

OEA/Ser.L/V/II
Doc. 44
1 April 2025
Original: español

REPORT No. 41/25
PETITION 2079-17
INADMISSIBILITY REPORT

N.C. & P.C.
BRAZIL

Approved electronically by the Commission on April 1, 2025.

Cite as: IACHR, Report No. 41/25, Petition 2079-17. Inadmissibility.
N.C. and P.C. Brazil. April 1, 2025.

I. INFORMATION ABOUT THE PETITION

Petitioner:	N.C., Public Defender's Office of the Union (<i>Defensoria Pública da União</i>) (DPU)
Alleged victim:	N.C. and P.C.
Respondent State:	Brazil
Rights invoked:	Articles 5 (Right to Humane Treatment), 8 (Right to a Fair Trial), 11 (Right to Privacy), 19 (Rights of the Child), and 24 (Right to Equal Protection) of the American Convention on Human Rights ¹

II. PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE IACHR²

Filing of the petition:	November 15, 2017
Additional information received at the stage of initial review:	August 16, 2019
Notification of the petition to the State:	July 7, 2020
Request for Extension:	October 7, 2020
Granting of Extension:	October 14, 2020
State's first response:	November 6, 2020
Additional Observations from the Petitioning Party:	December 7, 2020; April 3, 2022; April 5, 2022; February 27, 2024

III. COMPETENCE

Competence <i>Ratione personae</i>:	Yes
Competence <i>Ratione loci</i>:	Yes
Competence <i>Ratione temporis</i>:	Yes
Competence <i>Ratione materiae</i>:	Yes, the American Convention (instrument deposited on September 25, 1992)

IV. DUPLICATION OF PROCEDURES AND INTERNATIONAL *RES JUDICATA*, COLORABLE CLAIM, EXHAUSTION OF DOMESTIC REMEDIES AND TIMELINESS OF THE PETITION

Duplication of procedures and International <i>res judicata</i>:	No
Rights declared admissible	None
Exhaustion of domestic remedies or applicability of an exception to the rule:	Yes, on December 1, 2017, as per Section VI
Timeliness of the petition:	Yes, partially, as per the terms of Section VI

V. POSITION OF THE PARTIES

The Petitioning Party

1. The petitioning party alleges that the Brazilian State failed to protect the rights of Ms. N.C. and her son, P.C., in the context of legal disputes over the child's custody and allegations of child sexual abuse.

¹ Hereinafter "the American Convention" or "the Convention."

² The observations of each party were duly considered and forwarded to the other party.

Protective Measures

2. According to the petitioning party, on January 13, 2014, Ms. N.C. reported acts of violence and threats by her then-husband, Mr. T.M., father of the child P.C., to the 78th Police Station in São Paulo.

3. In the same context, she filed a legal action for an unspecified precautionary measure with the application of protective measures (case number 1017566-51.2014.8.26.0002) before the 3rd Family and Probate Court of Santo Amaro, obtaining a court decision removing Mr. T.M. from the home.

Divorce Action and Provisional Custody

4. According to the petitioning party, also in 2014, Ms. N.C. initiated a divorce action (case number 1016240-56.2014.8.26.0002) before the 3rd Family and Probate Court of Santo Amaro and obtained provisional custody of her son.

Custody and Visitation Rights Action

5. The petitioning party indicates that, in 2014, the father filed a custody and visitation rights action against Ms. N.C. (case number 1035356-48.2014.8.26.0002), requesting shared custody and accusing the mother of parental alienation.

6. The action was processed before the 3rd Family and Probate Court of Santo Amaro. During the proceedings, N.C. reported to the court that she did not trust leaving her son alone with the father, as there were signs of sexual abuse committed by the father; she requested that the visits be monitored; and she attached an audio recording in which the boy reported games of a sexual nature between him, his father, and a friend of his father during bath time.

7. On June 2, 2015, by court order, a psychological evaluation of P.C. was conducted. The evaluation i) considered that the story about the bath mixed reality and fantasy and understood that the boy saw the scene as a game; ii) questioned Ms. N.C.'s alienating attitudes, stating that she could contaminate the child's memory, in addition to criticizing the child's nanny; iii) indicated that Ms. N.C. presented characteristics compatible with the diagnosis of paranoid personality disorder.

