Mutual legal assistance and extradition

Dr Alexander Ressos, TEP
Attorney-at-Law (Switzerland and Germany),
Solicitor (England & Wales and Hong Kong)
Of Counsel, KGP Legal LLC
alexander.ressos@kgplegal.com.sg
www.ressos.com.sg

The Mutual Assistance in Criminal Matters Act 2000

The Mutual Assistance in Criminal Matters Act 2000 (MACMA) is the principal statute for cooperation with foreign prosecutors. Its long title describes its purpose as facilitating "the provision and obtaining of international assistance in criminal matters". The Attorney-General is the central authority in both directions: requests from Singapore "may be made only by the Attorney-General", while every request from a foreign country must be made to him.[1]

The Act distinguishes between two groups of countries. Some forms of assistance, such as the taking of evidence, are available to any foreign country. Others, including production orders, search and seizure and the enforcement of confiscation orders, are reserved for "prescribed" foreign countries, which the Minister may declare where a treaty, memorandum of understanding or other agreement on assistance is in force. A country that is not prescribed may still receive certain forms of assistance if it undertakes to comply with a future reciprocal request from Singapore.[2] The structure reflects the importance Singapore attaches to reciprocity, a theme that recurs in its regulatory diplomacy.

© 2026 Dr Alexander Ressos. General information only, not legal, tax or investment advice. No client relationship is created. All Singapore law advice is provided by a duly licensed and regulated firm of Singapore advocates and solicitors only on the basis of an express written letter of engagement. More information at SingaporeIQ.com and ressos.com.sg.

Grounds for refusal and dual criminality

The Attorney-General must refuse a request in a series of cases set out in section 20(1). They include offences "of a political character", purely military offences, requests made to prejudice a person on grounds of race, religion, sex, ethnic origin, nationality or political opinion, cases in which the person has already been convicted, acquitted or pardoned for the same conduct, offences that are "not of sufficient gravity" and assistance that would be "contrary to public interest". He may also refuse where assistance would impose an "excessive burden" on Singapore's resources or prejudice the safety of any person.[3]

For the coercive forms of assistance, dual criminality applies. A request for a production order, a search warrant or the enforcement of a confiscation order must be refused where the conduct "would not have constituted a Singapore offence" had it occurred in Singapore. Subsections (4) and (5) contain specific rules for foreign tax evasion offences.[4] These provisions belong to the reforms by which Singapore made serious tax crimes predicate offences for money laundering and opened its banking system to foreign tax authorities, a development that Chapter II of Part E traces.

Production orders and the protection of evidence

Production orders show how the Act protects both the foreign investigation and the persons concerned. A prescribed foreign country may request an order requiring a person in Singapore to produce a thing for a criminal matter abroad. Where a financial institution is involved, the application goes to the General Division of the High Court. The court must be satisfied that there are reasonable grounds to suspect that a specified person carried on or benefited from a foreign offence, that the thing is likely to be "of substantial value" to the foreign matter and is not subject to legal privilege, and that production is not contrary to the public interest. Failure to comply without reasonable excuse, or the production of materially false or misleading material, is punishable with a fine of up to S$10,000 or imprisonment for up to two years.[5]

© 2026 Dr Alexander Ressos. General information only, not legal, tax or investment advice. No client relationship is created. All Singapore law advice is provided by a duly licensed and regulated firm of Singapore advocates and solicitors only on the basis of an express written letter of engagement. More information at SingaporeIQ.com and ressos.com.sg.

A foreign country that receives documents must undertake to restrict their use to the stated purpose and to return or dispose of them on request. Without such an undertaking, the request must be refused.[6] For banks, these rules mean that client documents leave Singapore only after a judicial decision. The client is not usually notified in advance, yet the order rests on findings that the court has made on the record.

