

**INTER-AMERICAN COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS  
RESOLUTION TO LIFT PRECAUTIONARY MEASURES 30/2025**

Precautionary Measure No. 448-10  
V́ctor Ayala Tapia regarding Mexico<sup>1</sup>  
March 31, 2025  
Original: Spanish

**I. SUMMARY**

1. The Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (IACHR) has decided to lift these precautionary measures in favor of V́ctor Ayala Tapia, in Mexico. At the time of making the decision, the Commission assessed the actions taken by the State during implementation as well as the observations presented by the beneficiaries' representation. Taking into account the nature of the precautionary measures and in light of the information available, the Commission considered that it is not possible to establish a situation of risk under the terms of Article 25 of its Rules of Procedure at this time. Upon not identifying compliance with the procedural requirements, the IACHR has decided to lift these precautionary measures.

**II. BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

2. On June 28, 2011, the IACHR granted precautionary measures in favor of V́ctor Ayala Tapia, in Mexico. The request stated that the beneficiary had been missing since September 14, 2010, after heavily armed individuals reportedly broke into his residence, threatened those present at gunpoint, and kidnapped him. On that occasion, in view of the lack of determination of the beneficiary's situation and whereabouts, the Commission required that the Government of Mexico:

- a. immediately adopt the necessary measures to determine the situation and whereabouts of V́ctor Ayala Tapia and to protect his life and personal integrity; and,
- b. report on the actions taken to investigate the facts that led to the adoption of this resolution, so as to prevent them from reoccurring.<sup>2</sup>

3. The Collective Against Torture and Impunity (*Colectivo Contra la Tortura y la Impunidad, CCTI*) exerts representation before the Commission.

**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 have been received from the parties and sent from the IACHR on the following dates:

	State	Representation	IACHR
<b>2011</b>	July 20	No information	August 1

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

<sup>2</sup> IACHR, [Precautionary Measure No. 448-10](#), V́ctor Ayala Tapia regarding Mexico, June 28, 2011 (Available only in Spanish).

<b>2013</b>	September 24	May 28 <sup>3</sup>	April 29, October 10
<b>2020</b>	November 20 (extension), December 10	No information	October 20, December 9 (extension)
<b>2022</b>	November 7	October 19	August 23, November 4
<b>2023</b>	January 5, September 26	April 18, June 5	January 25, July 24, November 7
<b>2024</b>	September 13	February 16 (extension), May 4	April 4 (extension), June 18, October 25

5. The State requested that the measures be lifted on November 7, 2022, January 5, and September 26, 2023, and September 13, 2024. The representation requested an extension of the measures on June 5, 2023 and May 4, 2024. The requests were forwarded to the parties, and it was stated that the Commission would evaluate keeping these precautionary measures in force. The representation has not replied to the last request for information dated October 25, 2024, and the granted period has since expired.

**b. Information provided by the State**

6. On July 20, 2011, the State learned that the investigation GALE/04/328/2010-IX was ongoing at the Office of the Inspector General of Guerrero (*Procuraduría General de Justicia de Guerrero*, PGJG). It was indicated that the Guerrero Human Rights Defense Commission (*Comisión de Defensa de Derechos Humanos de Guerrero*, CODDHEHUM) issued Recommendation 021/2011 for proceedings to search for and locate the beneficiary and that psychological care was to be offered to his wife, but she had refused to receive it. The PGJG agreed to comply with the recommendation. The following proceedings were reported in the investigation in 2010: on September 14, the complaint was received; on September 16, the preliminary investigation was initiated; on September 18, an visual inspection was conducted; on September 20, a suspension was denied in an appeal for protection of constitutional rights (*amparo*) filed to request certain actions from the PGJG; on September 23, it was learned that the beneficiary had previously been imprisoned for marijuana possession, but at the time of the events, there was no record of any admission to penitentiary centers; on September 23, the beneficiary's wife reaffirmed the complaint; on September 25, a press release about the beneficiary's disappearance was received; on October 1, after a published article, it was verified with the beneficiary's wife that he had not been located; on October 13, the PGJG and the CODDHEHUM went to interview the wife; on December 6, assistance was requested to verify if prosecutors in other jurisdictions had any preliminary investigations related to the beneficiary. It was added that CODDHEHUM concluded that it was not proven that the disappearance was attributable to state agents.

