Judicial Review In Mexico A Study Of The Amparo Suit Latin American

Judicial Review in Mexico - Richard D. Baker 2015-01-02 The amparo suit is a Mexican legal institution similar in its effects to such Anglo-American procedures as habeas corpus, error, and the various forms of injunctive relief. It has undergone a long evolution since it was incorporated into the Constitution of 1857. Today, its principal purpose is to protect private individuals in the enjoyment of the rights guaranteed by the first twenty-nine articles of the Constitution. Mexico after its independence produced many constitutions. One of the earliest problems was to find an adequate means of defending the Constitution against ill-founded interpretations of its precepts. Like the United States, Mexico has developed a system of constitutional defense in which the judiciary is the supreme interpreter of what this document means. Unlike the United States Supreme Court, however, the Mexican Supreme Court has not been innovative in its decisions or contradicted the administration on major policy decisions. This difference must be attributed to the civil law system of Mexico as well as to the political climate. The first part of Richard D. Baker’s book describes the historical background of amparo and other methods of constitutional defense in Mexico. The three men most closely associated with creating a judicial form of constitutional defense in Mexico were Manuel Crescencio Rejón, José Fernando Ramírez, and Mariano Otero. Their own writings indicate that the immediate source of amparo must be found in the American institution of judicial review that was transmitted to Mexicans through Alexis de Tocqueville’s Democracy in America. The second part is an exposition of the workings of the amparo suit in the twentieth century and the constitutional and statutory provisions affecting it. Since 1857, when it was incorporated into article 102 of the Constitution, the amparo suit has evolved into a highly complex institution performing three functions: the defense of the civil liberties enumerated in the first twenty-nine articles of the Constitution, the determination of the constitutionality of federal and state legislation, and cassation. The Supreme Court is primarily limited to defending civil liberties through the amparo suit; it remains less innovative and more restricted than the United States system of judicial review, especially in the effect of its judgments on political agencies. Baker’s study is the first one in English dealing with this subject and is one of the most extensive in any language. It should be welcome as a valuable tool to all students of Mexican law, history, and political thought.

Notes on Judicial Review in Mexico and the United States - Lucio Cabrera 1963

Judicial Politics in Mexico - Andrea Castagnola 2016-11-03 After more than seventy years of uninterrupted authoritarian government headed by the Partido Revolucionario Institucional (PRI), Mexico finally began the transition to democracy in 2000. Unlike most developing democracies, there was no special Constitutional Court to handle the transition to democracy. This book explores the amparo suit, the key instrument of judicial review, and its complex role in the political transition to democracy. It has undergone a long evolution since it was incorporated into the Constitution of 1857. Today, its principal purpose is to protect private individuals in the enjoyment of the rights guaranteed by the first twenty-nine articles of the Constitution. Mexico after its independence produced many constitutions. One of the earliest problems was to find an adequate means of defending the Constitution against ill-founded interpretations of its precepts. Like the United States, Mexico has developed a system of constitutional defense in which the judiciary is the supreme interpreter of what this document means. Unlike the United States Supreme Court, however, the Mexican Supreme Court has not been innovative in its decisions or contradicted the administration on major policy decisions. This difference must be attributed to the civil law system of Mexico as well as to the political climate. The first part of Richard D. Baker’s book describes the historical background of amparo and other methods of constitutional defense in Mexico. The three men most closely associated with creating a judicial form of constitutional defense in Mexico were Manuel Crescencio Rejón, José Fernando Ramírez, and Mariano Otero. Their own writings indicate that the immediate source of amparo must be found in the American institution of judicial review that was transmitted to Mexicans through Alexis de Tocqueville’s Democracy in America. The second part is an exposition of the workings of the amparo suit in the twentieth century and the constitutional and statutory provisions affecting it. Since 1857, when it was incorporated into article 102 of the Constitution, the amparo suit has evolved into a highly complex institution performing three functions: the defense of the civil liberties enumerated in the first twenty-nine articles of the Constitution, the determination of the constitutionality of federal and state legislation, and cassation. The Supreme Court is primarily limited to defending civil liberties through the amparo suit; it remains less innovative and more restricted than the United States system of judicial review, especially in the effect of its judgments on political agencies. Baker’s study is the first one in English dealing with this subject and is one of the most extensive in any language. It should be welcome as a valuable tool to all students of Mexican law, history, and political thought.

