

trial as required by amendment VI of the Constitution.

(Added Pub. L. 93-619, title I, § 101, Jan. 3, 1975, 88 Stat. 2085.)

§ 3174. Judicial emergency and implementation

(a) In the event that any district court is unable to comply with the time limits set forth in section 3161(c) due to the status of its court calendars, the chief judge, where the existing resources are being efficiently utilized, may, after seeking the recommendations of the planning group, apply to the judicial council of the circuit for a suspension of such time limits as provided in subsection (b). The judicial council of the circuit shall evaluate the capabilities of the district, the availability of visiting judges from within and without the circuit, and make any recommendations it deems appropriate to alleviate calendar congestion resulting from the lack of resources.

(b) If the judicial council of the circuit finds that no remedy for such congestion is reasonably available, such council may, upon application by the chief judge of a district, grant a suspension of the time limits in section 3161(c) in such district for a period of time not to exceed one year for the trial of cases for which indictments or informations are filed during such one-year period. During such period of suspension, the time limits from arrest to indictment, set forth in section 3161(b), shall not be reduced, nor shall the sanctions set forth in section 3162 be suspended; but such time limits from indictment to trial shall not be increased to exceed one hundred and eighty days. The time limits for the trial of cases of detained persons who are being detained solely because they are awaiting trial shall not be affected by the provisions of this section.

(c)(1) If, prior to July 1, 1980, the chief judge of any district concludes, with the concurrence of the planning group convened in the district, that the district is prepared to implement the provisions of section 3162 in their entirety, he may apply to the judicial council of the circuit in which the district is located to implement such provisions. Such application shall show the degree of compliance in the district with the time limits set forth in subsections (b) and (c) of section 3161 during the twelve-calendar-month period preceding the date of such application and shall contain a proposed order and schedule for such implementation, which includes the date on which the provisions of section 3162 are to become effective in the district, the effect such implementation will have upon such district's practices and procedures, and provision for adequate notice to all interested parties.

(2) After review of any such application, the judicial council of the circuit shall enter an order implementing the provisions of section 3162 in their entirety in the district making application, or shall return such application to the chief judge of such district, together with an explanation setting forth such council's reasons for refusing to enter such order.

(d)(1) The approval of any application made pursuant to subsection (a) or (c) by a judicial council of a circuit shall be reported within ten

days to the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, together with a copy of the application, a written report setting forth in sufficient detail the reasons for granting such application, and, in the case of an application made pursuant to subsection (a), a proposal for alleviating congestion in the district.

(2) The Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall not later than ten days after receipt transmit such report to the Congress and to the Judicial Conference of the United States. The judicial council of the circuit shall not grant a suspension to any district within six months following the expiration of a prior suspension without the consent of the Congress by Act of Congress. The limitation on granting a suspension made by this paragraph shall not apply with respect to any judicial district in which the prior suspension is in effect on the date of the enactment of the Speedy Trial Act Amendments Act of 1979.

(e) If the chief judge of the district court concludes that the need for suspension of time limits in such district under this section is of great urgency, he may order the limits suspended for a period not to exceed thirty days. Within ten days of entry of such order, the chief judge shall apply to the judicial council of the circuit for a suspension pursuant to subsection (a).

(Added Pub. L. 93-619, title I, § 101, Jan. 3, 1975, 88 Stat. 2085; amended Pub. L. 96-43, § 10, Aug. 2, 1979, 93 Stat. 331.)

Editorial Notes

REFERENCES IN TEXT

The date of enactment of the Speedy Trial Act Amendments Act of 1979, referred to in subsec. (d)(2), means the date of enactment of Pub. L. 96-43, which was approved Aug. 2, 1979.

AMENDMENTS

1979—Pub. L. 96-43, § 10(6), inserted “and implementation” in section catchline.

Subsec. (a). Pub. L. 96-43, § 10(1), inserted “as provided by subsection (b)”.

Subsec. (b). Pub. L. 96-43, § 10(2), (3), substituted provisions authorizing the circuit judicial council, upon application of the chief judge of a district, to grant a suspension of the time limits prescribed by section 3161(c) of this title for provisions requiring such circuit council to apply to the Judicial Council of the United States for a suspension of such time limits and substituted provision placing a one hundred and eighty day limit on any time increase from indictment to trial for provision placing such limit for any increase from arraignment to trial.

Subsec. (c). Pub. L. 96-43, § 10(4), substituted provisions authorizing the chief judge of any district, with the approval of the planning group convened in such district, to apply to the circuit council to implement the provisions of section 3162 of this title at any time prior to the date the sanctions prescribed therein were to become effective, so long as there was concurrence that the district was prepared to fully implement the provisions of such section for provisions specifying the reporting requirements of this chapter, assuring involvement of the Congress in the suspension process, and guaranteeing that there be an interval of at least six months between consecutive suspension periods. See subsec. (d) of this section.

Subsecs. (d), (e). Pub. L. 96-43, § 10(5), added subsecs. (d) and (e).