7. On September 24, 2013, an update was provided on the PGJG's proceedings: members of the Ministerial Police visited several communities; searches were carried out in prisons in four nearby municipalities; responses were requested from areas of the PGJG, from other Guerrero agencies, from Offices of Attorney Generals in other states, and from federal social rehabilitation centers. It was added that PGJG personnel had visited the residence of the beneficiary's wife to offer psychological support, but that the residence was uninhabited and they did not have any information on her current whereabouts. Psychological care was available to her and they were looking to report to her on the current status of the investigation. Furthermore, the PGJG was awaiting authorization from a family member to perform the DNA comparison with the basis of genetic profiles.

8. On December 10, 2020, an update was provided regarding the request for information from various hospitals, bus terminals, and public security secretariats, as well as the request made on September 20, 2018, for the collaboration of the Office of the Attorney General of Mexico (FGR) and the 31 federal entities for the search and location of the beneficiary. In this regard, during 2019 a response was received from the Office of the Attorney General of Tabasco, Tamaulipas, Baja California, State of Mexico and Oaxaca, without any

<sup>3</sup> The information contained in this communication was presented as confidential.

information on his whereabouts. On November 7, 2022, the State reported that in 2021 and 2022, “collaborative actions had been initiated, both with the National Search Commission [CNB] and with the State Commission for the Search for Missing Persons [CEBP].” It was noted that on September 19, 2022, the DNA sample report was requested. The Office of the Attorney General of Guerrero (FGEG, formerly PGJG) stated that it maintained contact with his family members at all times and had contacted them to offer them psychological support. This measure will remain in effect as needed, with the family’s consent. The State has requested that the measures be lifted.

9. On January 5, 2023, it was reported that the DNA sample report was requested again on November 28, 2022. It was informed that the CEBP, an institution that took office in April 2019, established communication with various authorities of the entity and transportation companies. In turn, the CEBP led 11 widespread search operations in the area, specifying the locations and dates of these operations between September 2021 and November 2022, all in collaboration with the FGR and four with a search collective. In addition, on November 30, 2022, the CEBP contacted the beneficiary’s family unit to request information about him to publish in a search bulletin. The request to lift the measures was reiterated.

10. On September 26, 2023, the State clarified that the SEGOB’s (Secretariat of the Interior) National System for the Search of Disappeared Persons had officially registered the beneficiary’s disappearance on February 5, 2021, and had commenced search efforts on his behalf on February 8, 2021. In this sense, it was indicated that by May 2022, when the beneficiary’s wife first contacted the CEBP, the institution already had records of the matter. With respect to the location of the genetic profile created for the beneficiary, it was specified that the records were included in the preliminary investigation. Additionally, the search bulletin prepared on November 30, 2022 was published for dissemination on the same day. It was noted that on August 15 and 28, 2023, individualized search efforts for the beneficiary’s whereabouts were conducted in three municipalities in Guerrero. Regarding information on the beneficiary’s family unit, the State shared the contact details of the State Executive Commission of Victims (*Comisión Ejecutiva de Atención a Víctimas*, CEAV) personnel in Guerrero, in order for family members to request the support and assistance they deem necessary. In relation to the above, it was noted that the FGEG requested the CEAV to collaborate with granting the status of indirect victims to the beneficiary’s wife and two children. The request to lift the measures were reiterated.

11. On September 13, 2024, it was updated that the file before the CEBP had been integrated with operational reports of actions from August 15 and 25, 2023, and March 8, 2024, with no positive search results. Regarding the registration of Víctor Ayala’s family members in the National Registry of Victims (RENAVI), it was stated that they had not reached out to the authorities, nor had any communication been received from them. As a result, they once again provided the contact information for the personnel they can approach. The request to lift was reiterated.

