Observatoire ARGA

ARGA Atlas

AML/CFT AND ABUSE OF INTERNATIONAL LEGAL COOPERATION: RISKS IN EXTRADITION, INTERNATIONAL ALERTS AND ASSET FREEZING

Authors:

Sergei Khrabrykh — President of ARGA, PhD

Tsmakalova Nataliia

Organization: Observatoire ARGA, ARGA 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, 5 may 2026

Purpose of the Document

This report has been prepared to provide a comprehensive analysis of how anti-money laundering and counter-terrorist financing mechanisms, originally designed to protect the integrity of the international financial system, may be used in conjunction with criminal proceedings, international alerts, extradition procedures and asset-freezing measures in ways that result in significant restrictions on human rights and proprietary interests.

The practical purpose of this document is to identify situations in which financial monitoring tools, cross-border information exchange and international legal cooperation are used not only to combat genuine criminal threats, but also to intensify pressure in cases that display indicators of procedural irregularities, selective prosecution, corporate conflict, political motivation or institutional bad faith.

For ARGA, this topic is of fundamental importance because the interaction between financial monitoring procedures, international information exchange, extradition and banking compliance frequently produces the most severe consequences long before the issue of guilt is examined by an independent court. A single domestic criminal case may lead to international alerts, termination of banking services, blocking of both digital and traditional assets, restrictions on freedom of movement, extradition detention and long-term destruction of business reputation.

This report examines these mechanisms as a unified system of cross-border impact requiring not only technical knowledge of financial regulation, but also a sophisticated understanding of fair trial guarantees, international human rights protection and the assessment of the procedural integrity of the originating criminal proceedings.

CONTENTS

Executive Summary

The anti-money laundering and counter-terrorist financing system is one of the most influential components of the modern international financial architecture. It encompasses banks, financial intelligence units, regulators, law enforcement agencies, international organizations and private market participants. Its core purpose is to detect, analyze and restrict financial flows connected to criminal activity and security threats.

However, the very effectiveness of this system creates a risk that it may be used in cases where the underlying criminal proceedings themselves raise serious concerns. When allegations display

indicators of selective prosecution, corporate conflict, political motivation or inadequate judicial control, AML/CFT mechanisms can multiply the consequences of claims that have not yet been independently tested.

In such circumstances, a domestic criminal case evolves into an international architecture of restrictions. Banks block accounts, financial institutions terminate services, financial intelligence units exchange information, foreign authorities receive mutual legal assistance requests, assets are frozen and the individual may be detained in extradition proceedings or in connection with international alerts.

The central conclusion of this report is that AML/CFT mechanisms should not be regarded as automatically neutral and inherently objective instruments. Their application requires an assessment of the procedural quality of the originating criminal proceedings, compliance with due process guarantees, the existence of effective judicial control and the real possibility of abuse of criminal prosecution.

Context & Problem Statement / Why This Topic Has Legal and International Significance

In international practice, financial monitoring, extradition, international alerts and asset freezing are often treated as distinct legal mechanisms. Formally, this is correct: each procedure is governed by different legal instruments and institutional structures. For the affected individual, however, they function as a single system of interconnected restrictions.

Once a criminal case acquires a financial dimension, it attracts heightened attention from banks, regulators and international authorities. Even in the absence of a conviction, information about an investigation may trigger suspicious activity reporting, enhanced transaction monitoring, account freezes and the transmission of information to foreign states.

The issue becomes particularly significant when the underlying criminal proceedings themselves raise concerns regarding judicial independence, evidentiary integrity, defense rights and procedural good faith. In such circumstances, a system intended to combat genuine financial crime may inadvertently become a mechanism for amplifying unjustified pressure.

For ARGA, this issue is strategically important because the most complex cross-border matters arise precisely at the intersection of criminal law, financial regulation and international legal cooperation. In such cases, legal protection must simultaneously address risks to liberty, assets, migration status, business reputation and access to banking infrastructure.

Legal Framework / Normative and Institutional Framework

The normative framework governing this subject constitutes one of the most complex and multi-layered systems in modern international regulation. Unlike traditional criminal proceedings, where domestic criminal and procedural law plays the central role, cases involving anti-money laundering and counter-terrorist financing engage national legislation, international conventions, intergovernmental standards, supranational regulations, banking procedures and internal rules of private institutions simultaneously.

The first level consists of domestic criminal legislation establishing liability for fraud, corruption, tax evasion, abuse of office, misappropriation of assets, market manipulation, money laundering and related financial offences. These allegations most often serve as the initial trigger for international mechanisms.

The second level is formed by national legislation on financial monitoring, customer due diligence, suspicious transaction reporting, asset blocking and cooperation with financial intelligence units.

These rules require banks and other entities to respond to indicators of elevated risk even in the absence of a final judicial determination.

The third level includes international conventions, most notably the United Nations Convention against Corruption, the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the European Convention on Human Rights.

The fourth level is constituted by the standards of the Financial Action Task Force (FATF). Although the FATF Recommendations are not treaty obligations in the formal sense, their practical significance is immense. They shape approaches to risk assessment, beneficial ownership transparency, asset freezing, information exchange and international cooperation.

The fifth level consists of supranational legal instruments, including European Union anti-money laundering directives, sanctions regulations, Regulation (EU) 2023/1114 on Markets in Crypto-Assets (MiCA) and related measures affecting both traditional and digital assets.

The sixth level includes the procedures of international and transnational bodies such as INTERPOL, the Egmont Group, MONEYVAL, financial intelligence units, extradition courts and human rights mechanisms of the United Nations and the Council of Europe.