8. On January 11, 2016, Ms. N.C. underwent a psychiatric evaluation by court order. The responsible psychiatrist ruled out the diagnoses of paranoid personality disorder and persistent delusional disorder and concluded that Ms. N.C. suffered from schizotypal disorder.

9. Ms. N.C.'s defense asked the expert if the symptoms presented posed a risk to the child and if she could exercise custody. The doctor replied that, according to the symptoms presented at the time of the psychiatric evaluation, there was no risk and that N.C. was fit for custody.

10. In May 2016, the judge of the 3rd Family and Probate Court of the Regional Forum II of Santo Amaro established shared custody of the child, and the decision became final.

Police Investigation

11. The petitioning party also reports that in July 2016, during the school holidays, P.C. remained under the care of his father for fifteen days. Upon returning to his mother, the boy reported that he had been prevented from communicating with her. In this context, Ms. N.C. contacted the Guardianship Council and reported to the 48th Police Station – Cidade Dutra, São Paulo, possible acts of sexual abuse and mistreatment committed by the father against the child. In response, the police initiated Police Inquiry 339/2016.

12. On March 21, 2017, the inquiry was closed. The petitioning party alleges that the investigation did not advance in the production of more in-depth evidence, despite Ms. N.C.'s repeated statements about the seriousness of the alleged facts.

Custody Reversal Action

13. On August 19, 2016, the father obtained a court order for the search and seizure of the minor P.C. under an emergency injunction. According to the petitioning party, the measure was carried out on the same date when armed police officers, accompanied by a court officer and two lawyers, removed the child from his mother's house. The court order was associated with the Custody Reversal Action (Case number 1042945-23.2016.8.26.0002) processed at the 4th Family and Probate Court of the Regional Forum II of Santo Amaro.

14. On August 22, 2016, the father filed a petition in the case alleging that the parental alienation committed by Ms. N.C. had not ceased and requesting sole custody of P.C., suspension of maternal contact, and a continued psychological evaluation of Ms. N.C.

15. Ms. N.C. presented her defense alleging that the core of the lawsuit—the possible situation of abuse suffered by the minor—was being disregarded and giving way to repeated questioning about her mental health. In addition, she informed the court that the father, even before the reversal decision, was already seeking to prevent the son's contact with the mother.

16. During the proceedings, Ms. N.C. also requested the revocation of the emergency injunction, a new evaluation, the subpoena of the psychologist responsible for the report in the previous case, and the recusal of the judge in the case. However, the requests were denied. Despite the mother's statements, the judge of the 4th Family and Probate Court of the Regional Forum II of Santo Amaro issued a judgment granting the father's requests and maintaining custody exclusively in his hands, suspending any form of visitation by Ms. N.C. for a period of one year.

17. Ms. N.C. filed an appeal against the judgment. On September 28, 2017, the São Paulo Court of Justice (TJSP) partially granted the appeal to establish a regime of supervised maternal visits for a period of three months, lasting three hours per week, subsequently transitioning to bi-weekly visits without overnight stays. The decision became final on December 1, 2017.

Rescissory Action

18. On March 20, 2018, Ms. N.C. filed a rescissory action (Case number 2052559-70.2018.8.26.0000) requesting the annulment of the final judgment and, as a preliminary or precautionary measure, the immediate suspension of sole custody in favor of the father. The request was supported by a new psychiatric evaluation, carried out on February 21, 2018, which ruled out the diagnosis of schizotypal disorder.

19. On April 2, 2018, however, the assigned rapporteur rejected the preliminary request. The case remains in progress.

Petition for Enforcement of Judgment

20. In parallel with the rescissory action, on July 26, 2018, Ms. N.C. filed a petition for enforcement of judgment (case number 0033079-37.2018.8.26.0002) requesting that the supervised visits take place at her sister's residence. The responsible judge rejected the request and ordered that the visits take place at the Court's Assisted Visitation Center (CEVAT).

21. According to the petitioning party, the supervised meetings began on June 23, 2019, and lasted until September 29, 2019, totaling six attempts. According to reports and technical reports, P.C. showed extreme difficulty in approaching, limiting himself to interacting with the intermediary sector team and refusing to remain in the visitation area next to his mother.

