LICS
PROCEEDINGS OF LEGAL INTERNATIONAL AND STUDIES
No. ISSN : 2986-4089
Published by Universitas Islam Sultan Agung, Semarang, INDONESIA

LICS 2026
Topic: *Strengthening Legal Frameworks for Combating Human Trafficking and Enhancing Protection of Women and Children*

Harmonization of Extradition Regulations and Asset Tracing of Human Trafficking Proceeds in the Asean Region

Andri Rico Manurung
Faculty of Law, Universitas Islam Sultan Agung (UNISSULA) Semarang, Indonesia,
E-mail: manurung.arm@gmail.com

Abstract. *Trafficking in Persons (TIP) remains one of the most pervasive and profitable forms of transnational organized crime in Southeast Asia. The transnational nature of this crime enables perpetrators to exploit legal disparities among ASEAN member states, particularly in relation to extradition procedures and the recovery of criminal assets. This article examines the urgency of harmonizing extradition regulations and asset tracing mechanisms within the ASEAN region as strategic tools for combating human trafficking syndicates. Employing a normative legal research method, the study analyzes international legal instruments, regional agreements, and relevant domestic legislation governing extradition and asset recovery. The findings reveal three major challenges: the absence of a comprehensive ASEAN Extradition Treaty, legal and procedural obstacles in cross-border asset tracing and confiscation, and the lack of uniform legal standards among ASEAN member states. The study argues that effective suppression of human trafficking requires stronger regional legal integration through the harmonization of extradition frameworks, enhanced cooperation among Financial Intelligence Units (FIUs), and the strengthening of the ASEAN Mutual Legal Assistance Treaty (MLAT). Such measures would facilitate the apprehension of offenders, accelerate cross-border asset recovery, and support victim restitution. Ultimately, a coherent and coordinated regional legal framework is essential to ensure that traffickers cannot evade justice or retain the proceeds of their crimes within ASEAN jurisdictions.*

Keywords: *ASEAN; Asset Recovery; Asset Tracing; Extradition; Mutual Legal Assistance, Trafficking in Persons (TIP).*

LICS
PROCEEDINGS OF LEGAL INTERNATIONAL AND STUDIES
No. ISSN : 2986-4089
Published by Universitas Islam Sultan Agung, Semarang, INDONESIA

LICS 2026
Topic: *Strengthening Legal Frameworks for Combating Human Trafficking and Enhancing Protection of Women and Children*

1. Introduction

Human Trafficking (Trafficking in Persons/TIP) is one of the most degrading transnational crimes against human dignity in the modern era. As a contemporary manifestation of slavery, TIP systematically deprives individuals of their freedom, exploits economic vulnerabilities, and destroys the future of millions of people for the sake of generating unlimited financial gain. Unlike conventional crimes that are local and sporadic in nature, human trafficking has evolved into a highly organized global criminal industry. This illicit industry operates across national borders, exploits legal loopholes, and continues to flourish under the influence of globalization, which facilitates the movement of people and capital across continents.

Within the global crime landscape, Southeast Asia (ASEAN) occupies a particularly strategic position and frequently attracts international attention. ASEAN's geographical location as a major global crossroads, combined with its diverse socio-economic conditions, has made the region one of the principal centers of human trafficking activities. Economic disparities among ASEAN member states create strong push and pull factors. Poverty, limited employment opportunities, and low educational attainment in several developing countries serve as push factors, while the demand for inexpensive labor and entertainment industries in more prosperous countries acts as a pull factor exploited by criminal syndicates.

The evolution of this crime has transformed human trafficking syndicates into sophisticated multinational criminal enterprises that operate beyond national borders. Their operational patterns are designed to maximize profits while minimizing legal risks. Victims are often recruited from economically vulnerable countries such as Indonesia or Myanmar through local brokers and deceptive promises. Subsequently, they are smuggled across borders and subjected to forced labor or exploitation in economically more developed neighboring countries such as Malaysia or Thailand. Meanwhile, the proceeds of these crimes, amounting to billions of dollars, are not retained at the location of exploitation but are instead laundered and accumulated in international financial centers that offer advanced banking facilities, such as Singapore.[1]

This fragmentation of criminal activities demonstrates the sophistication of the masterminds behind human trafficking syndicates. They deliberately separate the locations of recruitment, exploitation, and asset storage to evade law enforcement detection. Under such circumstances, law enforcement authorities in source countries such as Indonesia are often unable to dismantle trafficking networks comprehensively. Domestic law enforcement efforts frequently result only in the arrest of low-level recruiters or transportation facilitators, while the principal perpetrators remain beyond the reach of justice in foreign jurisdictions.