CHAPTER 209—EXTRADITION

- Sec.
 3181. Scope and limitation of chapter.
 3182. Fugitives from State or Territory to State, District, or Territory.
 3183. Fugitives from State, Territory, or Possession into extraterritorial jurisdiction of United States.
 3184. Fugitives from foreign country to United States.
 3185. Fugitives from country under control of United States into the United States.
 3186. Secretary of State to surrender fugitive.
 3187. Provisional arrest and detention within extraterritorial jurisdiction.
 3188. Time of commitment pending extradition.
 3189. Place and character of hearing.
 3190. Evidence on hearing.
 3191. Witnesses for indigent fugitives.
 3192. Protection of accused.
 3193. Receiving agent's authority over offenders.
 3194. Transportation of fugitive by receiving agent.
 3195. Payment of fees and costs.
 3196. Extradition of United States citizens.

Editorial Notes**AMENDMENTS**

1996—Pub. L. 104-294, title VI, § 601(f)(9), (10), Oct. 11, 1996, 110 Stat. 3500, inserted comma after “District” in item 3182 and after “Territory” in item 3183.

1990—Pub. L. 101-623, § 11(b), Nov. 21, 1990, 104 Stat. 3356, added item 3196.

§ 3181. Scope and limitation of chapter

(a) The provisions of this chapter relating to the surrender of persons who have committed crimes in foreign countries shall continue in force only during the existence of any treaty of extradition with such foreign government.

(b) The provisions of this chapter shall be construed to permit, in the exercise of comity, the surrender of persons, other than citizens, nationals, or permanent residents of the United States, who have committed crimes of violence against nationals of the United States in foreign countries without regard to the existence of any treaty of extradition with such foreign government if the Attorney General certifies, in writing, that—

(1) evidence has been presented by the foreign government that indicates that had the offenses been committed in the United States, they would constitute crimes of violence as defined under section 16 of this title; and

(2) the offenses charged are not of a political nature.

(c) As used in this section, the term “national of the United States” has the meaning given such term in section 101(a)(22) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(22)).

(June 25, 1948, ch. 645, 62 Stat. 822; Pub. L. 104-132, title IV, § 443(a), Apr. 24, 1996, 110 Stat. 1280.)

HISTORICAL AND REVISION NOTES

Based on title 18, U.S.C., 1940 ed., § 658 (R.S. § 5274). Minor changes were made in phraseology.

Editorial Notes**AMENDMENTS**

1996—Pub. L. 104-132 designated existing provisions as subsec. (a) and added subsecs. (b) and (c).

Statutory Notes and Related Subsidiaries**EXTRADITION TREATIES INTERPRETATION**

Pub. L. 105-323, title II, Oct. 30, 1998, 112 Stat. 3033, provided that:

“SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

“This title may be cited as the ‘Extradition Treaties Interpretation Act of 1998’.

“SEC. 202. FINDINGS.

“Congress finds that—

“(1) each year, several hundred children are kidnapped by a parent in violation of law, court order, or legally binding agreement and brought to, or taken from, the United States;

“(2) until the mid-1970’s, parental abduction generally was not considered a criminal offense in the United States;

“(3) since the mid-1970’s, United States criminal law has evolved such that parental abduction is now a criminal offense in each of the 50 States and the District of Columbia;

“(4) in enacting the International Parental Kidnapping Crime Act of 1993 (Public Law 103-173; 107 Stat. 1998; 18 U.S.C. 1204), Congress recognized the need to combat parental abduction by making the act of international parental kidnapping a Federal criminal offense;

“(5) many of the extradition treaties to which the United States is a party specifically list the offenses that are extraditable and use the word ‘kidnapping’, but it has been the practice of the United States not to consider the term to include parental abduction because these treaties were negotiated by the United States prior to the development in United States criminal law described in paragraphs (3) and (4);

“(6) the more modern extradition treaties to which the United States is a party contain dual criminality provisions, which provide for extradition where both parties make the offense a felony, and therefore it is the practice of the United States to consider such treaties to include parental abduction if the other foreign state party also considers the act of parental abduction to be a criminal offense; and

“(7) this circumstance has resulted in a disparity in United States extradition law which should be rectified to better protect the interests of children and their parents.

“SEC. 203. INTERPRETATION OF EXTRADITION TREATIES.

“For purposes of any extradition treaty to which the United States is a party, Congress authorizes the interpretation of the terms ‘kidnaping’ and ‘kidnapping’ to include parental kidnapping.”

JUDICIAL ASSISTANCE TO INTERNATIONAL TRIBUNAL FOR YUGOSLAVIA AND INTERNATIONAL TRIBUNAL FOR RWANDA

Pub. L. 104-106, div. A, title XIII, § 1342, Feb. 10, 1996, 110 Stat. 486, as amended by Pub. L. 111-117, div. F, title VII, § 7034(t), Dec. 16, 2009, 123 Stat. 3364, provided that:

“(a) SURRENDER OF PERSONS.—

“(1) APPLICATION OF UNITED STATES EXTRADITION LAWS.—Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3), the provisions of chapter 209 of title 18, United States Code, relating to the extradition of persons to a foreign country pursuant to a treaty or convention for extradition between the United States and a foreign government, shall apply in the same manner and extent to the surrender of persons, including United States citizens, to—

“(A) the International Tribunal for Yugoslavia, pursuant to the Agreement Between the United States and the International Tribunal for Yugoslavia; and

“(B) the International Tribunal for Rwanda, pursuant to the Agreement Between the United States and the International Tribunal for Rwanda.