**c. Information provided by the representation**

12. On October 19, 2022, it was reported that on October 13, 2018, experts from the Office of the Attorney General went to the residence of Víctor Ayala’s wife, where they took blood samples from her and their children. It was questioned that, as of October 2022, they had not been informed of the results of the samples and were only told that they were being tracked because it was not possible to locate them. It was shared that the representative organization, the CCTI, provided support and psychological care to the beneficiary’s family. In this sense, it concluded that, as a consequence of the disappearance, they have “an open wound that never heals”, which affects them emotionally and changes the roles within the family dynamic. The CCTI facilitated access to specialized medical care for family members and provided them with financial support during the pandemic. Moreover, it was emphasized that his family members had not been recognized as indirect victims nor had they been included in the National Registry of Victims, and therefore they did not have any support from the State.

13. On April 18, 2023, the representation reported that in the region where the family resides, on the Costa Grande of Guerrero, there have been reports of armed confrontations. Additionally, one of the beneficiary's sons received threats, forcing him to move abroad for safety. In a communication dated June 5, 2023, it was argued that, of the 11 general search operations reported by the State between September 2021 and November 2022, it was not reasonable to consider searching for the beneficiary in most of them. This was because the CEBP only contacted the family in May 2022, at which point it became aware of the case. In addition to the above, it was added that the genetic profile of Víctor Ayala had not been established, and searches for him were therefore not effective. The representation stated that only 12 years after his disappearance, and six months after the CEBP became aware of the case, was the beneficiary's identification file drawn up, and that they had only been in contact with his wife when his details were collected. It was reiterated that there was a context of violence in the area and residents have to lock themselves in their homes when the shootings begin. It was also shared that the beneficiary's family has faced difficulties accessing medical and psychological care to address issues they attribute to Víctor Ayala's disappearance,<sup>4</sup> reporting a decline in their overall health. It was reiterated that Víctor Ayala's wife and children were not included in RENAVI. Lastly, it was reported that Emmanuel received threats that "the same thing that happened to his father would happen to him",<sup>5</sup> so on March 9, 2023, he traveled to Tijuana, Mexico, from where he requested asylum in the United States, which he entered on May 15, 2023. The representation that the measures be extended in favor of Víctor Ayala's wife and children.

14. On May 4, 2024, it was recalled that the family had experienced psychosocial impacts and health problems, and that the State had not provided assistance in areas such as education, housing, basic food supplies, and healthcare. It was also emphasized that Víctor Ayala had been the main source of income for the family. It was reported that one of his sons had to take refuge outside the country and that a climate of violence persists in the area, and requested that the measures remain in force.

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

15. 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.

16. 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.<sup>6</sup> Regarding the protective nature, these measures seek to avoid irreparable harm and to protect the exercise of human rights.<sup>7</sup> To do this, the IACHR shall assess the

<sup>4</sup> Attached medical records of several consultations with diverse specialists, such as an otorhinolaryngologist, dermatologist, gynaecologist, gastroenterologist, among others.

<sup>5</sup> Provided a screenshot of a *WhatsApp* message in which, among other things, states: "you fucking kid Emanuel, you are the first with your daddy," from an unknown number.

<sup>6</sup> I/A Court H.R., [Matter of the Yare I and Yare II Capital Region Penitentiary Center](#), 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.

<sup>7</sup> 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)

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.<sup>8</sup> Regarding their 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.

17. 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.

18. 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.<sup>9</sup> In this sense, when no imminent risk is identified, the burden of proof and argument increases over time.<sup>10</sup> 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.<sup>11</sup>

19. As a *preliminary matter*, the Commission observes that the representation requested the extension of the measures in favor of Víctor Ayala’s wife and children. Thus, it is noted that a significant portion of the allegations concerns the medical and psychological care, as well as other forms of economic support, that the family has requested from the State. Moreover, although information was provided about threats received by one of the beneficiary’s children, they have been abroad since May 2023 and has not shared any plans to return in the near future. In this regard, and in light of the information provided, the Commission notes that there is no evidence to extend the precautionary measures, without prejudice to the possibility of submitting a new request if new events that place the individuals at risk occur.

