
**INTER-AMERICAN COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS
RESOLUTION TO LIFT PRECAUTIONARY MEASURES 17/2025**

Precautionary Measure No. 13-15
Norma Mesino Mesino and ten identified members of her family
regarding Mexico¹
February 18, 2025
Original: Spanish

I. SUMMARY

1. The Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (IACHR) decided to lift these precautionary measures in favor of Norma Mesino Mesino and ten members of her family, in Mexico. At the time of making the decision, the Commission assessed the actions taken by the State during the implementation and the lack of concrete, current and specific events against the beneficiaries that allow identifying a situation posing a serious and imminent risk. Taking into account the nature of precautionary measures and in light of the information available, the Commission considered that it is currently not possible to establish a situation presenting a risk under the terms of Article 25 of the Rules of Procedure. Consequently, the IACHR decided to lift the measures.

II. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2. On February 25, 2015, the IACHR granted precautionary measures in favor of Norma Mesino Mesino and ten identified members of her family,² in Mexico. In the request, it was indicated that Mesino Mesino was being subjected to threats, harassment, and acts of violence, while serving as leader of the Organization of Peasants of the Southern Sierra (OCSS), as well as in the context of seeking justice and clarifying the murder of her brothers, Miguel Ángel Mesino Mesino, in 2005, and Rocío Mesino Mesino, in 2013. The Commission considered that the requirements of seriousness, urgency, and irreparable harm were *prima facie* met, in the terms of Article 25 of the IACHR Rules of Procedure, and requested that Mexico:

- a) Take the necessary measures to preserve the life and personal integrity of Norma Mesino Mesino and the 10 identified members of her family;
- b) Adopt the necessary measures so that Norma Mesino Mesino can carry out her activities as a human rights defender without being subjected to acts of violence and harassment in the performance of her duties;
- c) Consult and agree upon the measures to be adopted with the beneficiaries and their representatives;
- d) Report on actions taken to investigate the alleged facts that led to the adoption of this precautionary measure, so as to prevent such events from reoccurring.³

3. The representation is exercised by the organization “Mexican Commission for the Defense and Promotion of Human Rights.”

¹In accordance with Article 17(2)(a) of the IACHR Rules of Procedure, Commissioner José Luis Caballero Ochoa, a Mexican national, did not participate in the debate and deliberation of this matter.

²According to the list provided, the identified members of her family are: Hilario Mesino Acosta, Alicia Mesino Castro, Carlos Mesino Mesino, Juan Carlos Mesino Messino, Victor Mesino Messino, Eugenia Messino Castro, María de la Luz Mesino Castro, Sergio Oyomel Mesino Castro, Daniel Mesino Sánchez, and María Luisa Sánchez Carbajal.

³IACHR, [Resolution 5/2015](#), Precautionary Measure No. 13-15, Matter of Norma Mesino Mesino et al. regarding Mexico, February 25, 2015.

III. INFORMATION PROVIDED DURING THE TIME THESE PRECAUTIONARY MEASURES WERE IN FORCE

a. Procedure during the time the measures were in force

4. During the time the precautionary measures were in force, the Commission followed-up on the situation by requesting information from the parties. In this regard, communications were received from the parties and sent from the IACHR on the following dates:

Year	State	Representation	IACHR
2015	March 26, September 22	August 11	June 30, August 3 (renewal), December 21
2016	May 19, December 1	January 12, July 26, November 7 (time extension)	July 1, October 3
2017	No information		April 7
2018	No information	October 29, December 5	
2019	No information	March 6, August 29	April 5, October 29 (rejection of work meetings)
2020	No information	No information	
2021	No information	April 21	
2022	October 5	No information	September 26, November 18
2023	September 15	January 17	June 15, November 2
2024	July 3	February 1	April 3, September 27

5. On August 3, 2015, the Commission notified the renewal of these precautionary measures. The State requested that the precautionary measures be lifted in its reports of October 5, 2022; September 15, 2023; and July 3, 2024, which were forwarded to the representatives for their observations. On such occasions, the IACHR indicated that it would evaluate whether these precautionary measures should remain in force and requested to send updated and detailed information on the situations presenting a risk that had taken place. The representation did not send communications since February 1, 2024. Nor has it responded to the requests made on April 3 and September 27, 2024.

