

Danielle Ireland-Piper

Accountability in Extraterritoriality

A Comparative
and International
Law Perspective



Accountability in Extraterritoriality

A Comparative and International Law
Perspective

Danielle Ireland-Piper

Associate Professor, Bond University, Australia



Edward Elgar
PUBLISHING

Cheltenham, UK • Northampton, MA, USA

© Danielle Ireland-Piper 2017

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical or photocopying, recording, or otherwise without the prior permission of the publisher.

Published by
Edward Elgar Publishing Limited
The Lypiatts
15 Lansdown Road
Cheltenham
Glos GL50 2JA
UK

Edward Elgar Publishing, Inc.
William Pratt House
9 Dewey Court
Northampton
Massachusetts 01060
USA

A catalogue record for this book
is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Control Number: 2016953933

This book is available electronically in the **Elgar**online
Law subject collection
DOI 10.4337/9781786431783



ISBN 978 1 78643 177 6 (cased)
ISBN 978 1 78643 178 3 (eBook)

Typeset by Columns Design XML Ltd, Reading
Printed and bound in Great Britain by TJ International Ltd, Padstow

Acknowledgments

This book was written on the traditional lands of the Yugambah people. To that end, I acknowledge these traditional custodians and offer my respects to elders past, present and emerging. I am humbled to have met people who descend from the oldest living continuous culture in the world.

I am indebted to Anthony Cassimatis, Andreas Schloenhardt, Dan Svantessen, Rick Bigwood and Sabine Gless for their kind support and generous guidance during various stages of the research journey undertaken in writing this book. I also thank Kim Rubenstein, Michael Weir and Tonya Roberts for their consistent and good-natured support of research work and Maria Ireland for her love of words.

I am grateful to the team at Edward Elgar who were a pleasure to work with. In particular, I would like to thank Alex Pettifer for considering my manuscript in the first instance, and Nicola Crane, Simon Harris, John-Paul McDonald, and Karissa Venne for their helpful assistance during the editorial and publication process.

Thanks are also owed to the law students who, over the years, have provided research assistance and brightened my academic days with good humour and enthusiasm. In particular, I thank Mikayla Brier-Mill, Jake Buckingham, Eoin Coffey, Marryum Kahloon, Amy Kosa, Connor McBain, and Keith Sypott.

And where would any writer be without the general forbearance of those with whom we walk alongside? Thank you, Chris.

Finally, I acknowledge the importance of friends and family, the loving memory of those lost to time, and the kindness of His Divine Grace Nitya-Lila Pravista Om Visnupada Paramahansa Srila Bhaktivedanta Narayana Goswami Maharaja.

Any faults are, of course, entirely my own.

Contents

<i>Acknowledgments</i>	vii
<i>Table of cases</i>	ix
<i>Table of legislation</i>	xiii
1 Introduction	1
2 Principles of jurisdiction	21
3 Principles of jurisdictional restraint	39
4 Australia and extraterritorial jurisdiction	73
5 India and extraterritorial jurisdiction	108
6 The United States and extraterritorial jurisdiction	138
7 Conclusions	176
<i>Index</i>	187

