WWW.IJRPR.COM

International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews

Journal homepage: www.ijrpr.com ISSN 2582-7421

Comparative Analysis of Anti Money Laundering Laws with Special Reference to US, France and India.

Theresa Charles

Christ Deemed to be University Pune Lavasa Campus

ABSTRACT

Money laundering is an illicit practice that has become a worldwide threat to the integrity and stability of financial systems, especially for countries that follow law, whose framework of laws is mainly codified. This paper is related to the growing concern of money laundering and its implication on law nations. The given study presents the complete view of the process of money laundering, within which the role of the laws of AML in affecting financial systems, international cooperation, and economic stability is analyzed. Statistical data and comparative analysis provide evidence of how lenient AML enforcement may open countries to financial exploitation and damage their reputation in the world financial market.

Keywords: Anti-Money Laundering, Law Nations, Economy, Financial System, Money Laundering

Statement of Problem

Money laundering continues to erode world financial systems with their instability and loss of economic output.Many a times the constitutive laws are not so dynamic to fit practical applications in combating the money launderers. Countries that lack reliable AML frameworks may develop instability, deter foreign investment, and also forfeit possible wealth because of financial exploitation by criminal networks.

Research Objective

Analysis and Comparison of AML Regulations in Financial Capitals: India, France, and the USA, with Practical Solutions to Strengthen Regulatory Measures and Enforcement in India as a Mixed Legal System

Research Methodology

The methodology applied for this research will involve qualitative and analytical aspects, such as reviewing the AML laws in civil law countries and common law countries and assessing case studies to observe trends in money laundering practice. It is followed by statistical data provided by international financial institutions, like the International Monetary Fund (IMF), through estimates of the scope and scale of money laundering all around the world. The study is based on primary as well as secondary sources, and the secondary sources are taken from legal journals, government reports, and other regulatory publications. It discusses a comparative analysis and introduces recommendations for enhancing the AML measures in India.

Introduction

Money laundering is a broad and complex illegal activity penetrating financial systems around the globe; it therefore poses great economic and security threats. The key goal of money laundering is to transform illicitly sourced gains into so-called clean money. It is through this process that criminals can spend their illegal gains incognito, in a manner that does not raise suspicions. [1]Money laundering has been addressed in the UN Vienna 1988 Convention Article 3.1 describing Money Laundering as: *"the conversion or transfer of property, knowing that such property is derived from any offense(s), for the purpose of concealing or disguising the illicit origin of the property or of assisting any person who is involved in such offense(s) to evade the legal consequences of his actions".*

[1] United Nations Convention Against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances, art. 3(1), Dec. 20, 1988, 1833 U.N.T.S. 397.

[2]The scale of money laundering in the world is quite staggering, and estimates made by the International Monetary Fund (IMF) put the figure at about 2% to 5% of the gross domestic product (GDP) produced worldwide every year. Putting this into perspective, using 1996 statistics, the IMF estimated this figure ranged between $590 billion and $1.5 trillion in USD, a sum comparable to the entire economic output of a mid-sized developed nation such as Spain. This staggering amount underlines the enormity of the issue, since unregulated money laundering can shake economies to their foundations, destabilize financial systems, and even affect international relations. With such statistics in mind, it is quite clear that money laundering goes beyond being just a financial crime, to being an economic global threat with monumental global consequences.

In this respect, there is a need for severe Anti-Money Laundering laws, specifically within civil law nations whose legal frameworks rely highly on codified laws. Civil law nations, which are, most of the time, highly centralized, may fall prey to money launderer's abuse unless there exists no sufficient AML provision in such countries. Rigorous AML legislation assists in the development of a clear, legitimate financial environment by discouraging criminal elements from using those financial systems for such laundering purposes.

Laws governing Anti money laundering in The United States of America

[3]The earliest law under the United States that covers money laundering is found in Title 18 of the United States Code at sections 1956 and 1957. Section 1956 provides for the prohibition of any transaction involving: Prohibited to report as required under any federal or state law. Section 1956 also prohibits the disposal of funds with an intent to conceal the source of such funds.

[4]Section 1957 prohibits knowingly conducting a financial transaction with illicit funds of more than $10,000 through a financial institution. "Financial institutions" include banks, securities firms, insurance companies, and casinos, among others according to the Bank Secrecy Act.