b. Information provided by the State

6. On March 26, 2015, the State reported, as background, that on October 28, 2013, the Governor of the State held a meeting with Norma Mesino Mesino to determine security measures after the death of her sister Rocío. On that occasion, it was agreed to implement the following: i) installation of security cameras; ii) protection and patrols by the municipal police; iii) risk assessment and advice by specialists; and iv) assignment of an emergency contact. The State of Guerrero reportedly also covered particular psychological care. On September 23, 2014, a new meeting took place with Norma Mesino Mesino, in which she was informed about progress in the investigation.

7. The State complemented that, after the granting, a meeting was held on March 6, 2015, in which it was agreed the following: i) delivery of a panic button; ii) provide emergency numbers; iii) verify the circumstances in which personal accompaniment service is provided to Norma Mesino Mesino; iv) provide psychological care; and v) collect statements from the beneficiaries in a place where they feel safe. It was added that there was an investigation folder for the events that gave rise to the these measures, where two family members acted as witnesses.

8. On September 22, 2015, the State reported that a meeting was held on August 28, 2015, with the beneficiary and her representation in Acapulco, Guerrero, where she was informed about the progress of the relevant investigations. After the meeting, the Secretary of Public Security of the State of Guerrero (SSPEG)

determined a service of four security escorts, in turns, for Norma Mesino Mesino; review of the security equipment of her group of security escorts, granting new bulletproof vests and firearms; as well as accompaniments by police elements for transfers in the state. In addition, the Ministry of the Interior (SEGOB) carried out a risk analysis of the beneficiary and her family. In turn, it was indicated that the Attorney General's Office of Guerrero (FGG) required that the representation transmit the calendar to collect the statements of witnesses, in the place where they felt comfortable.

9. On May 19, 2016, the State shared about a meeting on November 9, 2015, with the beneficiaries, where they announced the results of the risk analyses and reached agreements for the release of the pending testimonies. The State referred that Norma Mesino Mesino's guard service was provided on a continuous basis, with five permanent security escorts,⁴ who were trained for the functions, as well as an official unit. The State provided information on Joel Hernández López, regarding which the representatives requested an extension at the time.

10. By a report received on December 1, 2016, the State announced that the Mechanism for the Protection of Human Rights Defenders and Journalists (Mechanism) received a request for the incorporation of Norma Mesino Mesino. After carrying out the corresponding analysis, the "non-admission" of the request was determined, a decision that was challenged by the representation, but dismissed as extemporaneous. It was added that Norma Mesino Mesino continued with the service of four security escorts and a determination on a suspended family member was still pending.

11. On October 5, 2022, the State indicated that the security measures in force for the protection of Norma Mesino Mesino consisted of the following: i) a panic button; ii) a surveillance camera; iii) a high security door lock, iv) a lighting reflector; and v) an installation of cyclonic mesh. In addition to this, guard and custody service is provided through four elements of the SSPEG, who provide uninterrupted security since 2015. On the other hand, the State updated that in April and August 2022 inter-institutional meetings were held with the government of Guerrero, where security measures and progress in the investigations were reviewed, setting the next meeting on October 21, 2022. The State added that, in the meeting with the beneficiary in April 2022, she requested to include V.M.P.C. as part of her safety device, which was granted. The beneficiary also required to include two other elements for having "knowledge of their context," but the request was rejected for not covering the guidelines of the public security system. In turn, regarding the request to incorporate J.M.P. into her security detail, it was indicated that he was carrying out control and confidence tests to be part of the police. On questions raised by the representation regarding the state of the assigned vehicle, the State reported that it was renewed in 2019 at the request of the beneficiary, being in good condition and with a fuel supply card. It was added that in May 2022 certified copies of one of the ongoing investigations were provided and the representation would go to accredit itself as defense council for the beneficiaries in the investigation, to provide a strategic litigation route. The State requested to lift the precautionary measures.