A Comparison of Judicial Review in the United States and Mexico - Olivia de la Torre 1980

Judicial Power and Strategic Communication in Mexico - Jeffrey K. Staton 2016-03-22 Although they are not directly accountable to voters, constitutional court judges communicate with the general public through the media. In Judicial Power and Strategic Communication in Mexico, Jeffrey K. Staton argues that constitutional courts develop public relations strategies in order to increase the transparency of judicial behavior and promote judicial legitimacy. Yet, in some political contexts there can be a tension between transparency and legitimacy, and for this reason, courts cannot necessarily advance both conditions simultaneously. The argument is tested via an analysis of the Mexican Supreme Court during Mexico’s recent transition to democracy, and also through a cross-national analysis of public perceptions of judicial legitimacy. The results demonstrate that judges are active participants in the construction of their own power. More broadly, the study develops a positive political theory of institutions, which highlights the connections between democratization and the rule of law.

Judicial Review in Mexico - Richard D. Baker 1971

Judicial Review of Expropriation - 2014

Exercising the Doctrine of Judicial Review by Establishing a Constitutional Court in Mexico - Irma Leticia Leal-Moya 1998

The History and Growth of Judicial Review, Volume 2 - Steven Gow Calabresi 2021-04-13 This two-volume set examines the origins and growth of judicial review in the key G-20 constitutional democracies, which include the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Germany, Japan, Italy, India, Canada, Australia, South Korea, Brazil, South Africa, Indonesia, Mexico, and the European Union, as well as Israel. The volumes consider five different theories, which help to explain the origins of judicial review, and identify which theories apply best in the various countries discussed. They consider not only what gives rise to judicial review originally, but also what causes of judicial review lead it to become more powerful and prominent over time. Volume Two discusses the G-20 civil law countries.

Marbury in Mexico - Matthew Campbell Miron 2007

The Mexican Legal System - Francisco Avalos 2000 Serves as a primary research guide to the laws and legal literature of Mexico. Because of the importance of federal legislation over state legislation in Mexico, this work concentrates on federal legislation, organized in 41 subject sections.

Mexico’s Unrule of Law - Niels Uldricks 2010-04-02 Mexico’s Unrule of Law: Human Rights and Police Reform Under Democratization looks at recent Mexican criminal justice reforms. Using Mexico City as a case study of the social and institutional realities, Niels Uldricks focuses on the evolving police and justice system within the country’s long-term transition from authoritarian to democratic government. By analyzing extensive and penetrating police surveys and interviews, he goes further to offer innovative ideas on how to simultaneously achieve greater community security, democratic policing, and adherence to human rights.

The Judicialization of Politics in Latin America - Rachel Sieder 2016-04-30 During the last two decades the judiciary has come to play an increasingly important political role in Latin America. Constitutional courts and supreme courts are more active in counterbalancing executive and legislative power than ever before. At the same time, the lack of effective citizenship rights has prompted ordinary people to press their claims and secure their rights through the courts. This collection of essays analyzes the diverse manifestations of the judicialization of politics in contemporary Latin America, assessing their positive and negative consequences for state-society relations, the rule of law, and democratic governance in the region. With individual chapters exploring Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Mexico, Peru and Venezuela, it advances a comparative framework for thinking about the nature of the judicialization of politics within contemporary Latin American democracies.

Constitutional Courts as Mediators - Julio Rios-Figueroa 2016-04-15 The book proposes an informational theory of constitutional review highlighting the mediator role of constitutional courts in democratic conflict solving.

Elites, Masses, and the Struggle for Democracy in Mexico - Sara Schatz 2000 This book analyzes the transition to democracy in Mexico by developing and using a general model of delayed transitions to democracy.