---

<sup>8</sup> 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 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).

<sup>9</sup> I/A Court H.R., [Case of Fernandez Ortega et al.](#), Provisional Measures regarding Mexico, Order of February 7, 2017, considerandums 16 and 17 (Available only in Spanish).

<sup>10</sup> I/A Court H.R., [Case of Fernandez Ortega et al.](#), previously cited, considerandums 16 and 17.

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



20. In this matter, the Commission recalls that the precautionary measures were granted following Víctor Ayala Tapia's disappearance, which occurred on September 14, 2010, the day he was allegedly deprived of his liberty by armed individuals who broke into his home. Therefore, the Commission requested that the Mexican State take the necessary measures to determine his whereabouts or fate and to investigate the events.

21. The Commission confirms that, since the granting of these precautionary measures and during the time they were in force, the State has provided information on the measures adopted to locate the whereabouts of the beneficiary. In this regard, the Commission highlights the following:

- a. The PGJG/FGEG initiated investigation GALE/04/328/2010-IX in relation to the disappearance, and since 2010 has been carrying out proceedings and gathering responses from various institutions. Searches were reported to have been carried out in municipalities in the region and a genetic profile was obtained which, according to the State, is included in the investigation file.
- b. The CODDEHEHUM also issued a recommendation addressing the facts and has assisted the Prosecutor's Office in proceedings.
- c. The State Commission for the Search for Missing Persons (CEBP) included the beneficiary in its searches from February 8, 2021, reporting 11 searches between September 2021 and November 2022; as well as on August 15 and 28, 2023, and March 8, 2024, with no positive results. In turn, a search form was prepared and disseminated and information has been collected from several institutions. Without prejudice to the passage of time, the IACHR emphasizes the importance of the continuing CEBP search efforts related to the beneficiary as a specialized institution created for these purposes.
- d. In addition, it is noted that both the Office of the Attorney General and the Search National Commission reportedly have sought to maintain contact with the beneficiary's family members. It is positively highlighted that, although they are not beneficiaries, psychological support was made available to them. More recently, their registration in the state victims' registry was requested, providing the contact information of CEAV personnel to help them manage the support and assistance they may need. The Commission positively values the fact that a channel has been made available by the competent authority to channel the needs that have been reported in relation to the family unit.

22. In the analysis of compliance with the procedural requirements in cases of disappearances, each specific case must be evaluated, taking into account the time elapsed, the actions of the competent authorities, as well as the allegations of the representation. In this matter, the Commission notes the actions taken by several State bodies to search for and locate the beneficiary, both within the framework of the investigation by the FGEG and, more recently, with the involvement of the CEBP. The Commission also emphasizes that more than 14 years have elapsed since the disappearance. In this regard, the Commission takes into account that when granting precautionary measures for recent disappearances, it does so within a specific temporal context, with the goal of ensuring that "the competent authorities adopt expeditious action to find the person's whereabouts and avoid irreparable harm."<sup>12</sup> In this sense, the IACHR, like the Inter-American Court of Human Rights, considers that "the passage of time [...] and the lack of progress in the investigations directly affect the useful effect of the provisional [or precautionary] measures."<sup>13</sup> In this regard, in specific situations, the Commission has lifted precautionary measures regarding situations of disappearance, assessing the

<sup>12</sup> IACHR, [Resolution to Lift 2/2021](#), Precautionary Measure No. 1002-041, Luis Alberto Sabando Veliz regarding Ecuador, January 4, 2021, para. 16.

<sup>13</sup> I/A Court H.R., [Matter of Juan Almonte Herrera et al. regarding the Dominican Republic](#), Provisional Measures, Order of November 13, 2015, considerandum 14.

passage of time and the actions implemented by the State,<sup>14</sup> understanding that the allegations and the situation would correspond to be analyzed within the framework of a petition or case.