12. On September 15, 2023, the State reported that the security measures at the home of Norma Mesino Mesino and the accompaniments to which she was transferred had been complied with, highlighting that no risk had occurred. In relation to an affirmation by the beneficiary of feeling monitored by her security escorts for taking photographs of her, the State indicated that this corresponds to the permanent accompaniment in which the elements must justify the hours of service, since she has a four-element detail and an official vehicle that was changed recently "so that it was in optimal condition." In addition, it was explained that the elements of the security detail require assistance in other safety tasks, but it has three additional fixed elements and the vehicle with fuel.

13. The State argued that the measures have lasted for almost ten years, since October 31, 2013, without having taken place any incident that puts Norma Mesino Mesino at risk, so the review of the validity of

⁴ It was reported that one of the five elements was a relative of Norma Mesino Mesino, V.M.M., but due to his absence throughout the month of March 2015, he was suspended. After suggesting that the element be changed, the beneficiary refused and stated that she had asked her relatives to do so.

the measures was requested. It was reported that the security elements carried out activities not related to the measures, which constitutes an improper use, as the beneficiary performs her daily activities and not in work as a human rights defender or as a leader of the OCSS. The State recalled the measures granted, such as panic button, surveillance camera, high security door lock, lighting reflector and cyclonic mesh, clarifying that the panic buttons of Norma Mesino and Mario Hernández have an important period of inactivity, so in August 2023 the representation had been reminded of the importance of using the measures properly. On the part of the FGG, it was complemented that, after the meeting of October 2022, the position of a lawyer was accepted as an advisor to Norma Mesino in the investigation for the murder of Rocío Mesino. The FGG added that there was no investigation or complaint of threatening events against Rocío Mesino.

14. On July 3, 2024, the State specified that, in accordance with the FGG's search of its systems, there was no history of investigations or registration of threatening situations reported by Ms. Norma Mesino Mesino. The SSPEG confirmed that the surveillance of the beneficiary's home, the accompaniment in her transfers and the reported security and infrastructure measures continued, with no incidents since 2020. Regarding the reported lack of fuel and safety elements, it was reported that the SEGOB made arrangements for the SSPEG to review it. At the same time, in February 2024, two communications were sent to the representation, requesting to communicate in advance the planned routes to guarantee the supply of gasoline, while the SSPEG would review the specific needs to guarantee the fuel.

c. Information provided by the representation.

15. On August 11, 2015, the representatives submitted a report. They narrated that on February 10, 2015, the police officers guarding Norma Mesino Mesino reported that they should withdraw and leave her without security. On the same day, minutes later, Eugenia, Norma's sister, was detained in Norma's vehicle by Guerrero ministerial police officers. When the driver indicated to them who the vehicle belonged to, they questioned where she was and, after going to Eugenia, whom they allegedly confused with Norma because of her resemblance, they returned the documents and let them go. On May 27, 2015, while an OCSS meeting was being held, two members went out to shop and were followed by ministerial police and then their vehicle was stopped for inspection. The police took one of the defenders for no obvious reason, which caused Eugenia Mesino Mesino and other members of the OCSS to block a road to seek to rescue him. In the act, the policemen went down pointing pistols, but at the insistence, the release of the defender and the withdrawal of the policemen were achieved.

16. The representation reported a meeting with the authorities on April 21, 2015, when the head of the SSPEG indicated that Norma Mesino Mesino would be assigned requested police elements, in relation to a designation of eight people of her confidence required in 2013. According to the representation, they only managed to credit five, but they were assigned to other tasks. On April 21, 2015, the order was issued, but it was pointed out that this implied a decrease in her detail; since before she had five elements per shift and now between five elements they had to take turns, in addition to the fact that only one had a driver's license. It was added that the weaponry delivered was deteriorated and in poor condition, the bulletproof vests expired and the radio communication equipment did not work correctly. It was also reported that the security camera at the home of Norma Mesino Mesino did not work and they committed to installing cameras in the homes of the other beneficiaries, although this was not carried out. In addition, reference was made to the situation of Joel Hernández López and it was requested to extend the precautionary measures in his favor.