Table of cases

Australia

<i>Al-Kateb v Godwin</i> (2004) 208 ALR 124	94, 98
<i>AMS v AIF</i> (1999) 199 CLR 160	95
<i>Beaudesert Shire Council v Smith</i> (1966) 120 CLR 145	60
<i>Dietrich v The Queen</i> (1992) 177 CLR 292	94, 95, 102
<i>Horta v Commonwealth</i> (1994) 181 CLR 183	94, 96
<i>Kartinyeri v The Commonwealth</i> (1998) 195 CLR 337	97
<i>Leeth v Commonwealth</i> (1992) 174 CLR 455	104
<i>Mabo v Queensland (No 2)</i> (1992) 175 CLR 1	94, 97
<i>Minister for Foreign Affairs and Trade v Magno</i> (1992) 112 ALR 529	94
<i>Minister for Immigration and Ethnic Affairs v Teoh</i> (1995) 183 CLR 273	94, 96, 127
<i>Moti v The Queen</i> (2012) 283 ALR 393	18, 61, 70, 86, 87, 89, 90, 100, 101, 105, 106, 155, 182
<i>Newcrest Mining v The Commonwealth</i> (1997) 190 CLR 513	97
<i>Northern Territory v Mengel</i> (1995) 185 CLR 307	60
<i>Plaintiff M68/2015 v Minister for Immigration and Border Protection</i> [2016] HCA 1	84
<i>Polites v Commonwealth</i> (1945) 70 CLR 60, 75–6	94
<i>Polyukhovich v Commonwealth</i> (1991) 172 CLR 501	85, 86, 94
<i>R v Moti</i> [2009] 235 FLR 320	88
<i>R v Watson; Ex parte A-G</i> [2009] QCA 279	157
<i>Re Minister for Immigration and Multicultural Affairs; Ex parte Lam</i> (2003) 195 ALR 502	96
<i>South Australia v Totani</i> (2010) 242 CLR 1	102, 103
<i>Victoria v Commonwealth</i> (1996) 187 CLR 416	96
<i>XYZ v Commonwealth</i> (2006) 227 CLR 532	86

India

<i>Gramophone Co. of India vs. Birenda Bahadur Pandey</i> (1984) 2 SCC 534; 1984 SCR(2) 664	128
<i>GVK INDS. LTD. v The Income Tax Officer</i> [2011] 3 SCR 366	112, 115, 116, 131
<i>Maganbhai Ishwarbhai Patel v Union of India</i> (1970) 3 SCC 400	126
<i>Maneka Gandhi v Union of India</i> 1978 AIR 597, 1978 SCR (2) 621	130
<i>Nagaraj v Union of India</i> (2006) Supp 7 SCR 336	132, 133, 134, 135
<i>Nilabati Behra v State of Orissa</i> 1993 AIR 1960, 1993 SCR (2) 581	129, 134

<i>Republic of Italy v Union of India</i> (2013) 4 SCC 721 (' <i>The Indian Fishermen Case</i> ')	114, 116, 117, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 132
<i>Rudal Shah v State of Bihar</i> , 1983 AIR 1086, 1983 SCR (3) 508	129
<i>Selvi v State of Karnataka</i> (2010) 7 Sec 263, 4 [4]	130
<i>Vishaka v State of Rajasthan</i> (1997) 6 SCC 241	126, 127

United States

<i>Ahmad v Wigen</i> 726 F Supp 389 (ED NY, 1989)	154
<i>America Banana Co v United Fruit Co</i> , 213 US 347, 357 (1909)	143, 153
<i>EEOC v Arabian American Oil Co (Aramco)</i> , 499 US 244, 248 (1991)	143, 145
<i>Frisbie v Collins</i> 342 US 519 (US 1952)	155
<i>Hamdan v Rumsfeld</i> 548 US 557, 126 S Ct 2749 (2006)	159, 175, 183
<i>Hanson v Denckla</i> 357 US 23	170
<i>Helicopteros Nacionales de Columbia, SA v Hall</i> 466 US 408 (1984)	170
<i>International Shoe Company v Washington</i> (1945) 326 US 310	169, 170
<i>Ker v Illinois</i> 119 US 436 (US 1886)	18, 155
<i>Rasul v Bush</i> 542 US 466 (2004)	163, 172, 173, 175, 183
<i>The Paquete Habana</i> 175 US 677, 700 (1900)	165
<i>Underhill v Hernandez</i> 168 US 250 (1897)	89, 90
<i>United States v Al Kassar</i> 582 F Supp 2d 488 (SDNY 2008)	160
<i>United States v Aluminium Company of America</i> , 148 F. 2d. 416 (1944)	35
<i>United States v Warsame</i> 537 F Supp 2d 1005 (D Minn 2008)	160, 161
<i>United States v Yunis</i> 681 F Supp 896 (D DC, 1988); 924 F 2d 1086 (DC Cir, 1991)	154, 166
<i>United States v Zehe</i> 601 601 F Supp 196 (DC Mass 1985)	146
<i>United States v Alvarez-Machain</i> 112 S Ct 2188 (1992)	155, 156
<i>US v Verdugo-Urquidez</i> 494 US 259 (1990)	169