22. On October 8, 2019, the court deemed the period of assisted contact at CEVAT fulfilled and dismissed the case.

New Custody and Visitation Rights Action

23. On October 3, 2019, Ms. N.C. filed a new Custody and Visitation Rights Action c/c Parental Alienation Action (Case number 1056841-31.2019.8.26.0002) requesting the reversal of custody and, as a preliminary measure, the possibility of visits without the father's interference and the father's submission to a psychiatric evaluation. The court denied the preliminary request and maintained visits only at CEVAT. Then came the Covid-19 pandemic, making face-to-face meetings impossible, so video calls were ordered. Even so, the minor began to refuse any dialogue with his mother.

Conclusions of the Petitioning Party

24. The petitioning party considers that it has exhausted domestic remedies through the report of domestic violence, the action for protective measures, the report of statutory rape, the request for recusal of the judge in the custody action, the rescissory action, the action for enforcement of judgment, and the new custody and visitation rights action. Furthermore, it mentions that Ms. N.C. filed a complaint of mistreatment allegedly committed by the father against the child P.C. to the Senate's Parliamentary Inquiry Commission on Child Mistreatment.

25. Regarding the requirement of timely submission, the petitioning party considers that the last domestic decision, for the purpose of calculating the deadline, was the TJSP decision of September 28, 2017, which became final on December 1, 2017.

26. Regarding the characterization of the alleged facts, it considers that the State was negligent in relation to the allegations of sexual abuse and violation of rights, in addition to restricting the mother's contact with her son, treating her in a discriminatory manner and disregarding the best interests of the child.

27. In view of the foregoing, it requests the recognition of these violations, the accountability of the State, and the adoption of legal measures to re-establish shared custody in favor of Ms. N.C., in addition to the opening of proceedings to hold civil servants, magistrates, and others involved in the removal of the mother from contact with her son accountable.

Position of the Brazilian State

28. After a summary of the petitioning party's allegations, the State presents information on the internal proceedings, as well as arguments on admissibility.

Initial Custody Action

29. According to the State, in 2014, the father filed the custody lawsuit 1035356-48.2014.8.26.0002.

30. During the course of the action, on June 2, 2015, the accusation that the father sexually abused his own son was dismissed by the judicial expert report. In the end, there was an agreement for shared custody.

Custody Reversal Action

31. In 2016, in the face of new attempts by the mother to remove the child from the father, the latter requested a precautionary measure of search and seizure (case number 1042431-70.2016.8.26.0002) seeking compliance with what had been agreed in court, as well as initiating a custody reversal action (case number 1042945-23.2016.8.26.0002). The State considers that this action is the main internal proceeding in relation to the petition made to the Inter-American Commission.

32. The State emphasizes that this case was processed under judicial secrecy and that it obtained information about its processing from the Judge of the 3rd Family and Probate Court of Santo Amaro. According to this information, in summary: i) the initial custody case involved a false accusation of sexual abuse made by the mother to remove the father from contact with his son; ii) in the belief that the mother's acts of parental alienation would cease, the father accepted an agreement for shared custody; iii) after the agreement, however, the alienating attitudes remained and the mother removed the child from the father. In this context, the father requested provisional custody.

33. On August 22, 2016, the request was granted by a court decision of the 3rd Family and Probate Court of Santo Amaro. The decision mentioned the history cited in the previous paragraph and considered that the effort for the child to have a harmonious and serene life is hampered by the mother's behavior, emphasizing that she, despite the psychiatric diagnosis, did not accept specialized treatment. Thus, in order to preserve the child, the court ordered provisional sole custody in favor of the father.

34. The mother filed an interlocutory appeal against the decision. On October 3, 2016, the TJSP ruled the appeal unfounded, maintaining custody with the father and suspending the mother's visits in order to preserve the child. The decision, in summary, i) emphasizes that Ms. N.C. limited herself to arguing again that the father had committed child sexual abuse, when the same allegation had already been disproved in case 1035356-48.2014.8.26.0002; ii) mentions that Ms. N.C., in the context of case 1035356-48.2014.8.26.0002, was diagnosed by a psychiatric expert report with schizotypal disorder, whose symptoms include paranoid or bizarre ideas, perceptual disturbances, transient quasi-psychotic periods with intense illusions, auditory hallucinations, and pseudo-delusional ideas; iii) considers that the appellant's insistence on falsely alleging the occurrence of sexual abuse stems from the psychiatric disorder; iv) points out that, in addition to the false allegation of sexual abuse, the appellant hindered compliance with the visitation regime agreed upon in the previous case, having engaged in parental alienation and caused damage to the psychological development of the child P.C.