17. On January 12, 2016, with regard to the Mesino Mesino family, the representation stated that security cameras had not been installed in the homes of relatives and it was insisted that the protection was reduced to four people, which translated into two people per shift. Finally, the representation indicated that Eugenia's son had been detained while driving Norma Mesino Mesino's vehicle. They asked him to identify himself and checked the vehicle. The same police officers had been observed making rounds around their home.

18. On July 26, 2016, the representation announced that, despite having agreed in the meeting of November 9, 2015, they had not been given the results of the risk analysis in writing, so they could not know

the reasons why a high risk result was obtained on Norma Mesino Mesino. It was added that the panic buttons delivered to the relatives had failed since January 2016, which was notified on January 25 to the SEGOB, but it took four months to change them. In turn, they reported that, in May 2016, a technical visit was made to the home of Norma and “although there have been no recent incidents against the Mesino Mesino family,” security equipment had not been installed. It was added that they had not been approached to change a security escort who was suspended for health reasons and that since November 2016 there had been no meetings with the authorities.

19. On October 29, 2018, they sent a communication to the SEGOB on October 16, 2018, referring to the beneficiary’s willingness to continue using her panic button (before a query that was made to them for keeping the button off for long periods); and it was reported that the assigned patrol vehicle had mechanical failures. On December 5, 2018, the representatives reported that, on November 8, 2018, they were notified of the change of the unit, but that the replacement was “in worse condition.”

20. On January 17, 2023, the representation announced that on April 29 and October 21, 2022, they had meetings with the SEGOB: in the first one they expressed implementation failures, while in the second one they recognized improvement and requested changes in the integration of the security escorts. Regarding the shortcomings, it was noted that Norma Mesino Mesino’s security escorts had stopped providing accompaniment on the following days: September 8, 2021; October 13, 2021; March 14, 2022; and June 23, 2022. According to the details provided, the first occasion had no explanation; the second was due to lack of per diem, gasoline and salary of the elements; in the third one, elements of Acapulco that were guarding her reported that they had not eaten and there were no personnel to replace them, being absent from 8:30 p.m. to 5:00 a.m., while in another transfer of the same day, other elements stopped accompanying her on the journey; and, on the fourth occasion, the element argued that she was lost from her sight, the policeman leaving for three and a half hours. On the last occasion, the beneficiary communicated it to the head of the state police sector, being removed from her security team the following day. It was added that they reported to the authorities that both Norma and Eugenia Mesino Mesino had seen people on a motorcycle parking near their homes and staying several hours, “in what seemed like surveillance work.”⁵

21. The representation added that it had become constant that the elements of the security escort photographed her together with her companions in events and actions that she carries out in her capacity as a human rights defender, the security escorts responding that these were orders. The beneficiary reportedly expressed that she felt under surveillance. It was argued that “there has been a decrease in the number of security escort personnel”; that only one of the people she proposed had been approved and that they used to withdraw him from the security detail repeatedly, being the only element in which she trusted; the vehicles presented mechanical failures, even despite the change in 2019; and the supply of gasoline remained insufficient. On the other hand, a problem was reported with a sheet metal of his home that required attention, but had already been solved, as well as that the safety buttons of Norma and Eugenia Mesino had stopped working in June 2022, which was also solved. It was also alleged that there had been no progress in the investigation into the murder of Rocío Mesino, without proceedings since November 2022, which was indicated that it was because the prosecution again requested the statement of family members, who refused because they considered it revictimizing to testify again after nine years.

22. In the letter received on February 1, 2024, regarding the implementation of protection, the representation stated that “during 2023 the service provided by the State has improved substantially and it has not been necessary to report major incidents.” Notwithstanding, it was noted that the security escort had not accompanied Rocío Mesino in activities in Acapulco, Guerrero; and that Rocío and Eugenia Mesino Mesino “have continued to observe, although more sporadically, the presence of people, now, aboard cars and vans

⁵ According to the minutes of the working meeting of October 21, 2022, the representation indicated that “in an isolated and non-permanent manner, people who monitor her have allegedly been identified.” The Commission requested details in the indictment from the representation.