The Extradition Act 1968

Extradition is governed by the Extradition Act 1968, which dates from the first years of independence. An extradition offence must carry "a maximum punishment of imprisonment for not less than 2 years or any more severe punishment". The Act applies to a foreign State only when the Minister so directs by notification in the Gazette, which in practice presupposes a treaty. Every fugitive from such a State is then liable to be apprehended and surrendered, subject to the conditions of the Act and of the treaty.[7]

The classic restrictions apply. No person may be surrendered for an offence "of a political character", and surrender requires that the law of the requesting State or a treaty prevent the person from being tried for other offences committed before surrender, the rule of specialty. Separate parts deal with declared Commonwealth territories and with Malaysia. A duly authenticated Malaysian warrant may be endorsed by a Magistrate and executed in Singapore, although the Magistrate may refuse or delay surrender where it would be unjust or oppressive.[8] The endorsement of warrants is a legacy of the common legal history of Singapore and Malaysia, which Part C describes.

Treaties and the gaps between them

Singapore's network of extradition treaties is narrower than that of the major European financial centres. For many years the absence of a treaty with Indonesia was a source of tension, since Indonesian businessmen accused of corruption or banking fraud after the Asian financial crisis were said to have found refuge in

© 2026 Dr Alexander Ressos. General information only, not legal, tax or investment advice. No client relationship is created. All Singapore law advice is provided by a duly licensed and regulated firm of Singapore advocates and solicitors only on the basis of an express written letter of engagement. More information at SingaporeIQ.com and ressos.com.sg.

Singapore. An extradition treaty was finally signed at the leaders' retreat in January 2022, together with a defence cooperation agreement.[9] It has since entered into force.[10] Chapter IV of Part I returns to the relations with the two near neighbours.

Where no extradition treaty exists, mutual legal assistance and deportation fill part of the gap. In the money laundering case of 2023, the convicted foreign nationals were deported to Cambodia, Japan and the United Kingdom between May and July 2024 after serving their sentences.[11] Deportation is an administrative measure without the guarantees of extradition. It does not ensure that the person faces trial for any offences committed elsewhere.

Cooperation between regulators and intelligence units

Formal mutual legal assistance is only one channel. The Suspicious Transaction Reporting Office, Singapore's financial intelligence unit established under section 5 of the CDSA, may pass information to a foreign corresponding authority where it may be relevant to the investigation of a foreign serious offence. The conditions include an arrangement with that authority and undertakings on confidentiality and use, including that the information will not be used as evidence.[12] Financial intelligence can therefore move quickly, while evidence for court must still travel through the slower channel of a formal request.

Supervisory cooperation forms a third channel. When the Monetary Authority of Singapore directed BSI Bank to close its Singapore operations on 24 May 2016, the first withdrawal of a merchant bank status since 1984, it announced financial penalties of S$13.3 million for 41 breaches of MAS Notice 1014. It referred six members of the bank's senior management and staff to the Public Prosecutor and stated that it was "working closely with the Swiss Financial Market Supervisory Authority (FINMA)" on the orderly closure.[13] A supervisory measure, a criminal referral and coordination with the home supervisor of a Swiss bank thus formed one package, the pattern that Part E examines in more detail.

© 2026 Dr Alexander Ressos. General information only, not legal, tax or investment advice. No client relationship is created. All Singapore law advice is provided by a duly licensed and regulated firm of Singapore advocates and solicitors only on the basis of an express written letter of engagement. More information at SingaporeIQ.com and ressos.com.sg.