The seventh level comprises internal procedures of private institutions, including banks, payment systems, investment platforms, cryptocurrency exchanges, custodians and other asset-service providers. In practice, decisions of these institutions often have the most immediate impact because they can deprive an individual of access to funds and financial infrastructure without waiting for a final judicial outcome.

Accordingly, a single criminal case involving allegations of financial misconduct may activate an extensive and interconnected system in which domestic accusations generate international consequences and preliminary suspicions evolve into real restrictions on property rights and personal liberty.

Mechanisms of Practice / Abuse / Key Mechanisms of Practice, Abuse or Conflict

The first key mechanism is the automatic transformation of criminal allegations into a category of financial risk. Once a case includes accusations of fraud, corruption, money laundering, terrorist financing, abuse of office or other economic offences, financial institutions and public authorities often treat the information as an independent indicator of danger. The substantive validity of the allegations may receive far less attention than the preventive logic of risk management.

The second mechanism involves suspicious transaction reports and the exchange of information among financial intelligence units. Such reports may trigger additional reviews, freezing of operations and international information sharing. The affected individual frequently has no knowledge of the report, its contents or the actions that follow. Significant restrictions may therefore arise without an open adversarial process.

The third mechanism is the use of mutual legal assistance requests. After the initiation of criminal proceedings, domestic authorities may seek banking information, asset restraint, witness testimony, seizure of documents and other measures abroad. If the originating case contains signs of abuse, international cooperation effectively exports the consequences of a procedurally defective process to other jurisdictions.

The fourth mechanism concerns international alerts and extradition. Financial allegations are often regarded as sufficiently serious to justify requests that may lead to detention outside the originating

country. A dispute that may contain corporate, political or proprietary dimensions is thereby transformed into a direct threat to personal liberty.

The fifth mechanism lies in the decisions of banks and other financial institutions. These entities may block accounts, terminate services, intensify source-of-funds reviews and refuse transactions based solely on internal risk assessments, regardless of whether any final judgment exists.

The sixth mechanism is the interaction with sanctions and compliance screening. Information concerning criminal proceedings may heighten concerns about the origin of assets, ownership structures and relationships with other persons, creating additional barriers to the use of both traditional and digital financial instruments.

The seventh mechanism is the persistence of restrictions over time. Once allegations enter the international information environment, their consequences may continue even when investigative activity subsides. Banking restrictions, adverse internal profiles, enhanced monitoring and cautious treatment by counterparties can remain in place for years.

Taken together, these mechanisms transform AML/CFT from a technical regulatory framework into a powerful transnational infrastructure capable of both combating genuine threats and significantly amplifying the effects of criminal proceedings where the underlying process lacks procedural integrity.

Case Patterns / Typical Scenarios, Patterns of Development or Models of Application

The first typical scenario involves criminal proceedings that are formally classified as financial offences but in substance arise from a corporate conflict, ownership dispute, shareholder confrontation, pressure on a former business partner or a struggle for control over assets. Allegations of fraud, abuse of office, misappropriation or money laundering may be used not primarily to protect a legitimate public interest, but to create legal and financial vulnerability for an opponent. Once criminal proceedings are initiated, what was originally a commercial dispute is recharacterized by banks, foreign authorities and international institutions as a matter of elevated financial risk.

The second scenario arises when state authorities present a politically or commercially sensitive matter through the more neutral language of financial crime. A dispute involving strategic assets, a conflict with governmental structures or a politically charged confrontation may be framed as fraud, corruption, tax evasion or money laundering. Such legal characterization appears technical and objective to external observers. Banks, foreign courts and extradition authorities may be more inclined to rely on allegations of financial misconduct than to recognize the underlying political or proprietary motivations.

The third scenario concerns mutual legal assistance requests directed to jurisdictions where the individual maintains assets, bank accounts, corporate structures or business relationships. On their face, these requests appear to be routine acts of international cooperation. If the originating proceedings are procedurally defective, however, the request becomes a mechanism for exporting those defects. Foreign authorities may freeze assets, disclose banking information or seize documents based on an assumption that the requesting state is acting in good faith.

The fourth scenario involves the combination of international alerts and financial monitoring. An individual may simultaneously face cross-border law enforcement exposure, banking restrictions and extradition risk. Information concerning an international alert heightens banking suspicion, while banking restrictions are then interpreted as further evidence that the person presents a serious risk. A self-reinforcing cycle emerges: the criminal case generates risk, the risk generates restrictions, and the restrictions are treated as confirmation of the case.

The fifth scenario concerns the freezing of assets before any meaningful examination of the originating proceedings. Restrictions may be imposed on the basis of preliminary allegations, investigative requests or suspicious activity reports. The individual may have little practical ability to challenge the underlying basis because relevant information is dispersed among banks, financial intelligence units, foreign courts, prosecutors and investigators. The defense is thus forced to confront a distributed network of consequences rather than a single identifiable decision.

The sixth scenario arises in matters involving digital assets, stablecoins, cryptocurrency platforms and cross-border payment services. Such assets are particularly sensitive to automated risk assessment, sanctions screening and internal compliance decisions. If an individual becomes associated with a financial criminal case, a platform may restrict access, block transactions or demand additional documentation without any formal judicial review. In these circumstances, technical infrastructure effectively becomes an extension of criminal pressure. In such circumstances, technical infrastructure may effectively become an extension of compliance and enforcement mechanisms.

The seventh scenario involves the persistence of adverse consequences after the underlying proceedings weaken or are terminated. Even where charges are withdrawn, proceedings are discontinued or courts identify serious procedural defects, risk-related information may remain embedded in banking profiles, internal databases, compliance memoranda and international exchanges. Formally, the individual may be cleared; functionally, the historical risk profile continues to govern.