35. On January 26, 2017, the judge of the 3rd Family and Probate Court issued a judgment granting custody to the father and suspending the mother's visitation rights for a fixed period of one year, so that there would be sufficient time for Ms. N.C. to undergo psychological and psychiatric treatment. The judgment also established that, if the mother underwent treatment and improved her psychological condition, she could file a new action to resume contact with the child.

36. The conclusions of the judgment were justified on the following grounds: i) after the custody case in which the mother made a false accusation of sexual abuse of the son by the father, intending to remove him from contact with his son, the father reached an agreement with the best spirit of compromise, believing that the mother's attitudes of evident parental alienation would cease; ii) the alienating attitudes remained, with the mother removing the child from the father, forcing him to seek compliance with what was agreed in court through the precautionary measure of search and seizure 1042431-70.2016.8.26.0002; iii) to legitimize her conduct, Ms. N.C. again accused the father of having perpetrated sexual abuse, which had already been ruled out by an expert report; the expert report also identified that the mother suffered from a disorder whose symptoms are compatible with her insistence on falsely alleging the occurrence of sexual abuse; iv) the false accusations of sexual abuse, added to the behavior to hinder the visitation regime agreed upon in the previous case, would characterize parental alienation, with incalculable damage to the child's psychological development.

37. Ms. N.C. appealed to the TJSP. On September 27, 2017, the 8th Chamber of Private Law of the TJSP partially granted the appeal to, while maintaining paternal custody, order the resumption of maternal visits. According to the terms of the decision, in summary, i) there was no denial of defense in the case, and the instruction phase (production of evidence) was closed without opposition; ii) the mother insisted on accusing the father of sexual abuse, even after the reported facts were not confirmed in different cases; iii) in addition to the insistence on serious accusations of sexual abuse, the mother effectively obstructed the father's contact with his son.

38. In view of the foregoing, the TJSP considered that it would not be beneficial to the child's development to grant custody to the mother and, therefore, this part of the judgment was upheld. On the other hand, the Court noted that the diagnosed mental disorder, according to the expert report, does not involve a risk of aggression or negligence; thus, the mother's visitation regime, initially under supervision, could be re-established in favor of the child's psycho-affective development.

Rescissory Action and New Custody Action

39. Dissatisfied with the TJSP's decision in the custody reversal action, the mother filed a rescissory action (case number 2052559-70.2018.8.26.0000) with a request for a provisional remedy. The aforementioned request was assessed by another TJSP judge and denied. The Court, in summary, considered that the plaintiff's points were generic and that there was no indication that the expert reports taken into account by the questioned judgment were dubious or that there was any indication of procedural fraud.

40. Additionally, the mother filed a new lawsuit for custody and regulation of visits (Case 1056841-31.2019.8.26.0002). In this case, according to the State, the Judiciary maintained the need for supervision in the visits, noting the absence of elements that would justify the immediate reversal of custody in favor of the mother.

Conclusions of the State

41. The State considers that the petition did not previously exhaust domestic remedies. It mentions that, at the time the petition was submitted to the IACHR, the rescissory action and the new custody action had not yet been exhausted.

42. The State also emphasizes that none of the exceptions to the rule of prior exhaustion apply to the case. The petitioning party was not prevented from accessing the Judiciary, nor was there undue delay or absence of due process. On the contrary, Ms. N.C. was able to use various domestic remedies, having even reversed part of the custody reversal to resume contact with her son.

43. The State further emphasizes that the IACHR should not act as a review court or fourth instance. It argues that the domestic decisions were issued within the competence of the national courts, based on a broad analysis of evidence and in accordance with due process. It stresses that any disagreements of the petitioner in relation to expert reports or decisions do not, in themselves, constitute violations of rights.

VI. ANALYSIS OF EXHAUSTION OF DOMESTIC REMEDIES AND TIMELINESS OF THE PETITION

44. The Inter-American Commission observes that the petition denounces the reversal of custody of the child P.C. against Ms. N.C., despite i) the allegations that the father had committed sexual abuse against the child and ii) the expert report having found that the psychological situation of P.C.'s mother would not prevent her from exercising custody.