The U.S. exercises extraterritorial jurisdiction-meaning that these laws can apply to activities taking place abroad if they involve U.S. citizens or affect U.S. commerce. This is perhaps one of the most important cases that rationalized such extraterritorial scope. [5]Here, Pasquantino v. United States is taken as one example, although it's a relevant one: there, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled, inter alia, that the indictment of a scheme to defraud foreign governments of tax revenue falls within the reach of the law of the United States.

The enforcement of AML violations is mainly done by the Department of Justice (DOJ). In fact, the same is investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI). Other than these, many agencies such as the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) have also been advancing enforcement, especially across borders. Financial Crimes Enforcement Network (FinCEN), being a bureau under the Treasury, has taken on this significant role of supervising AML compliance in financial institutions.

[6]The RICO Act, more accurately termed the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act, is a federal act of law passed in the United States in 1970. Meant as an anti-organized crime statute, it enables proper prosecution of those or groups who commit a pattern of corrupt crimes, such as money laundering, fraud, or drug trafficking, if they are connected to an enterprise or other type of organization.

The Money Laundering Control Act of 1986 criminalizes financial transactions with criminal proceeds and strengthens asset tracing and forfeiture tools. It works in conjunction with the Bank Secrecy Act to monitor and enforce currency reporting, as well as anti-money laundering standards. It requires additional reference to the IRS Code, which deals with federal tax compliance. The violations may be construed as RICO predicate offenses. Using it, the civil actions against financial institutions are possible. Besides these, the Act has further widely expanded its scope of exercise to reach all corners of the world via territorial and nationality considerations in cross-border offenses.

There are four ways for the U.S. federal courts to acquire abroad evidence, which include Mutual Assistance Treaties, which allows the request of prosecutors for foreign countries to share the evidence concerned but can only be used to request so for a limited number of crimes; Letters Rogatory, formal requests for assistance from foreign courts, use this method when other methods prove not viable, "Letters Rogatory are foreign court orders requesting assistance in collecting evidence" because they take a lot of time; Grand Jury Subpoenas Duces Tecum, which compel foreign entities that have U.S. operations to produce evidence; and Consent Directives, which involve witnesses authorizing foreign banks' direct release of records to the grand jury. Each methodology helps provide evidence for international cases.

Laws governing Anti money laundering in France

The anti-money laundering law in France is basically founded on Article 324-1 of the French Criminal Code, that defines money laundering as the facilitation or concealment of assets originating from a crime. These have further strengthened the French legal framework with further legislations like Law No. 2013-1117, which assists in the prosecution process of serious financial crimes by reverting the burden of proof in specific circumstances. Other categories of money laundering, such as customs and drug trafficking, fall under other regulations.

[2] **IMF**, Address by Michel Camdessus, Managing Director of the International Monetary Fund, at the Plenary Meeting of the Financial Action Task Force on Money Laundering, Paris, Feb. 10, 1998.
[3] United States code, 18 U.S.C. § 1956 (1948).
[4] United States code, 18 U.S.C. § 1957 (1948).
[5] Pasquantino v. United States, 544 US 349 (2005).
[6] Racketeer influenced and corrupt organizations act,9 R.I.C.O. (1970).

To prove money laundering under French law, it must be materiality such as acts to conceal or to convert proceeds of crime. There are also moral elements which call upon knowledge and intention to launder crime proceeds. According to Article 324-1-1, criminal origin shall be presumed when the origin of assets cannot be justified. Predicate offenses embrace a wide range of serious crimes including foreign crimes if they are also offenses under French law as well. Extra-territorial jurisdiction applies under French law, allowing prosecution of laundering offenses connected with France, even where elements of the crime were carried out abroad. Business organizations may be prosecuted liable with a fine of up to five times any penalty incurred by a physical person. Administration is conferred upon specialized agencies such as the French Financial Intelligence Unit, commonly referred to as Tracfin, and public prosecutors who specialize in serious financial crimes. The punishments range from monetary and imprisonment sanctions to further ones in the form of assets confiscation prohibition, and dissolution with debarment from contracts, especially for legal entities.