The eighth scenario concerns extradition proceedings in which a foreign court examines a request based on financial allegations without conducting a sufficiently rigorous review of the originating judicial process. If the court limits itself to formal extradition criteria and does not examine indicators of abuse, the financial allegations may receive international validation as though they were inherently reliable. This is particularly dangerous where the requesting jurisdiction displays signs of judicial dependence, pressure on the defense, disproportionate provisional measures or proprietary interests of third parties.

Risk Assessment / Main Risks, Legal Vulnerabilities and Problem Areas

The first risk is that AML/CFT mechanisms often move faster than judicial remedies. A bank may block an account within hours, a financial intelligence unit may transmit information through confidential channels, and a foreign authority may receive a mutual legal assistance request before the affected individual has even obtained full access to the case file. The defense is therefore placed in a reactive position, responding to consequences that have already materialized.

The second risk is the presumption that the originating criminal case is reliable. International actors frequently assume that if a competent authority has opened proceedings, submitted a request or reported suspicious activity, the underlying process must be procedurally sound. In cases involving selective prosecution, corporate conflict or political motivation, the international system may unintentionally reproduce the consequences of a defective domestic process.

The third risk is disproportionality. Financial monitoring and international cooperation may pursue legitimate objectives, yet the measures imposed can become excessive. Comprehensive asset freezes, prolonged restrictions and the inability to pay for legal defense, daily living expenses, taxes or contractual obligations may convert a preventive measure into a form of practical punishment.

The fourth risk is inadequate scrutiny of the evidentiary basis. Financial allegations often appear technically sophisticated and externally persuasive, involving payment chains, ownership structures, suspicious transaction reports and source-of-funds analyses. Complexity, however, does not

guarantee accuracy. Without independent judicial examination, such material may be incomplete, one-sided or interpreted outside its economic context.

The fifth risk is the confidential nature of information exchange. The affected individual may not know what information has been transmitted abroad, which institutions have received it, what conclusions have been drawn or what actions have been initiated. This creates a serious obstacle to the right of defense: it is difficult to challenge what is undisclosed, only partially explained or not embodied in a fully accessible decision.

The sixth risk is that private financial institutions effectively make decisions with public-law consequences. A bank or digital platform formally acts as a private entity, yet its decision to block an account, terminate services or reject transactions may have consequences comparable to state-imposed restrictions. At the same time, procedural safeguards are substantially weaker than in court proceedings. There is often no full adversarial process, no obligation to disclose all relevant materials and no publicly reasoned decision.

The seventh risk concerns extradition. Financial allegations are frequently presented as ordinary criminal charges and therefore appear neutral to foreign courts. This creates the possibility that political or corporate motivations may be concealed behind technical economic qualifications. If the requested state does not examine the broader context, financial allegations may become an effective vehicle for cross-border coercion.

The eighth risk is the long-term persistence of adverse profiles. Even after proceedings are terminated, charges are withdrawn or restrictive measures are lifted, information concerning the original suspicions may remain in banking systems, internal databases, compliance reports and historical risk assessments. Formal legal rehabilitation does not necessarily restore financial reputation. Systems are remarkably efficient at preserving suspicion and considerably less enthusiastic about deleting it.

The ninth risk is fragmentation of responsibility. Each participant in the system may point to another. Banks refer to regulatory obligations, financial intelligence units invoke confidentiality, foreign authorities rely on requests from the originating state, investigators cite the needs of the case, and courts refer to the limited scope of review. The individual faces a cumulative burden, but no single actor assumes responsibility for the overall impact.

The tenth risk is the insufficient integration of human rights considerations into AML/CFT practice. Combating money laundering, corruption and terrorist financing is both legitimate and necessary. Yet these objectives do not eliminate the obligation to assess procedural fairness, ensure access to defense, apply proportionality and recognize the possibility that criminal proceedings themselves may be abusive.

Judicial Defects in National Proceedings to Be Considered When Assessing Requests for Legal Assistance, Extradition, International Search Measures, and Restrictions on Property Rights

Foreign courts and regulators are generally justified in relying upon national judicial decisions in jurisdictions where judicial oversight is substantive and independent. However, where national judicial scrutiny is predominantly formalistic, foreign recipients of requests should strengthen their review of procedural quality and proportionality, particularly where the consequences are cross-border and difficult to reverse.

Set out below is a list of judicial and procedural defects (together with verifiable markers) that foreign courts, international organizations, and regulators may appropriately take into account when assessing: (a) requests for mutual legal assistance (MLA); (b) extradition requests and international search measures, including notification mechanisms through Interpol channels (including Red

Notices and diffusions); and (c) freezing, seizure, confiscation of assets, and other restrictions on property rights.

Methodological Qualification. The list below does not in itself establish abuse; rather, it identifies risk criteria requiring closer scrutiny of case materials, procedural chronology, and the quality of judicial oversight in the national proceedings. Each defect, considered in isolation, may be of limited significance; practical importance lies in recurrence and cumulative effect. Where several defects are present simultaneously, foreign recipients of requests may appropriately apply an enhanced standard of review, seek clarifications and supplementary materials, and assess whether compensatory safeguards are sufficient. In some cases, the defects identified may indicate that a request cannot be granted without additional conditions or should not be granted at all.