45. The petitioning party maintains that it used all available procedural means at the domestic level for the protection of the alleged rights. The State argues that measures and lawsuits are still ongoing, such as the new lawsuit for custody and regulation of visits.

46. The Inter-American Commission reiterates that the requirement of prior exhaustion of domestic remedies aims to allow national authorities to be aware of the alleged violation of a protected right before the situation is brought to the attention of an international body³.

³ IACHR, Digest of decisions on admissibility and competence of the IACHR, OEA/Ser.L/V/II.175 Doc. 20, Mar. 4, 2020, paragraph 105 et seq.

47. The Commission notes that the denounced issue could be known by the national authorities during the course of the custody and custody reversal actions.

48. Regarding custody action 1035356-48.2014.8.26.0002, according to the information provided by the parties, i) in 2014 the child's father filed the action; ii) on June 2, 2015, the expert report dismissed the accusation that the father sexually abused his own son; iii) in May 2016, the 3rd Family and Probate Court established shared custody in an agreement between the parties, and the action became final.

49. Regarding custody reversal action 1042945-23.2016.8.26.0002, in summary, i) in July 2016 Ms. N.C. again reported Mr. T.M. for sexual abuse against his son, and the criminal investigation was closed for lack of evidence; ii) in August 2016 Mr. T.M. obtained a court order for the search and seizure of the child and initiated the custody reversal action, having obtained provisional custody by court decision; iii) Ms. N.C. filed an interlocutory appeal against the decision, which was ruled unfounded by the TJSP on October 3, 2016; iii) on January 26, 2017, the judge of the 3rd Family and Probate Court issued a judgment granting custody of the minor to the father and suspending the mother's visitation rights for a fixed period so that she could receive psychiatric treatment; v) Ms. N.C. appealed the decision to the TJSP; on September 27, 2017, the Court partially granted the appeal to, while maintaining paternal custody, order the resumption of maternal visits. This decision became final on December 1, 2017.

50. In view of the foregoing, the Inter-American Commission considers that the TJSP decision exhausted ordinary domestic remedies. Considering that the initial petition was submitted to the IACHR on November 15, 2017, the petition, in this aspect, meets both requirements of Articles 46.1.a) and 46.1.b) of the Convention.

51. In conclusion, the Commission notes that, after the TJSP decision, the petitioner initiated a rescissory action and a new custody action. On this issue, it clarifies that the rescissory action aims to overturn a final judgment and, therefore, is a remedy of an exceptional nature. The new custody and visitation action, filed in 2019, addresses a factual situation subsequent to the 2017 decision. Therefore, it does not prevent the analysis of the exhaustion of remedies in relation to the situation as it existed until the 2017 decision became final.

VII. ANALYSIS OF COLORABLE CLAIM

52. The core of the petition lies in a family dispute over the custody of a child. The petitioning party alleges that the State violated the rights of the child and his mother by the way it intervened in the dispute. In this sense, it asks the Commission to admit the petition and, on the merits, to order the State to re-establish shared custody and to hold accountable the civil servants and judges involved in the removal of Ms. N.C.'s contact with her son. The State, for its part, considers that the national authorities did not violate the rights of the child and his mother, emphasizing that the Commission cannot act as a fourth instance.

53. The Inter-American Commission has competence to assess whether State actions and/or omissions represent violations of the Inter-American human rights standards applicable to the case. Such actions or omissions may be of an administrative, legislative, judicial, or other nature. The analysis of their compatibility with Inter-American law does not imply that the Commission acts as a fourth instance in relation to internal proceedings. At the same time, the Commission is a subsidiary body for the protection of human rights; in this sense, if the petition does not, *prima facie*, expose facts that could characterize a violation of conventional rights, it should not be admitted⁴.

54. Considering the object of the petition, the Commission recalls that, as the Inter-American Court has already established, children are holders of the rights established in the American Convention, in

⁴ In the same sense: IACHR, Report No. 24/23. Petition 1221-13. Inadmissibility. Tania Valencia Hernández, David Fernando Ochoa Valencia and Carlos Mario Ochoa Valencia. Colombia. February 26, 2023; IACHR, Report No. 83/05. Petition 644/00. Inadmissibility. Carlos Alberto López Urquía, Honduras, October 24, 2005; IACHR, Report No. 289/23. Petition 1682-13. Inadmissibility. O. B. P. P., O. B. P. G. and relatives. Chile. October 31, 2023.

addition to having the special protection measures contemplated in Article 19 of the Convention, which must be defined according to the particular circumstances of each specific case⁵.