Article L511-41-1-B of the French Monetary and Financial Code stipulates that credit institutions and finance companies shall have systems and strategies of identification, measurement, as well as management of various risks connected to the activity by which they operate. Some of the risks include credit and market risks, operational risks, liquidity risks, and leverage risks among others. Regular internal controls have to be introduced, which may also be subject to the Autorité de Contrôle Prudentiel et de Résolution (ACPR) and certain methodologies applied to check up capital adequacy, one of which is the Standardised Method for interest rate risk. Institutions are supposed also to maintain adequate internal capital and liquidity reserves, prepare for crisis scenarios, and have contingency plans in place.

Parent companies managing a consolidated group shall ensure all subsidiaries follow consistent and well-coordinated procedures for risk management. The specific application of this regulatory framework is implemented according to the rules set by the Ministry for the Economy.

The Autorité de Contrôle Prudentiel et de Résolution (ACPR) has policies that may help financial entities by offering them support for the requirements of Anti-Money Laundering and Counter-Terrorist Financing (AML/CFT). The policies outline the different regulations, which various industries are to abide by in applying AML/CFT measures, particularly regarding customer due diligence and reporting suspicious transactions.

On the other hand, AMF is the authority responsible for enforcing the AML/CFT regulations in the securities sector in France. AMF should require the formation of effective programs in AML, customer due diligence, monitoring of transactions, and reporting of suspicious financial activities. Such policies ensure that there is regulatory compliance as well as the limitation of the occurrences of the menace of illicit finance.

Sanctions on money laundering are provided within the Criminal Code in Articles 324-1 to 324-3 in France. Natural persons are punished with imprisonment of up to five years and a fine of €375 000, which can be increased to half the value of the assets laundered according to Article 324-1. At more serious instances of aggravation, presented in Article 324-2, imprisonment may reach ten years and fines – €750,000. If the sentence is stiffer for the principal crime, this sentence applies according to Article 324-2 in cases where the defendant knew about it.

Legal persons, under Article 324-9, shall be liable to penalties five times greater than that which applies to a natural person: €1.875 million for common money laundering offenses, and €3.75 million for aggravated offenses. It is also possible to impose supplementary penalties: dissolution, prohibition from public contracts (Article 45 of Order No. 2015-899), or interdict on the exercise of a professional activity.

Under this aspect, Article 421-5 addresses the financing of terrorism by means of imprisonment for a period not exceeding ten years and fines for natural persons to an amount of €225,000, whereas legal persons face the same fine amount, that is, up to €1.125 million, and are exposed to the same penalties under Aitassi's law. Article 324-1-1-1, as from 2013, contains a presumption of origin being criminal where the onus would lie with the defendant to prove that the assets are legitimate based on some circumstances to show an intention to conceal.

Article 324-1 Criminal Code has established some requirement of predicate offense to be prosecuted. France's "all-crime" system allows any felony or misdemeanor that generates income to act as a predicate. Article 324-1-1-1, enacted in the year 2013, presumes criminally acquired when circumstances are such that it appears likely that the assets have been concealed, and the burden of proof lies upon the defendant to prove that the source is legitimate.

Laws governing Anti money laundering in India

[7]India's anti-money laundering law finds its major source in the Prevention of Money Laundering Act, 2002. It defines money laundering as such activities "as bringing or attempting to bring or cause to be brought from a place outside India [or elsewhere] proceeds of crime into India" (Section 3) or "as bringing or attempting to bring or causing to be brought from a place outside India any proceeds of crime into India" (Section 3). This law advocates severe punishments for offenders, such as imprisonment ranging from three years up to and including seven years (Section 4). Under Section 5, provisional attachment of the property of an accused can be done by the authorities, and upon the order of a Magistrate, it can be confirmed under Section 8.

There are other specific rules that supplement PMLA like the PML (Maintenance of Records) Rules, 2005 that mandatorily orders financial institutions and other reporting entities to maintain transaction records, put in place customer due diligence (CDD) measures and submit suspicious transaction reports to the FIU-IND. The PML (Amendment) Act, 2009 expanded the AML effort through information sharing with international agencies, and the obligation of 2012 amends it to include obligations for identifying politically exposed persons (PEPs) and beneficial owners. The amendment bill of 2015 has been

7

focused particularly on bringing it in line with international standards with the objective of adding strength in terms of transparency by defining "reporting financial institutions."