without license plates [...], who park near their homes and stay several hours,”⁶ an issue that reportedly inhibited Rocío Mesino from carrying out her human rights defense activities. The representation alleged that the procedural requirements remained in force, “based on the context of violence that exists in Guerrero for human rights defenders,” particularly for women. It was reiterated that the security escorts were watching Norma Mesino, since they had listened to her and photographed her “to report what activities she carries out and not why she is being protected from any threat.” In turn, it was insisted that a threatening situation, given “the presence of strange people watching two” beneficiaries. Regarding a call from the State to keep the panic buttons on, after detecting long periods of inactivity, it was specified that this was due to the fact that they were unloaded very quickly and turned off during their transfers, but that the beneficiaries would be informed of the importance of having it on. In relation to the above, it was questioned that the SEGOB indicated in an official letter that, if the inactivity persists, the measure would be suspended. It was reiterated that there was still no progress in the investigation for the murder of Rocío Mesino.

23. On the other hand, the representation shared that, after the passage of Hurricane Otis in Guerrero, in October 2023, Norma Mesino Mesino collected food for the most affected communities, but there was a point where she was not allowed to enter due to the danger of the area and her security escorts, being indicated that “to go up here, it is without police or they do not return,” so she could not bring food to that area. It was added that, together with other members of the OCSS, they continued to carry out actions to request the release of political prisoners of the organization. It was argued that the security escort was necessary on a full-time basis.

IV. ANALYSIS OF THE REQUIREMENTS OF SERIOUSNESS, URGENCY, AND IRREPARABLE HARM

24. The precautionary measures mechanism is part of the Commission’s functions of overseeing compliance with the human rights obligations established in Article 106 of the Charter of the Organization of American States. These general oversight functions are provided for in Article 41 (b) of the American Convention on Human Rights, as well as in Article 18 (b) of the Statute of the IACHR; while the mechanism of precautionary measures is set forth in Article 25 of the Commission’s Rules of Procedure. In accordance with this Article, the IACHR grants precautionary measures in urgent and serious situations in which these measures are necessary to avoid irreparable harm to persons or to the subject matter of a petition or case before the organs of the inter-American system.

25. The Inter-American Commission and the Inter-American Court of Human Rights (“the Inter-American Court” or “I/A Court H.R.”) have established repeatedly that precautionary and provisional measures have a dual nature, both protective and precautionary.⁷ Regarding the protective nature, these measures seek to avoid irreparable harm and to protect the exercise of human rights.⁸ To do this, the IACHR shall assess the problem raised, the effectiveness of state actions to address the situation described, and how vulnerable the persons proposed as beneficiaries would be left in case the measures are not adopted.⁹ Regarding their

⁶ In the absence of detail, on April 3, 2024, the Commission requested the representation in the following sense: “a. Regarding their claim of surveillance by strangers of two beneficiaries, provide details of time, manner and place, as well as inform if the respective complaints have been filed, or failing that, if the facts have been brought to the attention of the authorities responsible for their protection; b. On the alleged “surveillance” by the person who is escorting the beneficiary, if this issue has been addressed in consultation meetings to find the best way to implement said protection measure.”

⁷ I/A Court H.R., [Case of the Yare I and Yare II Capital Region Penitentiary Center \(Yare Prison\)](#), Provisional Measures regarding the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Order of March 30, 2006, considerandum 5; [Case of Carpio Nicolle et al. v. Guatemala](#), Provisional Measures, Order of July 6, 2009, considerandum 16.

⁸ I/A Court H.R., [Matter of Capital El Rodeo I and El Rodeo II Judicial Confinement Center](#), Provisional Measures regarding Venezuela, Order of February 8, 2008, considerandum 8; [Case of Bámaca Velásquez](#), Provisional measures regarding Guatemala, Order of January 27, 2009, considerandum 45; [Matter of Fernández Ortega et al.](#), Provisional measures regarding Mexico, Order of April 30, 2009, considerandum 5; [Matter of Milagro Sala](#), Provisional measures regarding Argentina, Order of November 23, 2017, considerandum 5. (Available only in Spanish)