Other

<i>Al-Skeini and Others v United Kingdom</i> (European Court of Human Rights, Grand Chamber, Application no 55721/07, 7 July 2011)	48
<i>Amnesty International Canada v Canada (Minister of National Defence)</i> [2008] FC 336	18
<i>Attorney-General of the Government of Israel v Adolf Eichmann</i> (1961) 36 <i>International Law Reports</i>	21
<i>Bankovic and Others v Belgium and Others</i> (European Court of Human Rights, Grand Chamber, Application No 52207/99, 12 December 2001)	48
Decision on the Motion for Release by the Accused Slavko Dokmanovic, Case No. IT-95-13A-PT, 22 October 1997	6
<i>Prosecutor v Dokmanovic</i> , Decision on application for Leave to Appeal by the Accused Slavko Dokmanovic, Case No. IT-95-13a-AR 72, A. Ch., 11 November 1997	6
<i>Gencor v Commission</i> , Judgment of 25 March 1999, 1999 ECR II-753	35
<i>Joyce v DPP</i> [1946] AC 347	33
<i>Mitamura v Suzuki</i> 1067 Sup. Ct. (27 June 1972) (Supreme Court of Japan)	59

Notice of Motion for Evidentiary Hearing on Arrest, Detention and Removal of Defendant Stevan Todorovic and for Extension of Time to Move to Dismiss Indictment, D2989-D2984	6
<i>Öcalan v Turkey</i> (European Court of Human Rights, Grand Chamber, Application No 46221/99, 12 May 2005)	49, 50, 51
<i>Prest v Petrodel Resources Ltd</i> [2013] UKSC 34	61
<i>Public Prosecutor v Taw Cheng Kong</i> [1998] 2 SLR 410	12
<i>R v Hape</i> [2007] SCC 26	18, 69
<i>R v Klassen</i> [2008] BCSC 1762	18, 69
<i>UEJF and Licra c /Yahoo! Inc. et Yahoo France and Yahoo France</i> , Tribunal de Grande Instance of Paris (Paris), 22 May 2000	13

Decisions of International Courts and Tribunals

<i>Advisory Opinion on the Legal Consequences of the Construction of a Wall in the Occupied Palestinian Territory</i> [2004] ICJ Rep 136	48
<i>Barcelona Traction, Light, and Power Company, Ltd</i> (Belgium v Spain) [1970] ICJ Rep 3, 105	43, 44
<i>Case Concerning the Arrest Warrant of 11 April 2000 (Democratic Republic of the Congo v Belgium)</i> , International Court of Justice (ICJ), 14 February 2002, ICJ Reports 2002, pp 77–8, para 47	29
<i>Corfu Channel Case</i> (1949) I.C.J. Rep. 22	57
<i>Free Zones of Upper Savoy and District of Gex Case</i> (1932), P.C.IJ. (Ser. A/B) No. 46	57
Human Rights Committee, Views: <i>Communication No 204/1986</i> , 21st sess, UN Doc CCPR/C/OP/2 (2 November 1987) (' <i>AP v Italy</i> ')	19, 51
Human Rights Committee, Views: <i>Communication No 692/1996</i> , 60th sess, UN Doc CCPR/C/60/D/692/1996 (28 July 1997) (' <i>ARJ v Australia</i> ')	51
Human Rights Committee, Views: <i>Communications No 623/1995, 624/1995, 626/1995, 627/1995</i> , 62nd sess, UN Doc CCPR/C/62/D/623/1995, CCPR/C/62/D/624/1995, CCPR/C/62/D/626/1995, CCPR/C/62/D/627/1995 (29 May 1998) (' <i>Domukovsky and Others v Georgia</i> ')	48, 49, 50, 51
<i>Jurisdictional Immunities of the State (Germany v Italy: Greece intervening)</i> (Judgment) [2008] ICJ Rep 99	53
<i>Military and Paramilitary Activities in and against Nicaragua (Merits)</i> [1986] ICJ Reports, 14.	
<i>Questions Concerning the Obligation to Prosecute or Extradite (Belg. v Sen.)</i> , Judgment (Jul. 20, 2012)	53
<i>SS 'Lotus' (France v Turkey) (Judgment)</i> [1927] PCIJ (ser A) No 10 . 8, 9, 10, 24, 28, 118, 119, 122, 123	
<i>Trail Smelter Arbitration</i> , (1949) 3 R.I.A.A. 1905	57