A. Defects in Judicial Oversight (Quality of Judicial Review)

1. Formulaic (Declaratory) Judicial Reasoning

Verifiable Markers:

· repeated formulaic language without analysis of concrete facts or alternatives ("risks remain," "grounds exist," "arguments are unsubstantiated"), particularly in relation to asset seizure, extensions of restrictions, preventive measures, or refusals of defence motions;

· absence of references in judicial decisions to evidence supporting the court's conclusions;

· identical wording across different judicial decisions in the same case despite changed circumstances.

Why It Matters to a Foreign Recipient: the likelihood increases that the national court did not perform the role of an independent filter; accordingly, formal "judicial approval" should not be equated with substantive scrutiny.

2. Absence of a Proportionality Assessment

Verifiable Markers:

· failure by the court to balance the objective of the requested measure against its practical effects (including effects on business operations, third parties, or the ability to finance legal defence);

· failure to consider less restrictive alternatives (partial seizure, transaction limits, bail, prohibitions on specific conduct);

· failure to assess the impact of measures on bona fide counterparties, family members, or employees.

Why It Matters: in cases involving asset freezing, extradition, or other cross-border consequences, proportionality constitutes a central criterion of the legitimacy of rights interference.

3. Formalistic Approach to Admissibility and Provenance of Evidence

Verifiable Markers:

· absence of analysis concerning the source of evidence, chain of custody, or means of acquisition;

· disregard of translation, authentication, and certification issues, particularly for materials subsequently transmitted to foreign authorities under MLA requests;

· admission of evidence obtained through procedural irregularities without assessment of admissibility or impact on procedural fairness.

Why It Matters: foreign authorities risk legitimizing evidence that, under their own legal standards, would be inadmissible or materially problematic.

4. Ineffective Judicial Review (Appeal/Cassation as Formality)

Verifiable Markers:

· higher courts reproducing lower-court reasoning without addressing key defence arguments;

· formal treatment of appeals (without analysis of new facts or reassessment of proportionality);

· systematic confirmation of measures in the absence of individualized evaluation of risks and continuing necessity.

Why It Matters: for foreign recipients, what matters is not only the formal existence of appeal rights but the effectiveness of judicial review in practice.

B. Defects in Adversarial Fairness and Equality of Arms

1. Systemic Procedural Asymmetry

Verifiable Markers:

· denial of defence access to key materials (financial documents, correspondence, asset movement records) without lawful justification;

· refusal to admit alternative expert reports, request documents, or summon and examine material witnesses;

· refusals that are unreasoned or systematic and incapable of effective challenge.

Why It Matters: weak adversarial safeguards increase the risk that foreign recipients receive only the prosecution narrative, packaged into procedural documents without competing explanations.

2. Failure to Address Material Defence Arguments

Verifiable Markers:

· failure to engage substantively with arguments concerning legitimate business purpose, market conditions, or absence of intent;

· failure to consider the civil or commercial nature of disputes or alternative damage calculations presented by the defence;

· rejection of defence submissions through generalized formulae (“does not affect the court’s conclusions”) without individualized reasoning.

Why It Matters: foreign authorities must understand whether such issues were genuinely examined before deciding on restrictions affecting liberty, property, or financial access.

3. Restriction of Defence Rights at Critical Stages

Verifiable Markers:

· participation in procedural acts without effective legal assistance or under conditions limiting confidential communication with counsel;

· inability to obtain materials necessary to challenge restrictive measures (seizure, freezing, restrictions on disposal);

· restrictions impairing preparation of a defence, including financial isolation preventing payment for legal representation.

Why It Matters: in cross-border cases, early procedural stages often determine the subsequent "export" of allegations and durability of international restrictions.

C. Defects Critical for AML/CFT and Cross-Border Assets

1. Substitution of Evidentiary Standards by AML Terminology (AML Qualifiers)

Verifiable Markers:

· judicial acts or requests dominated by qualifying language ("money laundering," "organized group," "international channels") while lacking specificity regarding predicate offences, beneficial control, or tracing of assets;

· absence of documentation evidencing movement of funds from the alleged offence to assets targeted by restrictive measures;

· absence of causal linkage between the person's conduct and alleged harm, replaced by generalized assertions.

Why It Matters: compliance systems and foreign regulators often treat AML terminology as a high-risk trigger even where factual substantiation is weak, creating risks of automatic legitimization.

2. Disproportionate Asset Seizure/Freezing and Impact on Third Parties

Verifiable Markers:

· restrictions affecting assets substantially exceeding alleged losses;

· measures extending to unrelated property (family members, bona fide counterparties, companies lacking demonstrated links);

· absence of individualized judicial assessment of third-party rights;

· generalized rather than individualized explanation of the connection between particular assets and alleged criminal conduct.

Why It Matters: foreign courts and regulators ordinarily require a highly specific “asset — alleged offence” connection and separate consideration of third-party rights.

3. Prolonged Restrictions in the Absence of Substantive Progress

Verifiable Markers:

· repeated extensions of seizure or freezing measures on unchanged grounds without new factual developments;

· a regime of “permanent urgency,” where restrictions are continually prolonged for further review that is never meaningfully conducted;

· absence of any timetable or judicial plan for substantive evidentiary review.

Why It Matters: in the cross-border context, prolonged restrictions themselves become sanctions (loss of banking services, reputational damage, contract termination), prior to adjudication on the merits.

D. Defects in Internationalization (Risk of “Exporting Unverified Accusations”)

1. Premature Internationalization Without Adequate Domestic Scrutiny

Verifiable Markers:

· MLA requests, actions concerning foreign assets, international search measures, or extradition proceedings initiated before national courts have tested key elements of the alleged offence or proportionality of measures;

· activation of international mechanisms while evidentiary disputes remain unresolved and domestic judicial review incomplete.