To dismantle transnational trafficking syndicates effectively, law enforcement agencies can no longer rely solely on conventional domestic legal instruments. Two complementary mechanisms are essential: extradition and asset tracing. Extradition is necessary to secure the return of masterminds from foreign jurisdictions for prosecution, while asset tracing is vital for identifying, freezing, and confiscating criminal proceeds. Depriving syndicates of their financial resources is the most effective means of disabling their operational infrastructure while simultaneously providing funds for victim restitution.

However, significant obstacles remain within the ASEAN region. ASEAN comprises ten sovereign states with diverse colonial legacies and legal traditions. Countries such as Indonesia and Thailand primarily follow the Civil Law system inherited from continental European influences, emphasizing codified legal rules. In contrast, Malaysia and Singapore adhere to the Common Law tradition derived from British legal heritage, placing greater emphasis on judicial precedents. These fundamental differences in legal interpretation and criminal procedures create substantial barriers to cross-border cooperation.[2]

In practice, these legal disparities often hinder extradition processes. Requests for the extradition of trafficking masterminds are frequently delayed or rejected due to the principle of dual criminality, which requires the alleged conduct to constitute a criminal offense in both jurisdictions. Differences in legal definitions of exploitation, evidentiary standards, and trafficking-related offenses often generate lengthy legal disputes between prosecuting authorities, allowing suspects additional opportunities to evade prosecution.

Similar challenges arise in cross-border asset tracing and asset freezing efforts. When the Indonesian Financial Transaction Reports and Analysis Center (PPATK) detects suspicious financial flows linked to trafficking syndicates in neighboring countries, attempts to seize such assets often encounter strict bank secrecy regulations. Financial institutions typically require valid domestic court orders before disclosing customer information, creating additional procedural barriers. Criminal actors are fully aware of these legal loopholes and frequently exploit them to shield illicit wealth from confiscation.

Accordingly, the harmonization of extradition and asset tracing regulations within ASEAN has become an urgent necessity. Harmonization does not imply the unification of all national legal systems into a single framework, as such an approach would be incompatible with state sovereignty. Rather, it refers to the alignment of procedural standards, the establishment of common definitions concerning trafficking offenses, and the elimination of unnecessary administrative barriers to facilitate efficient cooperation, information exchange, and cross-border asset recovery.

Although ASEAN already possesses legal cooperation mechanisms such as the ASEAN Mutual Legal Assistance Treaty (MLAT), their implementation remains bureaucratic, rigid, and often unable to keep pace with the technological sophistication of criminal syndicates.[3] Against this backdrop, this article seeks to analyze the legal dynamics and obstacles associated with cross-border cooperation and to propose strategic approaches for regional legal harmonization. Such efforts are necessary to ensure that ASEAN ceases to be a safe haven for human traffickers and their illicit assets and instead becomes a region committed to safeguarding human dignity and fundamental rights.

2. Research Methods

This study employs a normative legal research method, which focuses on legal texts, legal principles, and legal theories as its primary objects of analysis.[4] The research adopts a statutory approach to examine positive laws and international legal instruments, as well as comparative and conceptual approaches to analyze the necessity of legal harmonization within ASEAN.

All data utilized in this research consist of secondary sources collected through library research. Primary legal materials include international instruments such as the United Nations Convention Against Transnational Organized Crime (UNTOC), the ASEAN MLAT, and national legislation concerning extradition and human trafficking. Secondary legal materials comprise scholarly books, academic journals, and other scientific publications. The collected data are analyzed using a descriptive-qualitative approach to formulate logical, systematic, and comprehensible arguments regarding appropriate harmonization strategies.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. Dynamics and Challenges of Extradition in the ASEAN Region

Extradition is a fundamental instrument of international criminal justice, generally defined as the formal surrender of a suspect or convicted person from the state in which they have sought refuge to a state that possesses lawful jurisdiction to prosecute or punish them. In the context of combating Trafficking in Persons (TIP), extradition serves as a legal bridge connecting delayed justice with the masterminds who intentionally hide behind the sovereign borders of other states. Without a robust and binding extradition mechanism, state sovereignty can easily become a protective shield for transnational criminals. Unfortunately, returning a human trafficking fugitive to the requesting state is far from simple. The process is frequently complicated by differences in legal systems, jurisdictional interests, and political considerations among states.