Mexican Constitution of 1917 - Mexico 1917

Judicial Review in Mexico - Richard D. Baker 2015-01-15 The amparo suit is a Mexican legal institution similar in its effects to such Anglo-American procedures as habeas corpus, error, and the various forms of injunctive relief. It has undergone a long evolution since it was incorporated into the Constitution of 1857. Today, its principal purpose is to protect private individuals in the enjoyment of the rights guaranteed by the first twenty-nine articles of the Constitution. Mexico after its independence produced many constitutions. One of the earliest problems was to find an adequate means of defending the Constitution against ill-founded interpretations of its precepts. Like the United States, Mexico has developed a system of constitutional defense in which the judiciary is the supreme interpreter of what this document means. Unlike the United States Supreme Court, however, the Mexican Supreme Court has not been innovative in its decisions or contradicted the administration on major policy decisions. This difference must be attributed to the civil law system of Mexico as well as to the political climate. The first part of Richard D. Baker’s book describes the historical background of amparo and other methods of constitutional defense in Mexico. The three men most closely associated with creating a judicial form of constitutional defense in Mexico were Manuel Crescencio Rejón, José Fernando Ramírez, and Mariano Otero. Their own writings indicate that the immediate source of amparo must be found in the American institution of judicial review that was transmitted to Mexicans through Alexis de Tocqueville’s Democracy in America. The second part is an exposition of the workings of the amparo suit in the twentieth century and the constitutional and statutory provisions affecting it. Since 1857, when it was incorporated into article 102 of the Constitution, the amparo suit has evolved into a highly complex institution performing three functions: the defense of the civil liberties enumerated in the first twenty-nine articles of the Constitution, the determination of the constitutionality of federal and state legislation, and cassation. The Supreme Court is primarily limited to defending civil liberties through the amparo suit; it remains less innovative and more restricted than the United States system of judicial review, especially in the effect of its judgments on political agencies. Baker’s study is the first one in English dealing with this subject and is one of the most extensive in any language. It should be welcome as a valuable tool to all students of Mexican law, history, and political thought.
interpreter of what this document means. Unlike the United States Supreme Court, however, the Mexican Supreme Court has not been innovative in its decisions or contradicted the administration on major policy questions. The reason for this is that the Mexican Constitution of 1917, which established the framework for the judiciary, includes a strong constitutional provision that limits the power of the Supreme Court to declare legislation unconstitutional. As a result, the Mexican Supreme Court has generally avoided ruling on cases that could be seen as challenges to the authority of the federal government.

Courts in Federal Countries—Nicholas Arney 2017 Courts in Federal Countries examines the role high courts play in thirteen countries, including Australia, Brazil, Canada, Germany, India, Nigeria, Spain, and the United States.

Rule of Law and Fundamental Rights—Alfredo Narváez Medécigo 2015-11-07 This book, which originated from the broadly held view that there is a lack of Rule-of-law in Mexico, and from the emphasis of traditional academia on cultural elements as the main explanation, explores the question of whether there is any relationship between the system of constitutional review — and thus the law — and the level of Rule-of-law in a given state. To do so, it elaborates a theoretical model for achieving Rule-of-law and compares it to the constitutional review systems of the United States, the Federal Republic of Germany, and Mexico. The study concludes that the two former states correspond to the model, while the latter does not. This is fundamentally due to the rule each legal system assigns to ordinary judges in carrying out constitutional review. Whereas the US and Germany have fostered the policy that constitutional review regarding the enforcement of basic rights is the responsibility of ordinary courts, Mexico has relied too heavily on the specialized constitutional jurisdiction.

Mexican Law—Stephen Zamora 2005 Mexican Law provides an overview of the Mexican legal system. In addition to setting forth rules and legal doctrines (with reference to the practical application of the law), this volume surveys the key institutions that make and enforce the law in Mexico, and places them in their historical and cultural context. The book makes frequent comparisons to United States legal doctrines and institutions, and provides a foundation for understanding the roles of law and legal institutions in shaping public and private life in Mexico. The volume surveys both public and private law, and provides examples of the practical application of the law. It discusses the discrepancies that exist between the written law (and the theories that underly it) and its application. Topics covered range from the origin of legal history to specific subjects such as labor law, family law, and constitutional law.

The Mexican Constitution—Nicholas Arney 2017 Mexico ratified the amendment in the year since its enactment by Congress on June 4, 1919. A revolution in women's rights, spanning over seventy years, came to a quiet conclusion as Secretary of State Richard Smith Coxe 1846

Reforming the Administration of Justice in Mexico—Wayne A. Cornelius 2007 This landmark study examines the challenge Mexico faces in reforming the administration of its justice system—a critical undertaking for the consolidation of democracy, the well-being of Mexican citizens, and U.S.-Mexican relations. The result of over four years of research from the Project on Reforming the Administration of Justice in Mexico, this bi-national collaborative initiative brought together U.S. and Mexican scholars, policy makers, law enforcement officials, lawyers, activists, and other experts to analyze the key issues of the state of administration of justice in Mexico. The authors analyze the causes of the current state of the administration of justice in Mexico and propose a policy agenda for reform. This book will interest academics and policy makers concerned with the sorry state of the administration of justice in Latin America at large, and Mexico more specifically. The chapters lead almost no controversial issues surrounding the justice system untouched. From diverse legal, criminal, social, and political perspectives the justice system is held under scrutiny and found to be wanting. The end result is a set of proposals for a new direction.