23. The Commission emphasizes, following the Inter-American Court on the issue of missing persons, and given the passage of time, that the analysis of the actions carried out by the State within the framework of the criminal investigations corresponds to a substantive analysis, which is better suited to the framework of petitions and individual cases system, in the framework of an individual petition and when the applicable procedural prerequisites are met.<sup>15</sup>

24. Considering the nature of the precautionary measures mechanism, based on the information available, and the analysis carried out, the Commission understands that, to date, 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,<sup>16</sup> the Commission considers it pertinent to lift these measures.

25. In line with what was indicated by the Inter-American Court in various matters,<sup>17</sup> a decision to lift cannot imply that the State is relieved from its general obligations of protection, contained in Article 1.1 of the Convention, within the framework of which the State is especially obliged to guarantee the rights of persons at risk and must promote the necessary investigations to clarify the facts, followed by the consequences that may be established. Furthermore, also based on the assessment of the Inter-American Court, the lifting of the precautionary measures does not imply a possible decision on the merits of the dispute.<sup>18</sup>

26. Lastly, 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, including the life and personal integrity of the person identified in the matter at hand. In this regard, it is the responsibility of the State of Mexico to continue the relevant investigations and search efforts, with the goal of clarifying the facts and circumstances surrounding the disappearance of Víctor Ayala Tapia.

## V. DECISION

27. The Commission decides to lift the precautionary measures granted in favor of Víctor Ayala Tapia, in Mexico.

---

<sup>14</sup> See, *inter alia*: IACHR [Resolution 13/2021](#), Precautionary Measure No. 240-15, José Fernando Choto Choto et al. regarding El Salvador, February 4, 2021; [Resolution 2/2021](#), Precautionary Measures No. 1002-04, Luis Alberto Sabando Veliz regarding Ecuador, January 4, 2021; [Resolution 31/2023](#), Precautionary Measures No. 170-18, Óscar Álvarez Rubio regarding El Salvador, May 29, 2023 (Available only in Spanish); [Resolution 31/2023](#), Precautionary Measure No. 265-23, Carla Valpeoz regarding Peru, May 29, 2023 (Available only in Spanish); [Resolution 61/2023](#), Precautionary Measures 201-18, Raffaele Russo, Antonio Russo, and Vincenzo Cimmino regarding Mexico, October 20, 2023 (Available only in Spanish); [Resolution 85/2023](#), Precautionary Measures No. 455-14, Dubán Celiano Días Cristancho regarding Colombia, December 27, 2023; [Resolution 86/2023](#), Precautionary Measures No. 147-15, Donatilo Jiménez Euceda and his family unit regarding Honduras (PM-147-15), December 27, 2023 (Available only in Spanish); [Resolution 25/2024](#), Precautionary Measures No. 264-10; Gerardo Vera Orcino, Javier Martínez Robles, and Francisco de Asís Manuel regarding Mexico, April 27, 2024.

<sup>15</sup> I/A Court H.R., [Case of Juan Almonte Herrera et al. regarding the Dominican Republic](#), previously cited.

<sup>16</sup> 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 (Available only in Spanish).

<sup>17</sup> I/A Court H.R., [Case of Velásquez Rodríguez](#), Provisional Measures regarding Honduras, Order of January 15, 1988, considerandum 3 (Available only in Spanish); [Matter of Giraldo Cardona et al.](#), Provisional Measures regarding Colombia, Order of January 28, 2015, considerandum 40 (Available only in Spanish), and, [Case of Vélez Loor Vs. Panama. Panama](#), Provisional Measures, Order of May 25, 2022, considerandum 62 (Available only in Spanish).

<sup>18</sup> I/A Court H.R., [Matter of Guerrero Larez](#), Provisional Measures regarding Venezuela, Order of August 19, 2013, considerandum 16 (Available only in Spanish); [Matter of Natera Balboa](#), Provisional Measures regarding Venezuela, Order of August 19, 2013, considerandum 16.

---

28. 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.

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

30. Approved on March 31, 2025, by Andrea Pochak, First Vice-President; Arif Bulkan, Second Vice-President; Roberta Clarke; Carlos Bernal Pulido; and Gloria Monique de Mees, members of the IACHR.

Tania Reneaum Panszi  
Executive Secretary