Notes

1. Mutual Assistance in Criminal Matters Act 2000, long title, ss 7 and 19(1) (text as reproduced on lawplayer.com, accessed November 2026). ↩
2. MACMA, ss 16(1), 16(2)(b) and 17(1) (text as reproduced on lawplayer.com, accessed November 2026). ↩
3. MACMA, s 20(1) (text as reproduced on lawplayer.com, accessed November 2026); MACMA, s 20(2) (text as reproduced on lawplayer.com, accessed November 2026). ↩
4. MACMA, s 20(3) (text as reproduced on lawplayer.com, accessed November 2026); MACMA, s 20(4) and (5) (text as reproduced on lawplayer.com, accessed November 2026). ↩
5. MACMA, s 22(1), (2) and (4) (text as reproduced on lawplayer.com, accessed November 2026); MACMA, s 25 (text as reproduced on lawplayer.com, accessed November 2026). ↩
6. MACMA, s 20(2A) (text as reproduced on lawplayer.com, accessed November 2026). ↩
7. Extradition Act 1968, s 2(1), definition of "extradition offence" (text as reproduced on lawplayer.com, accessed November 2026); Extradition Act 1968, ss 4(1) and 7(1) (text as reproduced on lawplayer.com, accessed November 2026). ↩
8. Extradition Act 1968, ss 8(1) and 8(2)(c) (text as reproduced on lawplayer.com, accessed November 2026); Extradition Act 1968, Part 5 (ss 27–30, Commonwealth territories) and Part 6 (ss 32–39, Malaysia), in particular ss 33(1) and 36 (text as reproduced on lawplayer.com, accessed November 2026). ↩
9. Wikipedia, "Indonesia–Singapore relations" (accessed November 2026): extradition treaty signed at the "5th Singapore–Indonesia Leader's Retreat" in January 2022, under which the two countries "will grant extradition for a

© 2026 Dr Alexander Ressos. General information only, not legal, tax or investment advice. No client relationship is created. All Singapore law advice is provided by a duly licensed and regulated firm of Singapore advocates and solicitors only on the basis of an express written letter of engagement. More information at SingaporeIQ.com and ressos.com.sg.

comprehensive list of extraditable offences"; defence cooperation agreement signed at the same retreat. ↩

10. Entry into force of the Singapore–Indonesia extradition treaty in March 2024 and its retrospective coverage of offences committed up to 18 years earlier. ↩
11. Wikipedia, "2023 Singapore money laundering case" (accessed November 2026): deportation of Wang Baosen and Su Wenqiang to Cambodia on 6 May 2024, of Su Haijin and Su Baolin to Cambodia and Vang Shuiming to Japan on 1 June 2024, of Zhang Ruijin, Chen Qingyuan and Lin Baoying to Cambodia on 15 June 2024, of Wang Dehai to the United Kingdom on 6 July 2024 and of Su Jianfeng to Cambodia on 26 July 2024. ↩
12. CDSA, ss 5(1) and 48 (text as reproduced on lawplayer.com, accessed November 2026). ↩
13. MAS, "MAS directs BSI Bank to shut down in Singapore", media release, 24 May 2016, mas.gov.sg. ↩

Disclaimer

This article is provided for general information only. It is based on publicly available sources as at its date of publication. These sources have not been independently verified against licences, regulatory registers or the records of the entities concerned. It is not legal, tax, financial or investment advice. Nor is it a recommendation to invest in, transact with or use the services of any entity mentioned. Law and regulation change frequently, so the content may be incomplete or outdated. To the fullest extent permitted by law, Dr Alexander Ressos and the publisher of SingaporeIQ exclude all liability for loss or damage arising from the use of or reliance on this article. Readers should obtain advice on their specific circumstances before acting or refraining from action.

Names and trademarks of the entities discussed belong to their owners and are used for identification only. Their mention implies no endorsement, affiliation or allegation of wrongdoing. All Singapore law advice is provided by a duly licensed and regulated firm of Singapore advocates and solicitors only on the basis of an express written letter of engagement. Corrections and updates: contact@ressos.com.

© 2026 Dr Alexander Ressos. General information only, not legal, tax or investment advice. No client relationship is created. All Singapore law advice is provided by a duly licensed and regulated firm of Singapore advocates and solicitors only on the basis of an express written letter of engagement. More information at SingaporeIQ.com and ressos.com.sg.

© 2026 Dr Alexander Ressos. This article may be quoted with attribution to SingaporeIQ (SingaporeIQ.com). Reproduction in full and any commercial use require prior written consent. The Legal Terms at https://singaporeiq.com/legal-terms apply.

Author contact: Dr Alexander Ressos, TEP · contact@ressos.com

© 2026 Dr Alexander Ressos. General information only, not legal, tax or investment advice. No client relationship is created. All Singapore law advice is provided by a duly licensed and regulated firm of Singapore advocates and solicitors only on the basis of an express written letter of engagement. More information at SingaporeIQ.com and ressos.com.sg.