Why It Matters: international mechanisms risk functioning as multipliers of pressure (restrictions on movement, financial isolation, reputational damage) rather than neutral tools of justice.

2. Incomplete or One-Sided Presentation of Materials to Foreign Authorities

Verifiable Markers:

· omission from requests of information concerning procedural disputes, appeals, or alternative expert opinions;

· omission of partial refusals of prosecutorial requests or narrowing of measures by higher courts;

· omission of information regarding evidence declared inadmissible or materially rebutted;

· presentation of materials in a one-sided form, excluding defence arguments and evidence.

Why It Matters: foreign authorities may decide on incomplete information without visibility into domestic procedural uncertainty or evidentiary weaknesses.

Practical Recommendation for Use

This list may usefully function as a due diligence checklist when assessing requests for legal assistance, extradition, international search measures, or asset freezing before irreversible consequences arise.

Review should document:

· which of the listed defects are present in the national proceedings;

· how those defects relate to the seriousness of the requested interference (extradition, seizure, confiscation, freezing);

· whether compensatory safeguards exist (effective judicial review, defence access to evidence, proportionality, individualized reasoning, and completeness of materials provided to the foreign authority).

A cumulative pattern of such defects generally means that international requests should not be approached through a model of automatic trust, but instead require additional scrutiny, clarification requests, and assessment of safeguards. Where safeguards are absent or serious doubts persist, foreign authorities may conclude that the request should not be granted or that its scope should be limited.

Conclusion

Foreign courts, international organizations, regulators, financial intelligence units, banks, and compliance functions should not automatically rely upon the mere existence of a national criminal accusation. When evaluating requests for legal assistance, extradition, freezing, or confiscation of assets, attention should be given to the judicial defects outlined above, which may indicate that national proceedings are instrumentalized and that international cooperation is being used to pursue objectives external to justice (proprietary, corporate, political, or reputational pressure).

Priority in such assessments should be given to documented facts, procedural chronology, the existence of independent and effective judicial review, proportionality of requested measures, and completeness of materials provided to the foreign recipient.

Institutional Gaps / Institutional Limitations, Gaps, Deficits of Safeguards and Systemic Weaknesses

The first systemic weakness is the disparity between the speed of financial restrictions and the pace of judicial protection. Financial monitoring, banking controls and inter-agency information exchange operate rapidly, often confidentially and on a preventive basis. Judicial remedies require time, access to evidence, legal submissions and reasoned decisions. As a result, accounts and assets may be restricted long before a court meaningfully reviews the legality of the originating criminal proceedings.

The second weakness is the structural reliance on trust in information received from competent authorities. Such trust is essential for international cooperation, but it becomes problematic when the originating jurisdiction displays judicial dependence, politicized prosecution, weak procedural safeguards or the use of criminal proceedings in corporate disputes. The international system may not generate the abuse itself, but it can amplify it dramatically.

The third weakness is the limited ability of affected individuals to challenge the dissemination of information. In ordinary litigation, a person typically knows which authority has acted, on what grounds and through which procedure the decision may be appealed. In AML/CFT matters, suspicious transaction reports may remain confidential, exchanges between financial intelligence

units may be undisclosed, banking decisions may be only partially explained and foreign requests may not be fully accessible. The result is a substantial deficit of procedural visibility.

The fourth weakness is the blending of public and private mechanisms. State authorities initiate investigations, banks evaluate risk, private platforms block transactions, foreign regulators receive information and international organizations may rely on the resulting data. Each actor formally operates within its own mandate, yet for the individual the outcome resembles a single integrated system of pressure. Procedural safeguards equivalent to those available in criminal courts do not apply uniformly across this network.

The fifth weakness is the insufficient application of proportionality. Asset freezes, service terminations, information sharing and transaction restrictions may pursue legitimate aims, but there is often no rigorous assessment of whether a particular measure is necessary, time-limited and proportionate to the actual risk. This is especially troubling when restrictions prevent payment for legal defense, housing, medical treatment, taxes or ordinary business obligations.

The sixth weakness is the absence of a uniform standard for identifying abuse in the originating criminal case. Some foreign courts are prepared to examine political motivation, corporate conflict and proprietary interests of third parties. Others confine their review to formal criteria. Some banks permit a meaningful presentation of evidence and explanations. Others terminate relationships with little or no substantive engagement. Some authorities give serious weight to fair trial concerns. Others treat such issues as matters to be addressed exclusively within the requesting state. This fragmentation creates unpredictability and makes the outcome heavily dependent on the specific jurisdiction and institution involved.

The seventh weakness is that international AML/CFT standards do not always contain sufficiently developed safeguards against abuse of criminal prosecution. They are highly effective in identifying suspicious financial flows, opaque ownership structures and indicators of illicit conduct. They are less explicit when addressing situations in which the underlying criminal allegations are themselves selective, procedurally defective or deployed as instruments of pressure.

The eighth weakness is the long life of adverse information. Risk-related data may remain embedded in client profiles, internal databases, compliance memoranda and institutional exchanges long after the legal status of the case has changed. The termination of proceedings, withdrawal of charges, deletion of an international alert or judicial findings of procedural violations do not automatically erase historical risk markers. Restoring access to financial infrastructure therefore requires a separate and often lengthy remediation process.

The ninth weakness is the multi-front nature of the defense burden. Individuals affected by these mechanisms frequently need to respond simultaneously in criminal proceedings, extradition litigation, banking reviews, sanctions-related inquiries, migration matters and reputational disputes. Each forum has distinct deadlines, evidentiary standards and procedural languages. Without a coordinated strategy, the defense becomes reactive and fragmented, allowing restrictive measures to become entrenched before a coherent position is presented.

