need for neutral assessment.

The seventh step is separation of facts and assessment. In legal documents, it is important not to claim that publications themselves prove the unlawfulness of prosecution. It is stronger and more accurate to state that they constitute a new circumstance confirming the development of public pressure and an external accusatory background.

The eighth step is linking media pressure to the prohibition of forced return. If the person alleges a risk of persecution in the country of origin, public accusatory framing may intensify return-related risks, especially where publications are perceived as part of a state or quasi-state information environment.

The ninth step is consideration of humanitarian factors. Health, family, children, integration in the state of stay, and duration of proceedings should be assessed together with media pressure, because such pressure intensifies overall stress and vulnerability.

The tenth step is preparation of updated communications. When new publications and institutional actions appear, updated communications should be sent to INTERPOL/CCF, extradition authorities, asylum authorities, and international human rights mechanisms.

9. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR LEGAL AND INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENT

First, media pressure should be considered as a factor in international assessment in cases where criminal prosecution is combined with international search, extradition, and asylum. It must not replace legal analysis, but it should be included in the contextual assessment.

Second, authorities examining extradition should take into account the public information environment, especially where publications form an image of the person as guilty or subject to surrender before the procedure has been completed.

Third, INTERPOL mechanisms should take into account that public accusatory coverage may be an indicator of a politicized or pressure-based context. This is especially important where the case concerns former officials, politically sensitive figures, state projects, or conflicts involving testimony.

Fourth, asylum authorities should treat media publications as potentially relevant materials for assessing return-related risk. If the person is publicly stigmatized in the country of origin, this may increase the risk of persecution, pressure, arbitrary detention, or unfair trial.

Fifth, international human rights mechanisms should develop an approach to assessing information pressure in transnational cases. In modern conditions, pressure may be exerted not only through arrests, warrants, and requests, but also through the public construction of the person's image.

Sixth, in cases involving corruption and budget-related allegations, a more precise assessment of the factual nature of the dispute is necessary. International authorities should not automatically treat such cases as ordinary criminal matters merely because they are formally classified as corruption cases.

Seventh, humanitarian circumstances should not be assessed separately from information pressure, but together with it. Family, health, children, and prolonged stay in the state of protection strengthen the need for individualized assessment.

Eighth, public publications appearing during pending extradition or pending asylum proceedings should be recorded as new circumstances. They may demonstrate that the case continues to develop and that the risk of pressure has not ended.

10. CONCLUSION

Media pressure in transnational criminal cases is not a secondary or decorative element. In cases where criminal prosecution, international search, extradition, and asylum proceedings are present simultaneously, public publications may become part of the overall mechanism of pressure.

The main problem is not the fact of journalistic coverage itself. The problem arises where publications reproduce an accusatory framework, link the person to already convicted or politically sensitive figures, emphasize international search and detention, while failing to address equally the arguments concerning political pressure, asylum, the prohibition of forced return, procedural violations, and humanitarian circumstances.

Such framing affects the perception of the person. It may transform a protection seeker in the public space into a “fugitive,” an “associate of a convicted person,” or a “figure in a corruption case,” even though their legal status remains unresolved and return-related risks require separate assessment.

For ARGA, the main conclusion is that media pressure must be documented and analysed as part of the international protection framework. It should be included in international master dossiers, updated INTERPOL communications, communications to extradition authorities, asylum materials, and notifications to international human rights mechanisms.

In a modern transnational case, pressure rarely operates through one channel only. It may include criminal proceedings, international search, extradition, institutional communications, media publications, family vulnerability, medical factors, and uncertainty of status. It is precisely the cumulative effect of these factors that must be subject to international assessment.

11. APPENDIX A. TERMINOLOGY

Media pressure means public information impact whereby publications, headlines, repeated formulas, and accusatory framing create an adverse external background around a person involved in criminal, extradition, or asylum-related proceedings.

Public framing of a case means the way in which a case is presented to society: through neutral description, accusatory narrative, connection with politically sensitive figures, emphasis on search, detention, extradition, or alleged damage.

Reputational pressure means influence on public perception of a person through the stable association of that person with allegations, convicted individuals, corruption narratives, or the image of evading justice.

Associative stigmatization means the formation of a negative perception of a person through their connection with another person who has already been convicted, is politically toxic, or is publicly discredited.

International search means the use of international law-enforcement channels, including mechanisms related to INTERPOL, for the purpose of locating, detaining, or facilitating the extradition of a person.

Extradition risk means the risk of transfer of a person to the country of origin or another requesting state where the person may face persecution, unfair trial, torture, ill-treatment, or other serious harm.

Prohibition of forced return means the principle prohibiting the return of a person to a state where they face persecution, torture, cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment, or other serious human rights violations.

Protection-sensitive case means a case in which criminal prosecution or extradition intersects with asylum, risk of persecution, family circumstances, medical vulnerability, or other humanitarian factors.

Institutional pressure means influence on a case through a combination of state, inter-agency, international, anti-corruption, diplomatic, or law-enforcement channels.