⁹ I/A Court H.R., [Matter of Milagro Sala](#), Provisional Measures regarding Argentina, Order of November 23, 2017, considerandum 5 (Available only in Spanish); [Matter of Capital El Rodeo I and El Rodeo II Judicial Confinement Center](#), Provisional Measures regarding

precautionary nature, these measures have the purpose of preserving a legal situation while under study by the organs of the inter-American system. Their precautionary nature aims at safeguarding the rights at risk until the petition pending before the inter-American system is resolved. Their object and purpose are to ensure the integrity and effectiveness of an eventual decision on the merits and, thus, avoid any further infringement of the rights at issue, a situation that may adversely affect the useful effect of the final decision. In this regard, precautionary or provisional measures allow the State concerned to comply with the final decision and, if necessary, to implement the ordered reparations. In the process of reaching a decision, according to Article 25(2) of its Rules of Procedure, the Commission considers that:

- a. “serious situation” refers to a grave impact that an action or omission can have on a protected right or on the eventual effect of a pending decision in a case or petition before the organs of the inter-American system;
- b. “urgent situation” refers to risk or threat that is imminent and can materialize, thus requiring immediate preventive or protective action; and
- c. “irreparable harm” refers to injury to rights which, due to their nature, would not be susceptible to reparation, restoration or adequate compensation.

26. In this sense, Article 25(7) of the Commission’s Rules of Procedure establishes that decisions granting, extending, modifying or lifting precautionary measures shall be adopted through reasoned resolutions. Article 25(9) sets forth that the Commission shall evaluate periodically, at its own initiative or at the request of either party, whether to maintain, modify or lift the precautionary measures in force. In this regard, the Commission shall assess whether the serious and urgent situation and the risk of irreparable harm that caused the adoption of the precautionary measures persist. Furthermore, it shall consider whether there are new situations that may meet the requirements outlined in Article 25 of its Rules of Procedure.

27. Similarly, the Commission recalls that while the assessment of the procedural requirements when adopting precautionary measures is carried out from a *prima facie* standard of review, keeping such measures in force requires a more rigorous evaluation.¹⁰ In this sense, when no imminent risk is identified, the burden of proof and argument increases over time.¹¹ The Inter-American Court has indicated that the passage of a reasonable period of time without any threats or intimidation, added to the lack of imminent risk, may lead to the lifting of international protection measures.¹²

28. As a *preliminary matter*, the Commission recalls that through the mechanism of precautionary measures it is appropriate to analyze exclusively issues related to the requirements of seriousness, urgency, and irreparable harm established in Article 25 of the Rules of Procedure of the IACHR. In this regard, the Commission has consistently maintained that allegations referring to domestic proceedings before the competent entity require determinations on the merits, so they must continue with their due process and with the guarantees established in the American Convention and the applicable standards.¹³ In general, the analysis of the compatibility of domestic processes with the American Convention does not correspond within the framework of the mechanism of precautionary measures; hence, these issues will not be assessed in this resolution. Their analysis is a matter of the petition and case system, in the event that an individual petition is filed and the conventional and procedural requirements in force are met. Due to the very mandate of the Commission, it is not for it to determine either individual criminal liabilities as regards the events reported in this proceeding.

Venezuela, Order of February 8, 2008, considerandum 9; [Matter of the Criminal Institute of Plácido de Sá Carvalho](#), Provisional Measures regarding Brazil, Order of February 13, 2017, considerandum 6 (Available only in Spanish).

¹⁰ I/A Court H.R., [Case of Fernandez Ortega et al.](#), Provisional Measures regarding Mexico, Order of February 7, 2017, considerandums 16 and 17.

¹¹ I/A Court H.R., [Case of Fernandez Ortega et al.](#), previously cited, considerandums 16 and 17.

¹² I/A Court H.R., [Case of Fernandez Ortega et al.](#), previously cited, considerandums 16 and 17.

¹³ IACHR [Resolution 55/2021](#), Precautionary Measure No. 576-21, José Domingo Pérez Gómez and his family regarding Peru, July 25, 2021, para. 52; [Resolution 64/2023](#), Precautionary Measure No. 576-21, José Domingo Pérez Gómez and his family regarding Peru, November 8, 2023, para. 72.