The tenth weakness is the institutional tendency toward over-caution. For a bank, terminating a client relationship may appear safer than explaining continued service to a regulator. For a foreign authority, executing a request may seem less risky than undertaking a detailed examination of political and procedural context. For a compliance department, classifying a person as high-risk is often administratively simpler than defending a more nuanced conclusion. This logic is understandable, but it creates an environment in which a questionable criminal case may produce disproportionately severe international consequences.

Practical Guidance / Practical Recommendations and Model of Legal Action

The first practical step is to treat the matter not as an isolated domestic criminal proceeding, but as a potential multi-layered cross-border risk. If the case involves financial allegations, international assets, corporate structures, digital assets, foreign counterparties or a realistic possibility of international alerts, extradition or banking restrictions, the defense should proceed on the assumption that consequences may extend far beyond the originating court.

The second step is a detailed diagnostic review of the underlying criminal case. Counsel should identify the precise allegations, the evidentiary basis, the role of complainants, the existence of any corporate conflict, the parties who stand to benefit economically, the degree of judicial independence and the procedural foundation for provisional measures. Without this analysis, it is impossible to explain to foreign authorities and financial institutions why the case should not be treated as an ordinary good-faith prosecution.

The third step is the preparation of a unified evidentiary package. The package should be suitable for use before domestic and foreign courts, banks, financial intelligence units, international organizations, extradition authorities and human rights mechanisms. It should include procedural documents, court decisions, evidence of due process violations, material demonstrating political or corporate context, information concerning third-party interests and proof of the real-world consequences already suffered.

The fourth step is the clear separation of documented facts, defense submissions and legal analysis. Assertions that proceedings are abusive should be supported by specific evidence and reasoned argument. International institutions and financial actors are more likely to engage seriously when the presentation distinguishes verifiable facts from interpretative conclusions. Bureaucracies, despite their devotion to paperwork, remain strangely allergic to unsupported rhetoric.

The fifth step is early engagement with potentially affected financial institutions. Where there is a realistic possibility of account closures, blocked transactions or enhanced scrutiny, a structured explanatory submission should be prepared in advance. Such a submission should not deny the existence of proceedings if they are ongoing, but should explain the procedural context, the absence of any final determination, indicators of abuse and the legitimate origin of assets.

The sixth step is the parallel use of international mechanisms alongside domestic remedies. Depending on the circumstances, this may include submissions to United Nations procedures, Council of Europe mechanisms, challenges to international alerts, materials for extradition courts, communications with regulators and approaches to other human rights institutions. The critical point is coordination. If each filing evolves independently, the defense becomes a stack of unrelated documents rather than a coherent strategy.

The seventh step is a dedicated assessment of extradition exposure. Financial allegations often appear to foreign courts as conventional criminal charges. The defense must therefore explain why the matter cannot be evaluated solely by reference to formal legal classifications. Indicators of selective prosecution, judicial dependence, disproportionate provisional measures, asset-related pressure and third-party proprietary interests should be presented systematically.

The eighth step concerns asset protection. Where there is a risk of freezing or seizure, counsel should identify which assets are vulnerable, the jurisdictions in which they are located, the legal grounds likely to be invoked and the procedures available to challenge restrictions. Consideration should also be given to obtaining exceptions for legal fees, living expenses, taxes and the preservation of ongoing business operations. In cross-border matters, “we will deal with the assets later” is often a remarkably efficient way to discover that there are no accessible assets left.

The ninth step is the systematic preservation of evidence of consequences. Account closure notices, transaction refusals, enhanced due diligence requests, communications from counterparties, migration complications, detentions, travel restrictions and reputational publications should all be retained and organized. These materials demonstrate that the originating proceedings have produced concrete and disproportionate effects rather than merely theoretical concerns.

The tenth step is continuous updating of the legal position. Cross-border matters evolve rapidly. New court decisions, international requests, banking responses, compliance restrictions and public information may materially affect the strategic landscape. The defense package should therefore be revised regularly to reflect current developments and to document continuing procedural defects or disproportional consequences.

Policy Recommendations / Recommendations on Legal and Institutional Approach

First, international financial institutions and authorities involved in legal cooperation should evaluate not only the existence of criminal proceedings, but also the procedural quality of the originating case. Allegations of money laundering, fraud, corruption or terrorist financing should not automatically justify severe restrictions without an assessment of evidence, judicial safeguards and indicators of abuse.

Second, AML/CFT procedures should incorporate clearer safeguards for affected individuals. This does not require disclosure of sensitive investigative methods, but it does require a meaningful opportunity to understand the nature of the concerns, submit documentation, obtain reasoned consideration and seek review when restrictions are based on defective or outdated criminal allegations.

Third, foreign courts and authorities processing mutual legal assistance requests should undertake more substantive review where there are signs of political motivation, corporate conflict, proprietary interests of third parties, judicial dependence or disproportionate provisional measures. Mutual trust between states should not become a mechanism for automatic replication of procedural defects.

Fourth, extradition courts should scrutinize financial allegations used in politically or commercially sensitive matters with particular care. Neutral economic terminology should not obscure the real context of the prosecution. If proceedings function as instruments of pressure, asset redistribution or removal of an opponent, they should not be treated as ordinary criminal cases merely because the request uses technical financial classifications.

Fifth, banks and financial service providers should develop effective procedures for individualized review. Initial restrictions may be justified on a precautionary basis, but they should not remain in place indefinitely without meaningful consideration of updated documentation and changes in legal status.