Within Southeast Asia, extradition faces substantial structural challenges. The primary obstacle stems from the fact that ASEAN has not yet established a comprehensive and legally binding ASEAN Extradition Treaty applicable to all ten member states. Although discussions concerning such a treaty have existed for many years, progress has been slow due to concerns among certain states regarding the potential impact on national sovereignty. The absence of a uniform regional legal framework has rendered law enforcement efforts against mobile transnational criminal syndicates vulnerable, inefficient, and often ineffective.

As a direct consequence of the absence of a multilateral extradition agreement, the return of fugitives within ASEAN largely depends on bilateral treaties between individual states.[5] Indonesia, for example, does not currently maintain extradition treaties with every ASEAN member state. This situation creates legal gaps that are carefully exploited by human trafficking syndicates. Criminal masterminds often identify jurisdictions that lack extradition arrangements with Indonesia and use them as safe havens from which they can continue directing criminal operations.

When an Indonesian trafficking suspect flees to a country without an extradition treaty with Indonesia, the process of securing their return becomes heavily dependent upon diplomatic negotiations rather than clear legal procedures.

Indonesian authorities must rely on political dialogue, high-level diplomatic engagement, or the uncertain principle of reciprocity. Such ad hoc approaches are time-consuming, costly, and susceptible to fluctuations in bilateral political relations.

An equally significant challenge is the requirement of dual criminality. This universally recognized principle requires the conduct underlying the extradition request to constitute a criminal offense in both the requesting and requested states. Given ASEAN's diverse legal traditions including Civil Law systems in countries such as Indonesia and Common Law systems in countries such as Malaysia and Singapore reconciling the legal elements of trafficking offenses often becomes a contentious issue.

In trafficking cases, defense attorneys frequently exploit differences in legal definitions to oppose extradition requests. Concepts such as "exploitation," "victim consent," and distinctions between migrant smuggling and human trafficking may vary significantly across jurisdictions. If authorities in the requested state conclude that the conduct in question constitutes merely an immigration violation rather than a serious criminal offense, an extradition request may be rejected on the grounds that the dual criminality requirement has not been satisfied.

Beyond legal technicalities, extradition processes may also be influenced by political and economic interests. Modern trafficking syndicates often launder criminal proceeds through investments, real estate acquisitions, and ostensibly legitimate business enterprises within the jurisdictions where they operate. Consequently, local authorities may be reluctant to extradite certain individuals if doing so is perceived as potentially affecting investment flows or economic stability. Such considerations undermine the pursuit of justice and weaken efforts to protect trafficking victims.

To address these persistent challenges, ASEAN member states must move beyond narrow jurisdictional concerns and actively pursue the adoption of a comprehensive ASEAN Extradition Treaty. Such a treaty would establish standardized procedures, enhance legal certainty, accelerate the surrender of offenders, and reduce opportunities for political interference. A binding regional extradition framework would send a clear message that no part of Southeast Asia can serve as a sanctuary for perpetrators of human trafficking.

3.2. The Urgency of Asset Tracing in Human Trafficking Cases

Within contemporary criminal justice systems, imprisoning offenders alone is no longer considered sufficient to combat organized transnational crime, particularly when criminal assets remain intact and accessible. Human trafficking is fundamentally a profit-driven criminal enterprise. As long as financial resources remain available, trafficking syndicates can continue operating, corrupt public officials, and finance the recruitment of new members. Consequently, criminal punishment must be accompanied by measures aimed at depriving offenders of their illicit wealth.

One of the most effective approaches adopted internationally is the "follow the money" strategy. Rather than focusing exclusively on low-level facilitators who can easily be replaced, law enforcement agencies increasingly prioritize the identification and tracing of financial flows that sustain criminal organizations. Through financial investigations, authorities can uncover organizational structures, identify corrupt collaborators, and ultimately determine who benefits most from the exploitation of victims.