29. In analyzing whether the procedural requirements continue to be met, the Commission emphasizes that the purpose of this proceeding refers to the protection of life and integrity and the exercise of the activities as a human rights defender of Norma Mesino Mesino and ten identified family members, through the adoption of agreed measures and the investigation of the facts that led to the precautionary measures.¹⁴ Although, at the time, the parties referred to the situation of Joel Hernández López, the Commission recalls that it did not issue a decision to extend precautionary measures in his favor.

30. Based on the information provided in the case file, the Commission notes the following:

- a. Protective measures During the time the precautionary measures were in force, a risk analysis was carried out and, initially, measures were implemented consisting of a panic button –later a second one was granted–, emergency numbers, and personal accompaniment to Norma Mesino Mesino. In addition to the above, infrastructure measures consisting of a surveillance camera, a high security door lock, a lighting reflector, and a cyclonic mesh were provided.

Regarding the personal security escort service, the SSPEG determined four security escorts in turn, and the possibility of requesting the inclusion of trusted persons of the beneficiary who met the legal requirements was highlighted. The service was later modified by five permanent security escorts, in addition to providing a vehicle for the service and, according to the information available, in the transfers of the beneficiary the security detail was reinforced by police officers who rotated according to the locality. The Commission observes that, although there were constant questions about the integration of the security escort service by the representation, this measure had been implemented permanently during the time the measures were in force.

- b. Concertation actions The Commission recognizes the concertation and communication efforts undertaken by the parties, reporting that since before the granting there were two meetings with the beneficiary, a first one with the governor of Guerrero on October 28, 2013, after the murder of her sister, Rocío Mesino Mesino; and a second one, on September 23, 2014, on progress in the investigation. As of the effective date of the precautionary measures, note is taken of meetings held on March 6, April 21, August 28 and November 9, 2015, as well as November 2016. Although it is noted that for a long period of time they stopped holding consultation meetings, these were resumed in 2022, taking place on April 29 and October 21, 2022.

The IACHR notes that the dialogue between the parties has been effective for the concerted design of the security detail of Norma Mesino and to address possible failures in the measures granted, such as the review of the armament and security equipment of her bodyguards or the failures in the infrastructure measures and panic buttons. Even, despite the lack of meetings for a long period, it is observed that there was a constant exchange of communications between the parties, which was also effective in reporting problems that were addressed, such as the change of vehicle in 2019 or the offices for the review of security escorts and/or fuel supply in 2024.

The Commission positively highlights that, on some occasions, the problems referred to by the representation with the measures granted, at the time of communicating them to the IACHR, were reported as already addressed by authorities. At the same time, the importance of communication with the authorities in charge of the direct implementation of the measures at the local level is highlighted, noting that of the occasions in which the beneficiary reported that her security escorts were absent from their work, on the fourth occasion in which it was reported to the head of the state police sector, the element was removed from the security detail the following day, the issue being promptly corrected.

¹⁴IACHR, Resolution 5/2015, previously cited.

- c. Investigation of threatening events The IACHR notes that the investigation that has had the greatest relevance is that related to the murder of Rocío Mesino Mesino. It is noted that during the time the measures were in force, the parties have sought to promote this process. Indeed, in the consultation meetings updated information was provided on the progress of the investigation and there was a search for consensus to obtain statements from the beneficiaries as witnesses, in a place where they felt safe. In turn, during 2022, coordination on the matter was resumed, and a person from the representation in this matter was sworn in as counsel in the file to follow up on the file.

On the other hand, the State has verified that there is no complaint or investigation for threatening events against beneficiaries.

- d. Ongoing risk. The IACHR notes that, although the representatives noted the existence of people, first on motorcycles and then in vehicles, remaining near the homes of Norma and Eugenia Mesino Mesino, no specific details or facts were provided in this regard, despite having been requested certain information on two occasions. Although the foregoing was reportedly referred to the State also in a meeting on October 21, 2022, the minutes that were provided do not show any kind of detail or that any complaint had been filed for the facts. The Commission recalls that in order to assess the procedural requirements, it is necessary to provide a minimum of detail of the reported risk.