Sixth, international AML/CFT standards should more explicitly address the risk of abusive criminal proceedings. Existing frameworks describe illicit financial threats in detail, but devote less attention to circumstances in which the underlying allegations are selective, procedurally defective or strategically deployed as instruments of coercion.

Seventh, human rights guarantees should be treated as an integral part of AML/CFT practice rather than as external constraints. Effective financial crime prevention must remain compatible with fair trial rights, property rights, access to defense, freedom of movement and proportionality. Otherwise, a system designed to protect legal order may itself become a source of systemic legal harm.

Eighth, international organizations and regulators should encourage practical mechanisms for remediation after erroneous or abusive risk classification. Termination of proceedings, withdrawal of

charges, deletion of international alerts and judicial findings of procedural violations should trigger meaningful procedures for updating risk profiles and restoring access to financial infrastructure.

Ninth, legal practice should abandon the compartmentalized treatment of criminal proceedings, extradition, banking restrictions, asset freezing and international alerts. These elements should be analyzed as parts of a single interconnected system. Individually, each measure may appear formally lawful; collectively, they may produce a disproportionate and unjust result.

Tenth, institutions should support early-warning approaches. Where the defense possesses credible evidence that the originating proceedings are abusive, those materials should be presented before mutual legal assistance requests, international alerts and banking restrictions generate entrenched consequences. In this field, preventive legal work is often far more effective than attempting to rebuild financial infrastructure after the damage is done.

Conclusion

Anti-money laundering and counter-terrorist financing mechanisms are indispensable components of the modern international legal and financial order. Without them, it would be impossible to combat corruption, organized crime, terrorist financing, illicit asset movements and the misuse of financial infrastructure for unlawful purposes. Their legitimacy and necessity are beyond dispute.

At the same time, the very strength, speed and global reach of these mechanisms create a significant risk of abuse or disproportionate impact. When the underlying criminal proceedings are conducted in good faith, these tools serve the public interest. When the originating case contains indicators of selective prosecution, corporate conflict, political motivation or inadequate judicial control, the same mechanisms may transform contested allegations into an international architecture of restrictions.

The core problem does not lie in the existence of financial monitoring, mutual legal assistance, extradition or asset freezing as such. The problem arises when these instruments are applied without meaningful scrutiny of the procedural integrity of the originating case. In such circumstances, the international system does not correct the defects of the domestic proceedings. Instead, it exports those defects across jurisdictions, banking systems, corporate structures, migration processes and the personal liberty of the individual concerned.

For ARGA, the principal conclusion is clear. In matters involving AML/CFT measures, international alerts, extradition and asset freezing, legal protection cannot be limited to a formal denial of allegations. It must explain the full architecture of pressure: who initiated the proceedings, what interests are involved, how the evidentiary record was constructed, whether the court is genuinely independent, what restrictive measures were imposed, what international consequences have arisen and why automatic reliance on the originating proceedings may result in serious violations of fundamental rights.

A mature legal assessment in this field requires the simultaneous analysis of criminal procedure, financial regulation, international legal cooperation, banking compliance, human rights and the real economic context of the dispute. Only such an integrated approach makes it possible to distinguish legitimate international cooperation from situations in which a system designed to combat financial crime becomes an infrastructure of transnational coercion. Human institutions, with their usual talent for overachievement, can turn a protective mechanism into a remarkably efficient pressure machine.

Appendix A. Terminology

Anti-Money Laundering (AML). The body of legal, regulatory and operational measures designed to detect, prevent and suppress the use of the financial system to disguise the illicit origin of criminal proceeds.

Counter-Terrorist Financing (CFT). Measures intended to detect, prevent and suppress the collection, movement and use of funds for terrorist activities, terrorist organizations or associated persons.

Financial Monitoring. The process of reviewing transactions, clients, ownership structures and sources of funds in order to identify suspicious activity and manage legal and compliance risks.

Financial Intelligence Unit (FIU). A national authority empowered to receive, analyze and disseminate information concerning suspicious financial transactions to domestic and foreign competent authorities.

Mutual Legal Assistance (MLA). A form of inter-state cooperation in criminal matters involving the exchange of documents, disclosure of banking information, witness interviews, seizure of evidence, freezing of assets and other procedural measures at the request of another state.

Extradition. The surrender of an individual by one state to another for criminal prosecution or enforcement of a sentence, subject to applicable legal safeguards.

International Alert. Cross-border dissemination of law enforcement information intended to locate, monitor, detain or otherwise identify an individual in connection with criminal proceedings.

Asset Freezing. A temporary restriction on the right to transfer, dispose of or access money, securities, digital assets or other economic resources.

Compliance Risk Review. An internal process conducted by banks, payment systems, investment platforms and other institutions to assess clients and transactions for legal, sanctions, reputational and financial risks.

Risk-Based Approach. A regulatory and operational model under which the intensity of due diligence and restrictions is determined by the level of perceived risk associated with a client, transaction, jurisdiction or ownership structure.

Procedural Good Faith. Genuine compliance with the principles of judicial independence, defense rights, access to evidence, equality of arms, reasoned decisions and proportionality.

Abuse of International Legal Cooperation. The use of mutual legal assistance, international alerts, extradition, financial monitoring or related mechanisms not for the good-faith administration of justice, but for pressure, persecution, asset redistribution or circumvention of procedural safeguards.

International Restriction Contour. The aggregate of cross-border consequences arising from a domestic criminal case, including banking restrictions, information exchange, extradition, international alerts, asset freezing, migration complications and reputational harm.