Table of legislation

Australia

<i>Anti-People Smuggling and Other Measures Act 2010 (Cth)</i>	82, 104
<i>Australian Constitution (1901)</i>	70, 74, 75, 76, 96, 98, 99, 102, 104, 106, 149
<i>Crimes Act 1914 (Cth)</i>	80, 86, 88
<i>Criminal Code Act 1995 (Cth)</i> ...	26, 76, 77, 78, 79, 88, 91, 104, 179
<i>Extradition Act 1988 (Cth)</i>	157
<i>Migration Act 1958 (Cth)</i>	81

India

<i>Code of Criminal Procedure (1973)</i>	114, 117
<i>Constitution of India (1946)</i>	108, 112, 116, 121, 127, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 179
<i>Immoral Trafficking Prevention Act (1986)</i>	113, 114
<i>Indian Maritime Zones Act (1976)</i>	117
<i>Indian Penal Code (1860)</i>	112, 113, 114, 115, 119, 120, 131, 133
<i>Prevention of Corruption Act (1988)</i>	115
<i>Prevention of Terrorism Act (2002)</i>	114, 115

United States

<i>Authorization for Use of Military Force, Pub L No 107-40, 115 Stat 224 (2001)</i>	162
--	-----

<i>American Law Institute, Restatement (Second) of the Foreign Relations Law of the United States (1965)</i>	35
<i>American Law Institute, Restatement (Third) of the Foreign Relations Law of the United States (1987)</i>	21, 44, 155
<i>Military Extraterritorial Jurisdiction Act of 2000, 18 USC § 3261(2000)</i>	13
<i>Uniting And Strengthening America By Providing Appropriate Tools Required To Intercept And Obstruct Terrorism, Act of 2001 Pub L No 107-56, 115 Stat 272 (2001)</i>	148
<i>Securing Human Intelligence and Enforcing Lawful Dissemination Act, HR Res 703, 112th Congress (2011)</i>	151
<i>United States Code</i>	145
<i>United States Constitution</i>	139, 141, 142, 149, 161, 164, 165, 166, 168, 169, 186

Other

<i>African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights, opened for signature 27 June 1981, 1520 UNTS 217 (entered into force 21 October 1986)</i>	66
<i>Allgemeines Bürgerliches Gesetzbuch (Austrian Civil Code)</i>	59