Then, in 2023, PMLA witnessed the landmark amendment to the Maintenance of Records Rules. To this end, it updated the KYC norms by incorporating disclosure of beneficial owners as well as AML measures to include digital assets-whose meaning necessarily encompasses transactions involving cryptocurrency-in the country. The oversight on AML is supervised jointly by FIU-IND and RBI of India. The SEBI and IRDAI also govern AML compliance in the securities and insurance sectors, respectively.

India does not have a specific limitation period for money laundering offenses. This is because it has been held to be continuous, and Section 3 clearly makes a person liable as long as he continues to enjoy the proceeds of crime. The Finance Act of 2019 further cemented this interpretation. Forfeiture In the case of forfeiture, the properties derived from criminal activities connected with money laundering can be attached by ED even before conviction. Under Sections 5 and 8 of PMLA. Non-conviction-based forfeitures could arise from an accused's being found to be involved in the laundering of money but not necessarily in the underlying crime.

Comparison of these countries

The AML regimes for the US, France, and India while divergent, they were created to be effective instruments in the fight against financial crime in their respective legal and regulatory environments.

AML laws in the United States can be primarily derived from Title 18 U.S.C, mainly Sections 1956 and 1957, and the Money Laundering Control Act of 1986. These laws both criminalize transactions with illicit funds and specifically target efforts made to conceal the origin of money or avoid any tax obligations. The DOJ is probably at the vanguard of enforcement, but the Federal Bureau of Investigation, together with the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network (FinCEN), plays a significant role in investigation and compliance oversight. The country also exercises its extraterritorial reach-the ability to apply these AML laws to activities concerning U.S. citizens or commerce occurring outside its borders-as seen in Pasquantino v. United States.

The basis for AML regulations in France is Article 324-1 of the French Criminal Code, which states that money laundering pertains to an act that facilitates or conceals the origin of criminally acquired assets. In France, severe fines and imprisonment are meted out for aggravated offenses. On top of these fines, companies may be penalized with dissolution or disqualification from public contracts. Primary enforcing agencies are Tracfin, France's Financial Intelligence Unit, and public prosecutors specializing in complex financial crimes. French law further extends extraterritorial jurisdiction for crimes with a French connection; that is, prosecution is possible for an offence abroad if it relates to French interests.

In India, the AML framework comprises the Prevention of Money Laundering Act (PMLA) of 2002, which prohibits business or professional dealings involving proceeds derived from illegal activities. The enforcement function is managed by the Enforcement Directorate, while financial sector compliance is overseen by the RBI and FIU-IND. Non-conviction-based forfeitures are allowed under the PMLA as well, so that property can be attached even if the offender is not convicted of an underlying crime. Recent amendments also strengthen KYC norms, especially in digital and cryptocurrency transactions. The scope of the PMLA extends to collaboration with foreign authorities and exchange of information to prevent cross-border money laundering.

Conclusion and recommendation

Indian AML framework can take strength from US and French reforms.The expansion of extra-territorial jurisdiction, for instance, is exactly the kind of thing that happened in US law, thereby allowing prosecution abroad committed offences of AML by Indians. It could also take its cue from France's approach toward increasing the imposition of penalties upon companies indulging in money laundering and compliance standards into tighter straits with high-risk sectors like finance and real estate.

An independent body would oversee this, balancing enforcement with civil rights, over the activity of the Enforcement Directorate relating to asset seizure. Also, coordination interagency and well-defined data-sharing protocols-precisely the type in America-would further strengthen the Indian response to global AML concerns. Lastly, stricter measures of KYC for digital assets, such as cryptocurrencies, would grapple with financial crime risks in the digital world. This would,therefore, be a modernization of the AML framework in India, closer to international standards, as well as ready to face the new challenges in the AML regime.

The proposed reforms would further strengthen the robustness of India's AML standards so that they remained applicable in the context of a globalized, digital financial architecture. It would also provide transparency, cooperation, and accountability in the process of enforcement of AML so that India becomes more effective in protecting its financial system against both internal and external money-laundering threats.