Unconstitutional Constitutional Amendments—Yanet Roznai 2017-02-16 Can constitutional amendments be unconstitutional? The problem of 'unconstitutional constitutional amendments' has become one of the most widely debated issues in comparative constitutional theory, constitutional design, and constitutional adjudication. This book describes and analyses the increasing tendency in global constitutional law towards constitutionalizing the amendment process. The changes in constitutional unamendability to constitutional theory become even more complex when constitutional courts enforce such limitations through substantive judicial review of constitutional amendments, often resulting in the declaration that these constitutional amendments are 'unconstitutional'. Combining historical comparisons, constitutional theory, and a comparative study, Yanet Roznai sets out to explain what the nature of amendment power is, what its limitations are, and what the role of constitutional courts is and should be when enforcing limitations on constitutional amendments.

The U.S. Supreme Court and Racial Minorities—Leslie F. Goldstein 2017-07-28 The U.S. Supreme Court and Racial Minorities offers an in-depth, chronologically arranged look at the record of the U.S. Supreme Court on racial minorities over the course of its first two centuries. It does not pose the anachronistic standard, "Did the Supreme Court get it right?" but rather, "How did the Supreme Court compare to other branches of the federal government at the time?" Have these Justices, prevented against removal from office by discontented voters (in contrast to the President and the members of Congress), done any better than the elected branches of government at protecting racial minorities in America?

Restoring the Global Judiciary—Martin S. Flaherty 2019-09-03 Why there should be a larger role for the judiciary in American foreign relations In the past several decades, there has been a growing chorus from the United States Supreme Court and federal judiciary should stay out of foreign affairs and leave the field to Congress and the president. Challenging this idea, Restoring the Global Judiciary argues instead for a robust judicial role in the conduct of U.S. foreign policy. With an innovative combination of constitutional history, international relations theory, and legal doctrine, Martin Flaherty demonstrates that the Supreme Court and federal judiciary have the power and duty to apply the law without deference to the other branches. Turning first to the founding of the nation, Flaherty shows that the Constitution's original framers recognized the importance of judicial action in matters of foreign concern, and not least because the document shifted enormous authority to the new federal government. This initial conception eroded as the nation rose from fledgling state to superpower, fueling the growth of a dangerously formidable executive that today asserts near-plenary foreign affairs authority. Flaherty explores how international relations makes the commitment to balance among the branches of government all the more critical and he considers implications for modern controversies that the judiciary will continue to confront. At a time when executive and legislative actions in the name of U.S. foreign policy are only increasing, Restoring the Global Judiciary makes the case for a zealous judicial defense of fundamental rights involving global affairs.

Constitutional Origins—Paula A. Monophob 2020 "On August 26, 1920, these words became part of the United States Constitution as its Nineteenth Amendment. The requisite thirty-six states had ratified the amendment in the year since its enactment by Congress on June 4, 1919. A revolution in women's rights, spanning over seventy years, came to a quiet conclusion as Secretary of State Bainbridge Colby signed the measure into law in his privacy of his home at eight o'clock in the morning.1 None of the prominent suffrage leaders of the day, including the National American Woman Suffrage Association (NAWSA) president, Carrie Chapman Catt, or the National Woman's Party (NWP) chair, Alice Paul, were at the signing 2 Catt was later invited to go to the State Department to see the proclamation, but no similar invitation was extended to the more militant Paul. Paul had been a thorn in the side of President Woodrow Wilson, with her White House picketing and willingness to be imprisoned for the vote.3 Ratification was followed by ten years of litigation—most of it in state courts—during which the meaning and scope of the Nineteenth Amendment was contested. In its most literal sense, the Nineteenth Amendment did confer a "right" to vote per se. Rather, it simply prohibited the states or the federal government from using sex as a criterion for voter eligibility 4. In other words, it ratification meant that state and federal impediments to voting based on sex were now unconstitutional. It did not mean that all women in the United States could vote.5 As a matter of law, the Nineteenth Amendment meant that states could not prevent African American women from voting based solely on their sex. Yet vast numbers of African American women were prevented from voting in the November 1920 presidential election that followed on the heels of ratification.6 They faced the same impediments—poll taxes, literacy tests, grandfather clauses, and physical intimidation—used to prevent their male counterparts from voting after ratification of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments.7 Those amendments conferred citizenship on previously enslaved
The History and Growth of Judicial Review, Volume 1: Steven Gow Calabresi 2004-03-13 This two-volume set examines the origins and growth of judicial review in the key G-20 constitutional democracies, which include the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Germany, Japan, Italy, India, Canada, Australia, South Korea, Brazil, South Africa, Indonesia, Mexico, and the European Union, as well as Israel. The volumes consider five different theories, which help to explain the origins of judicial review, and identify which theories apply best in the various countries discussed. They consider not only what gives rise to judicial review originally, but also what causes of judicial review lead it to become more powerful and prominent over time. Volume One discusses the G-20 common law countries and Israel.