<i>American Convention on Human Rights</i> , opened for signature 22 November 1969, 1979 UNTS 144 (entered into force 18 July 1978)	66	<i>Prevention of Corruption Act</i> (Singapore)	12
<i>Bribery Act 2010</i> (UK)	12	International Instruments	
<i>Bürgerliches Gesetzbuch</i> (German Civil Code)	59	<i>2005 World Summit Outcome</i> , GA Res 60/1, UNGAOR, 60th sess, UN Doc A/60/L.1 (24 October 2005)	39, 40
<i>Code Pénal</i> (French Penal Code)	12	<i>Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment</i> , opened for signature 10 December 1984, 1465 UNTS 85 (entered into force 26 June 1987) ...	30, 93, 126, 166
<i>Codice Civile Italiano</i> (Italian Civil Code)	59	<i>Convention of the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women</i> , opened for signature 18 December 1979, 1249 UNTS 13 (entered into force 3 September 1981)	167
<i>Código Civil de Mexico</i> (Mexican Civil Code)	59	<i>Convention on Combating the Bribery of Foreign Public Officials in International Business Transactions</i> , OECD (21 November 1997)	4, 11
<i>Código Penal Federal</i> (Mexico)	12	<i>Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness</i> , opened for signature 30 August 1961, 989 UNTS 175 (entered into force 13 December 1975)	26, 126
<i>Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms</i> , opened for signature 4 November 1950, 213 UNTS 222 (entered into force 3 September 1953)	46, 63, 66	<i>Convention on the Rights of a Child</i> , opened for signature 20 November 1987, 1577 UNTS 3 (entered into force 2 September 1990)	167
<i>Criminal Code</i> (Thailand) (1956)	13	<i>Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees</i> , opened for signature 28 July 1951, 189 UNTS 150 (entered into force 22 April 1954)	93, 126, 166, 167
<i>Criminal Code 1969</i> (Iraq)	12		
<i>Criminal Code of the Russian Federation</i> (1996)	12		
<i>Criminal Law (Codification and Reform) Act</i> (Zimbabwe) (2004)	12		
<i>Criminal Law Convention on Corruption and Additional Protocol</i> , opened for signature 27 January 1999, ETS No 173 (entered into force 1 July 2002)	4, 12		
<i>Inter-American Convention Against Corruption</i> , opened for signature 29 March 1996, Organization of American States (entered into force 6 March 1997)	4		
<i>Penal Code</i> (Japan) (1907)	13		
<i>Penal Code of Indonesia</i> (1982)	12		
<i>Penal Code</i> (Singapore, cap 224, 2008 rev ed)	12		
<i>Penal Law of Israel</i> (Israel)	13		

<i>Declaration on Principles of International Law Concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations</i> , GA Res 2625 (XXV), UNGAOR, 25th sess, 1883rd plen mtg, UN Doc A/8028 (1970) 121 (24 October 1970)	52, 53
<i>Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of Their Independence and Sovereignty</i> , GA Res 2131 (XX), 20th sess, 1408th plen mtg, UN DOC A/RES/20/2131 (21 December 1965)	53
<i>International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings</i> , opened for signature 15 December 1997, 2149 UNTS 256, (entered into force 23 May 2001)	4, 12, 93, 126, 166
<i>International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism</i> , opened for signature 9 December 1999, 2178 UNTS 197 (entered into force 10 April 2002)	4, 12, 93, 126, 166
<i>International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights</i> , Adopted and opened for signature, ratification and accession by General Assembly resolution 2200A (XXI) of 16 December 1966, (entered into force 23 March 1976)	19, 46, 48, 56, 91, 125, 166
<i>International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights</i> , opened for signature 16 December 1966, 993 UNTS 3 (entered into force 3 January 1976)	46, 47, 167
<i>Montevideo Convention on the Rights and Duties of States</i> , opened for signature on 26 December 1933 165 L.N.T.S 19	58
<i>Optional Protocol To the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the Sale of Children, Child Prostitution and Child Pornography</i> , UNGA A/RES/54/263	3
<i>Optional Protocol To the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the Sale of Children, Child Prostitution and Child Pornography</i> , opened for signature 25 May 2000, 2171 UNTS 227 (entered into force 18 January 2002)	11
<i>Protocol Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, and relating to the Protection of Victims of International Armed Conflicts (Protocol I)</i> , opened for signature 8 June 1977, 1125 UNTS 3 (entered into force 7 December 1978)	126
<i>Protocol against the Smuggling of Migrants by Land, Sea and Air</i> , opened for signature 15 November 2000, 2241 UNTS 507 (entered into force 28 January 2004)	81, 93, 125, 166
<i>Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children</i> , opened for signature 15 November 2000, 2237 UNTS 319 (entered into force 25 December 2003)	81, 93, 125, 166
<i>Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court</i> , opened for signature 17 July 1998, 2187 UNTS 3 (entered into force 1 July 2002)	15, 53, 91, 93, 126, 167
SC Res 138, UN SCOR, 15th sess, 868th mtg, UN Doc S/4349 (24 June 1960)	21
<i>United Nations Convention Against Corruption</i> , UNCAC (31 October 2003)	4, 11