This approach is implemented through asset tracing, a financial intelligence process designed to identify, locate, and recover criminal proceeds. Asset tracing requires detailed investigations into financial transactions and ownership structures. International trafficking syndicates rarely retain profits in cash form. Instead, criminal proceeds are commonly laundered through legitimate-looking investments, including luxury real estate, corporate shareholdings, shell companies, and offshore bank accounts.

The digital era has introduced new complexities into asset tracing efforts. Human trafficking syndicates increasingly utilize financial technologies such as cryptocurrencies and blockchain-based transfer systems to conceal transaction records. Proceeds generated through victim exploitation in one country can be converted into digital assets, transferred across multiple jurisdictions within seconds, and converted back into conventional currency elsewhere. Such developments require law enforcement agencies to possess advanced expertise in cyber-financial forensics.

Unfortunately, cross-border asset tracing within ASEAN remains particularly challenging because member states maintain different standards regarding banking confidentiality and financial disclosure. Certain jurisdictions intentionally provide strong protections for customer confidentiality as part of broader efforts to attract international capital. Consequently, financial institutions frequently refuse to disclose transaction records or account ownership information to foreign authorities unless compelled by domestic judicial orders.

These legal barriers create significant operational difficulties. When Indonesia's Financial Transaction Reports and Analysis Center (PPATK) identifies suspicious transfers linked to human trafficking, it generally lacks the authority to directly freeze accounts held abroad. Instead, Indonesian authorities must rely on international cooperation mechanisms to obtain assistance from foreign jurisdictions.

The principal mechanism available for this purpose is Mutual Legal Assistance (MLA). However, MLA procedures are often criticized as bureaucratic and time-consuming. Requests frequently pass through multiple institutions, including police agencies, prosecutors' offices, ministries of justice, and ministries of foreign affairs before reaching foreign authorities through diplomatic channels. Such processes may require months to complete.

This delay provides substantial advantages to criminal actors. During the time required to process MLA requests, traffickers may transfer, conceal, or dissipate assets. Consequently, by the time authorization for asset freezing is granted, the targeted accounts may no longer contain recoverable funds.

For this reason, simplifying cross-border asset tracing and asset freezing procedures has become an urgent priority. Successful asset confiscation not only weakens criminal organizations but also promotes substantive justice for victims. Confiscated assets represent a crucial source of funding for victim restitution programs, enabling compensation for physical, psychological, and economic harm. Without effective asset recovery mechanisms, criminal justice systems risk providing only symbolic justice through imprisonment while neglecting victims' long-term recovery needs.

3.3. Strategies for Harmonizing Extradition and Asset Tracing Regulations

Addressing the systemic challenges arising from sovereignty concerns, bureaucratic delays, and restrictive banking secrecy laws requires comprehensive regulatory reform. ASEAN must move beyond conventional law enforcement approaches and adopt a harmonization strategy that prioritizes victim protection and regional cooperation. The objective is not to unify national criminal codes but rather to establish common operational standards that facilitate efficient cross-border enforcement.

The first strategic measure involves strengthening the role and capacity of Financial Intelligence Units (FIUs) throughout ASEAN. Institutions such as Indonesia's PPATK should be empowered to engage in direct agency-to-agency cooperation with their regional counterparts. Through secure and integrated communication networks, FIUs could exchange intelligence, monitor suspicious financial activities, and identify criminal assets in near real time.

Such direct cooperation would significantly reduce dependence on slow diplomatic procedures. Fast-track communication channels would enable authorities to respond rapidly to suspicious transactions and implement temporary freezing measures before assets are withdrawn or transferred to alternative financial platforms.

The second strategic priority is the modernization of the ASEAN Mutual Legal Assistance Treaty (ASEAN MLAT). Existing provisions should be revised to include detailed regulations concerning cross-border asset confiscation. A modernized framework should establish clear and standardized procedures governing the identification, seizure, management, and recovery of criminal assets throughout ASEAN.

A particularly important reform would involve the adoption of the principle of mutual recognition of confiscation orders. Under this approach, a final court order issued in one ASEAN member state requiring the confiscation of trafficking-related assets would be recognized and enforced directly by other member states. This would eliminate the need for repetitive judicial proceedings and significantly accelerate asset recovery efforts.