55. In the present case, according to the reported facts, the State's Judiciary carried out various interventions over several years, with the participation of experts, investigators, magistrates, and second-instance courts. This broad action indicates, *prima facie*, that the State established channels of access to justice and adopted procedures to evaluate the allegations of both parties and observe the rights of all persons involved, especially children and adolescents.

56. The successive expert reports and opinions, as well as the caution in provisionally defining or reversing custody, indicate an attempt to assess, at different times, whether the child was exposed to risks or suffered any abuse. The child was heard and evaluated in an expert setting, and his report influenced the conclusions contained in the records. The closure of the criminal investigation, the determination of search and seizure, the subsequent resumption of maternal visits, and the possibility of new actions to reassess custody demonstrate that, in general, the State sought to comply, *prima facie*, with its duty to ensure the rights of the child, his development, safety, and well-being.

57. The Commission also observes that the judicial decisions on custody, including those that restricted the mother's contact, were justified mainly by the understanding that the repeated allegations of sexual abuse, not corroborated by the expert reports, were causing psychological harm to the child. As the Inter-American Court of Human Rights pointed out, "*a child should not be interviewed more frequently than necessary, especially when investigating harmful events, since [reiteration] can be difficult and have traumatic effects.*"⁶

58. The reported facts also denote that the domestic instances complied, *prima facie*, with what the IACHR stated about legal separations of the child from family members being justified in the best interests of the child, exceptional and, as far as possible, temporary⁷. The Judiciary, over the years of intrafamily conflict, sometimes decided to remove Mr. T.M. from the home and grant custody to Ms. N.C., and sometimes decided to reverse custody and temporarily suspend visits to prevent harm to the child's well-being and development.

59. When it reassessed the expert conclusion that there would be no risk in re-establishing contact, the Judiciary re-established assisted visits, demonstrating concern for ensuring the family bond and, at the same time, safeguarding the child's well-being in the face of the established family conflict. The reported facts also indicate that the care of progressive rapprochement was observed, another relevant aspect of Inter-American law applicable to the issue⁸.

60. Thus, even if the petitioning party disagrees with the expert reports or the judicial decisions and continues to reiterate the possibility of abuse, the reported facts do not show, in principle, omission or arbitrary action on the part of the State that the Commission can qualify, *prima facie*, as a violation of Inter-American law. The existence of judicial mechanisms to hear the child, take into account his best interests, and reassess custody when necessary, coupled with the plurality of instances covered, suggests that the State acted in a manner compatible with international protection standards.

61. In light of the foregoing, the Commission understands that the reported facts do not constitute an apparent or potential violation of conventional rights that would justify the continuation of the examination

⁵ Inter-American Court of Human Rights. Case of Atala Riffo and Daughters v. Chile. Judgment of February 24, 2012 (merits, reparations, and costs), paragraph 196.

⁶ Inter-American Court of Human Rights. Case of Atala Riffo and Daughters v. Chile. Judgment of February 24, 2012 (merits, reparations, and costs), paragraph 205.

⁷ Inter-American Court of Human Rights. Case of Fornerón and Daughter v. Argentina. Judgment of April 27, 2012 (merits, reparations, and costs), paragraph 116 ("*... legal separations of the child from his biological family are only permissible if they are duly justified in the best interests of the child, are exceptional and, as far as possible, temporary...*").

⁸ See, e.g., Inter-American Court of Human Rights. Case of Fornerón and Daughter v. Argentina. Judgment of April 27, 2012 (merits, reparations, and costs), paragraphs 160, 164.

within the framework of the Inter-American System. Consequently, it declares the petition inadmissible for lack of characterization, in accordance with Article 47.b) of the Convention.

VIII. DECISION

1. To declare the present petition inadmissible;
2. To notify the parties of this decision; to publish this decision and include it in its Annual Report to the General Assembly of the Organization of American States.

Approved by the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights on the 1st day of the month of April, 2025.
(Signed:) José Luis Caballero Ochoa, President; Arif Bulkan, Second Vice President; Roberta Clarke, Carlos Bernal Pulido and Gloria Monique de Mees, Commissioners.