Appendix B. Risk / Powers / Legal Consequences Matrix

Action	Legal Risk	Legal Limitation	Possible Consequences	Practical Comment
Opening criminal proceedings involving financial allegations	Automatic classification of the individual as a high-risk subject	The opening of proceedings does not establish the facts and cannot replace judicial review	Banking scrutiny, transaction refusals, asset restrictions, reputational damage	A documented position regarding the procedural quality of the case should be prepared immediately

Filing a suspicious transaction report	Confidential escalation without notice to the affected person	A suspicious transaction report is not proof of wrongdoing	FIU analysis, enhanced monitoring, blocked transactions	Banking correspondence should be preserved and source-of-funds explanations prepared
Information exchange between financial intelligence units	International dissemination of untested or one-sided information	Information sharing should serve legitimate purposes and not substitute for judicial findings	Foreign reviews, banking restrictions, asset freezes	An international defense package should be prepared in advance
Mutual legal assistance request	Export of procedural defects to another jurisdiction	Foreign authorities should consider abuse indicators and due process concerns	Disclosure of banking information, seizure of documents, restraint of assets	Foreign authorities should receive submissions explaining the procedural context
Request to freeze assets	Effective loss of access to property before final adjudication	Restrictions must be necessary, reasoned, temporary and proportionate	Blocked accounts, frozen digital assets, inability to fund defense	Exceptions should be sought for legal fees, living expenses, taxes and business continuity
Use of financial allegations in an extradition request	Concealment of political or corporate motivations behind ordinary criminal charges	Extradition should be refused where proceedings are selective, abusive or politically motivated	Arrest, detention and prolonged extradition litigation	The broader factual and institutional context must be documented
International alert in a financial case	Conversion of contested allegations into a threat to liberty and mobility	International alert mechanisms should not be used inconsistently with international safeguards	Travel restrictions, detention, migration complications and increased banking risk	A dedicated submission challenging misuse of the alert mechanism should be prepared
Bank account closure	Financial isolation without a judicial determination	Risk management should not become indefinite punishment	Loss of access to funds and inability to perform contractual obligations	Internal review should be requested with supporting documentation
Termination of services by a financial institution	Exclusion from essential financial infrastructure	Individual circumstances and updated legal developments should be considered	Closed accounts, payment interruptions and inability to receive or transfer funds	Separate engagement with compliance departments is essential
Automated risk scoring	Mechanical reinforcement of adverse profiles	Risk assessments should be individualized and regularly updated	Repeated refusals, prolonged restrictions and persistent high-risk classification	Review should be requested when legal status changes

Prolonged investigation without judgment	Use of uncertainty as an independent pressure mechanism	Delay must not substitute for proof of wrongdoing	Years of restrictions, business disruption and reputational damage	The duration and practical effects of the proceedings should be documented
Termination of proceedings, withdrawal of charges or deletion of alerts	Persistence of residual consequences	Legal rehabilitation should be reflected in institutional records	Continuing scrutiny and difficulty restoring financial relationships	Dedicated remediation work is required to update information and rebuild reputation
Review by foreign courts or authorities	Formal reliance on the originating jurisdiction's allegations	International cooperation should not be automatic where abuse indicators exist	Execution of requests, recognition of restrictions and denial of relief	Materials describing procedural defects and human rights risks should be submitted
Lack of a unified defense strategy	Fragmented responses to interconnected consequences	Different procedures have distinct rules, but their effects must be addressed collectively	Entrenchment of restrictions, inconsistent positions and loss of time	Criminal, banking, extradition and international defense efforts should be coordinated

This matrix reflects recurring situations in which AML/CFT mechanisms, mutual legal assistance, extradition and financial monitoring interact in a manner that can cause a contested or abusive criminal case to generate disproportionately severe international consequences. Its practical purpose is to identify points at which risk spreads and to prevent a domestic allegation from automatically evolving into a global system of restrictions.

Official Sources

United Nations Convention against Corruption.

United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime.

International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism.

International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

United Nations Human Rights Committee, General Comment No. 32 on Article 14 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

European Convention on Human Rights.

European Court of Human Rights case law on Article 6 of the European Convention on Human Rights.

European Court of Human Rights case law on Article 1 of Protocol No. 1 to the European Convention on Human Rights.

Financial Action Task Force, International Standards on Combating Money Laundering and the Financing of Terrorism and Proliferation (FATF Recommendations).

Financial Action Task Force, Guidance on the Risk-Based Approach.

Financial Action Task Force, Guidance on Beneficial Ownership and Transparency of Legal Persons.

Financial Action Task Force, Guidance on Asset Recovery.

Financial Action Task Force, Guidance on Counter Proliferation Financing.

Egmont Group of Financial Intelligence Units, Principles for Information Exchange Between Financial Intelligence Units.

Egmont Group operational materials on cooperation between financial intelligence units.

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime materials on mutual legal assistance, international cooperation and asset recovery.

World Bank and United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, Stolen Asset Recovery Initiative (StAR).

INTERPOL Constitution.

INTERPOL Rules on the Processing of Data.

INTERPOL official materials on Notices, Diffusions and international police cooperation.

Council of Europe conventions on money laundering, confiscation and the financing of terrorism.

Council of Europe MONEYVAL evaluation materials.

European Union Directive (EU) 2015/849.

European Union Directive (EU) 2018/843.

Regulation (EU) 2023/1113.

Regulation (EU) 2023/1114.

European Union restrictive measures and asset-freezing regulations.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, Convention on Combating Bribery of Foreign Public Officials in International Business Transactions.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, Recommendation of the Council for Further Combating Bribery of Foreign Public Officials in International Business Transactions.

Basel Institute on Governance materials on asset recovery, financial investigations and corruption-related financial flows.