In addition to regulatory reforms, harmonization requires closer operational integration between extradition procedures and asset tracing mechanisms. Cross-border enforcement actions should be coordinated to ensure that arrests, extradition proceedings, and asset freezing measures occur simultaneously whenever possible. Such synchronization minimizes opportunities for suspects to conceal or transfer assets after learning of impending legal action.

Furthermore, ASEAN member states should negotiate an Asset Sharing Agreement governing the allocation and management of confiscated assets. Such an agreement should establish that victim compensation and restitution constitute the highest priority in the distribution of recovered funds. Remaining assets could then be allocated among participating states to support regional anti-trafficking initiatives, joint task forces, and capacity-building programs.

Ultimately, combining efficient extradition procedures with transparent and effective asset tracing mechanisms would generate a powerful deterrent effect against human trafficking syndicates. By depriving offenders of both their freedom and their illicit wealth, ASEAN can simultaneously strengthen law enforcement, enhance victim protection, and reinforce regional commitments to human rights. Through regulatory harmonization, Southeast Asia can transform itself into a region where modern forms of slavery find no refuge and where justice extends beyond national borders.

4. Conclusion

Trafficking in Persons is a transnational crime that exploits human beings for illicit financial gain across national borders. Differences among legal systems within ASEAN have inadvertently provided opportunities for criminal masterminds to evade prosecution and conceal illicit assets. Therefore, the harmonization of extradition regulations and asset tracing mechanisms constitutes a critical strategy for dismantling human trafficking syndicates. ASEAN member states should overcome jurisdictional rivalries and bureaucratic obstacles by accelerating the adoption of a comprehensive ASEAN Extradition Treaty and strengthening the ASEAN Mutual Legal Assistance framework to facilitate the rapid freezing and confiscation of criminal assets. Only by ensuring that traffickers have neither safe havens nor access to their illicit wealth can meaningful victim protection, restitution, and the restoration of human dignity be fully realized.

5. References

Journals:

Eddyono, Supriyadi Widodo. "Tantangan Pemenuhan Hak Restitusi dan Bantuan Lintas Batas bagi Korban TPPO di Indonesia." *Jurnal Hukum Ius Quia Iustum*, Vol. 26, No. 2 (2019): 245-267.

Fajar, Mukti. "Efektivitas Bantuan Hukum Timbal Balik (MLA) dalam Membongkar Sindikat Perdagangan Anak." *Arena Hukum*, Vol. 13, No. 1 (2020): 88-105.

Gosita, Arif. "Urgensi Perlindungan Korban Kejahatan Transnasional melalui Mutual Legal Assistance dan Ekstradisi." *Jurnal Hukum dan Pembangunan*, Vol. 41, No. 2 (2011): 190-210.

Putri, Rika Saraswati. "Kendala Birokrasi Diplomatik dalam Pengembalian Aset Tindak Pidana Perdagangan Orang di ASEAN." *Jurnal Konstitusi*, Vol. 19, No. 4 (2022): 845-867.

Susanto, Eko Hadi. "Implementasi Kebijakan Mutual Legal Assistance dan Pelacakan Aset Antara Indonesia dan Negara ASEAN: Studi Kasus

Perdagangan Manusia." *Jurnal Kajian Hukum dan Keadilan*, Vol. 5, No. 3 (2022): 312-328.

Books:

Arief, Barda Nawawi. *Bunga Rampai Kebijakan Hukum Pidana: Perkembangan Penyusunan Konsep KUHP Baru*. Jakarta: Kencana, 2024.

Atmasasmita, Romli. *Sistem Peradilan Pidana Kontemporer dan Reformasi KUHAP*. Jakarta: Kencana, 2023.

Marzuki, Peter Mahmud. *Penelitian Hukum*. Jakarta: Kencana, 2017.

Parthiana, I Wayan. *Hukum Pidana Internasional dan Ekstradisi*. Bandung: Yrama Widya, 2004.

Rahardjo, Satjipto. *Hukum Progresif: Sebuah Sintesa Hukum Indonesia*. Yogyakarta: Genta Publishing, 2009.

Regulation:

Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 1 of 1979 concerning Extradition.

Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 21 of 2007 concerning the Eradication of the Crime of Trafficking in Persons.

The 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia.

Treaty on Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters Among Like-Minded ASEAN Member Countries (ASEAN MLAT, 2004).

United Nations Convention Against Transnational Organized Crime (UNTOC) and the Palermo Protocol on Trafficking in Persons.