<i>United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime</i> , opened for signature 15 November 2000, 2225 UNTS 209 (entered into force 29 September 2003)	125, 166
<i>United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea</i> , opened for signature 10 December 1982, 1833 UNTS 3 (entered into force 16 November 1994)	58, 117
<i>Universal Declaration on Human Rights</i> , GA Res 217A(III), UN GAOR, 3rd sess, 183rd plen mtg, UN Doc A/810 (10 December 1948)	46, 63, 66, 68

1. Introduction

1. INTRODUCING EXTRATERRITORIALITY

Assertions of extraterritorial jurisdiction provide a procedural apparatus through which the future of transnationalism can be distilled. The adjudication on exercises of extraterritoriality by domestic constitutional courts, for example, sets the stage for a broader debate as to the appropriate place of national courts in global governance and transnational crime regulation. It also calls into question the place of international law in national courts. For this reason, the regulation of extraterritorial jurisdiction has significant implications for human rights, the rule of law and international relations. It also is fertile ground for the transmogrification of traditionally private law doctrines, such as the abuse of rights doctrine, into the public law space. This is because mechanisms by which to resolve jurisdictional conflicts and jurisdictional restraints are generally more developed in the private than in the public law space. Further, the demarcation between notions of 'public' and 'private' law doctrine is generally overstated. Both are capable of informing the other, in the same way that domestic and international law frameworks are also capable of symbiosis.

The term 'extraterritoriality' is a broad concept. It is a term used differently by different authors. For example, some commentators are concerned with the extraterritorial operation of human rights law, or extraterritorial enforcement through military action. Some describe assertions of legislation that apply extraterritorially, but that have a territorial nexus, to be 'territorial' in nature. Others have considered the potential of unilateral assertions of extraterritorial jurisdiction to realise global values.¹ There is also commentary expressing a number of concerns about the unilateral exercise of extraterritorial jurisdiction, including that it is undemocratic, that it undermines meaningful multilateralism, and leads to piecemeal approaches to shared problems and the fragmentation

¹ Cedric Ryngaert, *Unilateral Jurisdiction and Global Values* (Eleven Publishing, 2015).

of international law.² Competing claims to jurisdiction can also contribute to tensions between States.³ The research that led to the writing of this book was undertaken in the context of, but separate to, this broad spectrum of commentary. The particular focus of this work is on criminal offences in domestic legislation that apply to conduct occurring, or partially occurring, outside the geographical boundaries of that State. In essence, the premise underlying the work is that the principles of law restraining extraterritoriality have not kept pace with its exercise.

2. WHAT IS EXTRATERRITORIAL JURISDICTION AND WHY DOES IT MATTER?

The term 'extraterritorial jurisdiction' describes an exercise by a State of prescriptive, adjudicative or enforcement authority over conduct outside that State's physical territory. The assertion of jurisdiction by States outside their territory can be a source of controversy and legal uncertainty. This is because the principles of jurisdiction under international law do not adequately resolve competing claims to jurisdiction and are primarily concerned with the relationship between States and not as between the State and the individual.

