In re Doe v. United States of America

652T

(2d Cir. 1988)

Ferdinand and Imelda challenged subpoenas issued to them fingerprints, palm prints, voice and handwriting exemplars, arguing that they should be immune because of "head-of-state immunity."

Should sitting heads-of-state be immune from criminal prosecution? Civil?

For actions outside their official duties?

[*Clinton v. Jones?*]

Should it extend to their spouses and children?

Should it extend to other high government officials-- Americo Norberto Pena-Irala, Inspector-General of Police in Asuncion, Paraguay?

Should *former* heads-of state retain their immunity?

Can the government waive the immunity?

University of Hawaii School of Law Library - Jon Van Dyke Archives Collection

In re Doe v. United States of America 649

(2d Cir. 1988)

Ferdinand and Imelda challenged subpoenas issued to them fingerprints, palm prints, voice and handwriting exemplars, arguing that they should be immune because of "head-of-state immunity."

Should sitting heads-of-state be immune from criminal prosecution? Civil?

For actions outside their official duties?

[*Clinton v. Jones?*]

Should it extend to their spouses and children?

Should it extend to other high government officials-- Americo Norberto Pena-Irala, Inspector-General of Police in Asuncion, Paraguay?

Should *former* heads-of state retain their immunity?

Can the government waive the immunity?

University of Hawaii School of Law Library - Jon Van Dyke Archives Collection