Comparative Judicial Review: Ezra P. Deely 2018-09-28 Constitutional courts around the world play an increasingly central role in day-to-day democratic governance. Yet scholars have only recently begun to develop the interdisciplinary analysis needed to understand this shift in the relationship of constitutional law to politics. This edited volume brings together the leading scholars of constitutional law and politics to provide a comprehensive overview of judicial review, covering theories of its creation, mechanisms of its constraint, and its comparative applications, including theories of interpretation and doctrinal developments. This book serves as a single point of entry for legal scholars and practitioners interested in understanding the field of comparative judicial review in its broader political and social context.

The Mexican Legal System: Mexico's administrative corruption within the changing Atlantic World, while also providing insightful perspectives from the lower social echelons of colonial Mexico. Corruption in Mexico's colonial period connoted the obstruction of justice; judges, for example, tortured prisoners to extract cash or accepted bribes to alter judicial verdicts. In addition, the concept evolved over time to include several forms of self-advantage in the bureaucracy. Rosenmüller embeds this important shift from judicial to administrative corruption within the changing Atlantic World, while also providing insightful perspectives from the lower social echelons of colonial Mexico.

The DNA of Constitutional Justice in Latin America: Daniel M. Brinks 2018-04-30 Analyzes the political roots of the systems of constitutional justice in Latin America, tracing their development over the last 40 years.

Corruption and Justice in Colonial Mexico, 1650-1755: Christoph Rosenmüller 2019-04-30 Corruption is one of the most prominent issues in Latin American news cycles, with charges deciding the outcomes of elections and political careers. In this book, Christoph Rosenmüller explores the causes and consequences of corruption in colonial Mexico. Using a combination of primary sources, legal documents, and historical analysis, Rosenmüller examines the relationship between corruption and justice in the colonial period, focusing on the role of the courts in enforcing the law and ensuring that justice is served.

The Rights Revolution: Charles R. Epp 2020-05-14 It is well known that the scope of individual rights has expanded dramatically in the United States over the last half-century. Less well known is that other countries have experienced "rights revolutions" as well. Charles R. Epp argues that, far from being the fruit of an activist judiciary, the ascendency of civil rights and liberties has rested on the democraticization of access to the courts—the influence of advocacy groups, the establishment of governmental enforcement agencies, the growth of financial and legal resources for ordinary citizens, and the strategic planning of grass roots organizations. In other words, the shift in the rights of individuals is best understood as a "bottom up," rather than a "top down," phenomenon. The Rights Revolution is the first comprehensive and comparative analysis of the growth of civil rights, examining the high courts of the United States, Britain, Canada, and India within their specific constitutional and cultural contexts. It brilliantly revises our understanding of the relationship between courts and social change.


Domestic Judicial Review of Trade Remedies: Mislim Yilmaz 2013-01-17 An examination of twenty-one countries' experiences of domestic judicial review being used to challenge trade remedy determinations.

The Mexican Legal System, 2nd Edition: Francisco Avalos 2013 This new edition continues to serve as a primary research guide to the laws and legal literature of Mexico. The work concentrates on federal legislation, organized into 48 subject sections, each containing an introduction, an outline of main law (listing titles, chapters and sections in English), and four subsections listing laws, regulations, periodical literature and books. The emphasis is on English-language primary and secondary materials. Also includes a guide to finding Mexican law on the Internet. — Publisher.
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Yeah, reviewing a book judicial review in mexico a study of the amparo suit latin american could ensue your near associates listings. This is just one of the solutions for you to be successful. As understood, execution does not recommend that you have fabulous points. Comprehending as without difficulty as promise even more than additional will meet the expense of each success. next-door to, the notice as with ease as acuteness of this judicial review in mexico a study of the amparo suit latin american can be taken as competently as picked to act.