In relation to other recent events, it was indicated that in 2023 Norma Mesino Mesino was not allowed to enter to deliver food in an area, receiving the message that “to go up here, it is without police or they do not return.” In this regard, notwithstanding the alleged limitation of traffic to carry out work in the aforementioned area, it is not clear from the facts that they are directed as a threat or aggression to Norma Mesino, being able to be a general situation of prohibition of entry to the area that was presented by the police accompaniment, without warning that it is related to the identification of the beneficiary.

31. On the other hand, the last response of the representation in the framework of this procedure corresponds to February 1, 2024. Subsequently, after transfers of the State’s reports and requests for observations and information on two occasions, no response has been received. The Commission recalls the importance of receiving regular updates on the situation presenting a risk.¹⁵

32. In evaluating compliance with the procedural requirements, and based on the review conducted, the Commission finds that the factual situation regarding Norma Mesino Mesino and her family members has changed. In particular, the existence of a current risk is not identified, in addition to the fact that the security details and investigation measures have been suitable and effective, and have allowed the exercise of her work in defense of human rights. In this regard, considering the information provided and given the most recent lack of updating of part of the representation of the beneficiaries, it is also not possible to identify new threatening situations or shortcomings in the implementation of the precautionary measures. In this regard, the IACHR acknowledges the efforts made by the Mexican authorities to comply with this precautionary measure.

33. Considering the nature of the precautionary measures mechanism, the information available, and the analysis carried out, the Commission knows that it has no elements to support compliance with the requirements of Article 25 of its Rules of Procedure. Given the above, and taking into account the exceptional and temporary nature of precautionary measures,¹⁶ the Commission considers that it is appropriate to lift these measures.

¹⁵ IACHR [Resolution 97/2024](#), Precautionary Measure No. 994-16, Matter of Lorenzo Mendoza and family regarding Venezuela, December 16, 2024, para. 17; and [Resolution 104/2024](#), Precautionary Measure No. 603-22, Child K.L.R regarding Mexico, December 27, 2024, para. 21.

¹⁶ I/A Court H.R., [Matter of Adrián Meléndez Quijano et al.](#), Provisional Measures regarding El Salvador, Order of August 21, 2013, para. 22; [Matter of Galdámez Álvarez et al.](#), Provisional Measures regarding Honduras, Order of November 23, 2016, para. 24.

34. The Commission emphasizes that regardless of the lifting of these measures, in accordance with Article 1(1) of the American Convention, it is the obligation of the State of Mexico to respect and guarantee the rights recognized therein. In this way, the permanence of protection measures at the domestic level is important, without prejudice to international protection that plays a complementary and subsidiary character. Taking into account that “if the conditions of risk to life and integrity do not subsist, neither do the reasons to keep them in force,” the State of Mexico is reminded of the importance of the internal authorities carrying out a risk assessment, with the participation of the beneficiaries, before deciding on the permanence of the protection measures.¹⁷

V. DECISION

35. The Commission decides to lift the precautionary measures granted in favor of Norma Mesino Mesino and ten identified members of her family, in Mexico.

36. The Commission recalls that the lifting of these measures does not prevent the representation from filing a new request for precautionary measures, should they consider that there exists a situation presenting a risk that meets the requirements set forth in Article 25 of its Rules of Procedure.

37. The Commission instructs its Executive Secretariat to notify this resolution to the State of Mexico and to the representation.

38. Approved on February 18, 2025, by Roberta Clarke, President; Carlos Bernal Pulido, First Vice-President; Arif Bulkan; Andrea Pochak; and Gloria Monique de Mees, members of the IACHR.

Tania Reneaum Panszi
Executive Secretary

¹⁷ IACHR, [Resolution 9/24](#), Precautionary Measure No. 519-17, Eduardo Valencia Castellanos regarding Mexico, March 6, 2024, para. 35; [Resolution 20/2024](#), Precautionary Measure No. 887-19, Families of the Nueva Austria del Sira Community regarding Peru, April 10, 2024, para. 36; [Second report on the Situation of Human Rights Defenders in the Americas](#), December 31, 2011, OEA/Ser.L/V/II. Doc. 66, paras. 529, 531.