Under customary international law, States are entitled to exercise jurisdiction on three main bases: territoriality, nationality and universality. Put simply, the nationality principle can provide a State with grounds for jurisdiction where a victim (passive nationality) or a perpetrator (active nationality) is a national of that State. The territoriality principle may be invoked where conduct either takes place within a nation's borders (subjective territoriality), or the effects of the conduct are felt within the borders (objective territoriality). The universality principle is reserved for conduct recognised as a crime under international law, such as piracy, genocide and crimes against humanity. International law also

² See, eg, the body of work on this subject by Austen Parrish, including: Austen Parrish, 'Reclaiming International Law from Extraterritoriality' (2009) 93 *Minnesota Law Review* 815; Austen Parrish, 'The Effects Test: Extraterritoriality's Fifth Business' (2008) 61 *Vanderbilt Law Review* 1455.

³ See, eg, the tension in relations between India and Italy as a result of competing assertions of jurisdiction in the Italian Marines Case, including as reported on by Devirup Mitra, 'India, Italy Spar Over Marines Issue Again as Ad-hoc Tribunal Reviews Enrica Lexie Case', *The Wire*, 30 March 2016 <<http://thewire.in/2016/03/30/india-italy-spar-over-marines-issue-again-as-ad-hoc-tribunal-reviews-enrica-lexie-case-26752/>>.

recognises a 'protective principle', wherein a State can assert jurisdiction over foreign conduct that threatens national security. There is also some support for an 'effects principle', which gives jurisdiction over extra-territorial conduct, the effects of which are felt by a State.

While the topic of extraterritorial criminal jurisdiction has 'attracted considerable interest in recent years, largely because of concerns raised by international terrorism, fraud, and other forms of high-profile transnational crime',⁴ it has, nonetheless, 'suffered from many years of neglect, and remains largely misunderstood by the majority of criminal lawyers'.⁵ This may be because, since the emergence of the sovereign nation State, jurisdiction has generally been understood by reference to geographical borders. Assertions by States of jurisdiction over crimes occurring outside their territory, such as piracy or treason, occurred as an exception to the rule. This is particularly the case in common-law jurisdictions.⁶ The late twentieth and early twenty-first century saw an increase in transnational organised crime. States became interested in criminal activity occurring in other parts of the world, either because of the unwillingness or inability of another State to prosecute serious crime, or because it served some sort of domestic or foreign policy agenda.

In response to the increased sophistication of transnational crimes, the international community developed treaties that either called for, or permitted, extraterritorial application of some types of domestic criminal offences. For example, the *1989 Convention on the Rights of the Child* (CRC) and the *Optional Protocol on the Sale of Children, Child Prostitution and Child Pornography* together require State Parties to criminalise child prostitution whether or not the acts occur domestically or transnationally.⁷ All countries of the world but two are party to the CRC, making it one of the most universally ratified of all United Nations Conventions.⁸ Other examples include international anti-corruption frameworks: the major international treaties on anti-corruption either

⁴ Michael Hirst, *Jurisdiction and the Ambit of the Criminal Law* (Oxford University Press, 2003) 1.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Assertions of extraterritoriality in the common law world tend to be *ad hoc*. By contrast, criminal codes in European jurisdictions such as Switzerland, France, Spain and Belgium often have a generic extraterritorial reach over nationals. This is discussed in further detail in Chapter 2.

⁷ *Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the Sale of Children, Child Prostitution and Child Pornography*, UNGA A/RES/54/263, art 1, 3.

⁸ Fiona David, 'Child Sex Tourism' (Australian Institute of Criminology No 156, *Trends and Issues in Crime and Criminal Justice*, 2000).

require or permit a degree of extraterritorial jurisdiction.⁹ Treaties relating to terrorism and torture also permit some assertions of extraterritorial jurisdiction.¹⁰ Consequently, more States now have domestic offences with extraterritorial reach. As noted by the International Court of Justice in 2000:

a gradual movement towards bases of jurisdiction other than territoriality can be discerned. This slow but steady shifting to a more extensive application of extraterritorial jurisdiction by States ... has led to ... the recognition of other, non-territorially based grounds of national jurisdiction.¹¹

In essence, assertions of extraterritorial jurisdiction have become more common. While there have been several well-known and widely examined international decisions relating to extraterritoriality under international law, the reality is – in the administration of ‘everyday’ justice – it is domestic courts who are called upon to adjudicate on such exercises. More often than not, this adjudication occurs in cases, the significance of which is often overlooked by scholars and practitioners alike. Among other things, this book seeks to engage with some of those decisions.