12. APPENDIX B. RISK, MECHANISM, AND LEGAL CONSEQUENCE MATRIX

No.	Risk	Mechanism of occurrence	Possible legal / institutional consequence	Practical comment
1	Public accusatory framing before final legal assessment	Media publications reproduce the narrative of the requesting state and present the person mainly through allegations, search, detention, or extradition.	Weakening of neutral assessment; reputational pressure; risk of prejudging conclusions before the completion of judicial, extradition, or asylum-related procedures.	Publications should be documented as new circumstances and analysed not only by factual content, but also by language, headlines, and overall framing.
2	Association with a convicted or politically sensitive figure	The person is repeatedly described through a connection with another public figure who has already been convicted or is negatively perceived by the public.	Reputational transfer; increased political sensitivity of the case; risk of perceiving the person through another person's conviction or public image.	The individual case must be separated from the public image of associated persons; such association should be assessed as a possible element of pressure.
3	Misuse or excessive expansion of international search mechanisms	INTERPOL-related international search is used in a case with a politically sensitive, administrative, budgetary, or managerial context.	Detention; movement restrictions; initiation of extradition proceedings; increased pressure on the person outside the country of origin.	INTERPOL-related communications should address not only formal charges, but also the broader context, including political, procedural, and humanitarian factors.

4	Marginalization of asylum and the prohibition of forced return	Publications and institutional communications focus on allegations and extradition, while protection arguments, return-related risk, and asylum proceedings are presented secondarily.	Risk of return without full protection-sensitive assessment; weakening of the perception of the person as a protection seeker.	Asylum and extradition authorities should be notified of public pressure and of the need for separate assessment of return-related risk.
5	Institutional pressure outside ordinary judicial review	The case is advanced in parallel through anti-corruption, diplomatic, inter-agency, or international cooperation channels.	Additional pressure on the state examining the request; creation of an adverse procedural environment; strengthening of the requesting state's position.	Such communications should be documented and assessed cumulatively together with search, extradition, publications, and the person's protection status.
6	Harm to family life	Extradition affects the spouse, children, and established family life in the state of stay.	Separation of the family; humanitarian harm; negative impact on children; imbalance between criminal cooperation interests and family life.	Family-life factors should be included in the analysis of proportionality and the consequences of extradition.
7	Deterioration of health under detention, stress, or transfer	Procedural uncertainty, detention, risk of transfer, stress, possible interruption of treatment, or change in medical supervision conditions.	Health-related humanitarian risk; deterioration of condition; need for additional assessment of detention conditions and access to treatment.	Medical documentation should be submitted where health condition is relevant to the assessment of detention, extradition, or humanitarian consequences.
8	Stigmatization through reference to INTERPOL	Reference to international search or INTERPOL is perceived by the public as confirmation of guilt, although it is not a judicial decision.	Symbolic strengthening of the accusation; reputational harm; pressure on perception of the case before legal assessment.	Documents should emphasize that international search does not replace judicial review and does not remove the need to assess political, procedural, and protection-related context.

9	Underestimation of the administrative or managerial nature of the underlying dispute	Economic, budgetary, or official-duty allegations are automatically perceived as an ordinary criminal case without analysis of the factual nature of the conflict.	Risk of erroneous qualification of the case as ordinary criminal; disregard of political, administrative, or contractual context.	It is necessary to separately analyse whether the case is connected with managerial decisions, state projects, budget administration, or retrospective reassessment of official activity.
10	Cumulative pressure (invisible to any single institution)	Each authority examines only one procedural fragment: INTERPOL assesses data, the court assesses extradition, the asylum authority assesses protection, and medical documents are considered separately.	Underestimation of overall risk; fragmented assessment; lack of understanding of the full pressure exerted on the person.	An international master dossier or analytical report should consolidate the entire picture: search, extradition, asylum, media pressure, institutional communications, health, and family.

13. OFFICIAL AND PUBLIC SOURCES

- Constitution of INTERPOL, in particular Articles 2 and 3.
- INTERPOL Rules on the Processing of Data, including provisions concerning legality, purpose limitation, data quality, accuracy, proportionality, and compliance with INTERPOL's constitutional framework.
- Statute of the Commission for the Control of INTERPOL's Files.
- Operating Rules of the Commission for the Control of INTERPOL's Files, where applicable to requests for access, correction, deletion, and suspension of processing.
- Convention relating to the Status of Refugees of 1951, in particular Article 33 concerning the prohibition of forced return.
- Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, in particular Article 3.
- International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, in particular Articles 6, 7, 9, and 14.
- Universal Declaration of Human Rights, in particular provisions concerning liberty, personal security, fair process, and protection against arbitrary treatment.
- Argentine Law No. 24.767 on International Cooperation in Criminal Matters, where applicable to extradition proceedings in the absence of a bilateral treaty.
- Applicable Argentine legal and institutional framework concerning refugee status and international protection, including the procedure before CONARE.
- Publicly available materials concerning the human rights situation in Kazakhstan prepared by international organizations, human rights mechanisms, and public institutions.

- Publicly available publications relevant to the assessment of public information context, reputational framing, and possible external pressure in transnational criminal, extradition, and asylum-related cases.