3. THE PURPOSE OF THIS BOOK

Assertions of extraterritorial criminal jurisdiction do not often fit neatly in either the international law or domestic law regulatory ‘space’.

⁹ See, eg, *Convention on Combating the Bribery of Foreign Public Officials in International Business Transactions*, OECD (21 November 1997); *United Nations Convention Against Corruption*, opened for signature 9 December 2003, 2349 UNTS 41 (entered into force 31 October 2003); *Inter-American Convention Against Corruption*, opened for signature 29 March 1996, Organization of American States (entered into force 6 March 1997); *Criminal Law Convention on Corruption and Additional Protocol*, opened for signature 27 January 1999, ETS No 173 (entered into force 1 July 2002).

¹⁰ See *International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings*, opened for signature 12 January 1988, 2149 UTS 256 (entered into force 15 December 1997), art 6; *International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism*, opened for signature 10 January 2000, 2178 UTS 197 (entered into force 9 December 1999), art 7(1); *Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment*, opened for signature 10 December 1984, 1465 UNTS 85 (entered into force 26 June 1987), art 5.

¹¹ Joint separate opinion of Judges Higgins, Kooijmans and Buergenthal in *Democratic Republic of the Congo v Belgium (Arrest Warrant)* [2002] ICJ Rep 3, 73.

Although influenced by both, such assertions nonetheless exist in a hybrid 'third space'. For example, international criminal law frameworks exist for international crimes. Domestic law frameworks exist for territorial crimes. By contrast, domestic laws with extraterritorial scope do not fit neatly in either domestic or international law frameworks and raise issues under both. In this way, there is a third space, the regulation of which lacks clarity. In short, the preparedness of States to use extraterritorial criminal jurisdiction has outstripped the legal restraint of its exercise. This is problematic because, '[t]here is no more important way to avoid conflict than by providing clear norms as to which State can exercise authority over whom, and in what circumstances. Without that allocation of competences, all is rancour and chaos'.¹²

There is, however, little scholarly examination of the relationship between individual rights and extraterritorial jurisdiction. Research on extraterritorial procedural rights is a 'vastly underdeveloped field'.¹³ This is unfortunate because, 'by their nature extraterritorial activities take place in circumstances where individuals are extremely vulnerable'.¹⁴

In that context, while this book considers principles of jurisdiction in detail, its essential purpose is to investigate principles of jurisdictional restraint that can apply to the relationship between the State and the individual. Specifically, the means by which assertions of extraterritorial criminal jurisdiction are regulated in Australia, India and the United States are considered. These countries were chosen for comparison because each is a common-law jurisdiction with a federal system of government and a written constitution. The different approaches adopted by each are instructive of the confusion and inconsistencies that can reign in the regulation of extraterritoriality. Each points to a need to identify common themes and solutions to the problems that arise at the crossroads where international law and domestic law meet. As will be discussed in further detail in Chapter 3, a particular conception of the rule of law is adopted so as to provide criteria by which to measure the regulation of extraterritorial criminal jurisdiction in Australia, India and the United States. In this way, the analysis proceeds on the assumption that while the rule of law is a contested concept, at a bare minimum it requires:

¹² Roslyn Higgins, *Problems and Process: International Law and How We Use It* (Oxford University Press, 1994) 56.

¹³ Larry May, *Global Justice and Due Process* (Cambridge University Press, 2011) 2.

¹⁴ Ralph Wilde, 'Legal "Black Hole"? Extraterritorial State Action and International Treaty Law on Civil and Political Rights' (2005) 26 *Michigan Journal of International Law* 739, 754.