

**INTER-AMERICAN COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS
RESOLUTION 51/2025**

Precautionary Measure No. 897-25

Henry Alberto Castillo Molero regarding Venezuela

July 28, 2025

Original: Spanish

I. INTRODUCTION

1. On July 3, 2025, the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (“the Inter-American Commission”, “the Commission” or “the IACHR”) received a request for precautionary measures filed by the Casla Institute (“the applicants”) urging the Commission to request that the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela (the “State” or “Venezuela”) adopt the necessary measures to protect the rights of Henry Alberto Castillo Molero. (“the proposed beneficiary”). According to the request, the proposed beneficiary has been missing since January 24, 2025, after being detained by agents of the General Directorate of Military Counterintelligence (DGCIM) in Caracas, Venezuela.

2. Pursuant to the provisions of Article 25(5) of its Rules of Procedure and the Inter-American Convention on Forced Disappearance of Persons, the Commission requested information from the parties on July 8, 2025. The applicants submitted a response on July 14, 2025. The State did not respond to the Commission within the granted deadline.

3. Upon analyzing the submissions of fact and law furnished by the applicant, the Commission considers that the proposed beneficiary is in a serious and urgent situation, given that his current location is unknown to date. Consequently, pursuant to the provisions of Article 25 of its Rules of Procedure, the Commission requires that Venezuela: a) adopt the necessary measures to protect the rights to life and personal integrity of the beneficiary. In particular, i. report whether the beneficiary is in the custody of the State and, if so, indicate the reason and circumstances of his detention; or the measures taken to determine his whereabouts or fate; ii. if the beneficiary is in the custody of the State, specify whether he has been charged and brought before a competent court to review his detention, or if he has not been brought before a court, explain why not; iii. expressly indicate the court that reportedly knows his criminal case, if any, or the reasons why he has not been released to date; iv. allow the beneficiary to communicate with his family and trusted legal representatives, giving them full access to his criminal file, if any; and v. immediately carry out a medical assessment of his health to obtain more information on his state of health; and b) report on the actions taken to investigate the alleged events that led to the adoption of this precautionary measure, so as to prevent such events from reoccurring.

II. SUMMARY OF FACTS AND ARGUMENTS

A. Information provided by the requesting party

4. Henry Alberto Castillo Molero is an entrepreneur and agricultural producer. He reportedly does not have any ties to military or political activities in the country. He is the uncle of Christian Bernardo Hernández Castillo, a former lieutenant in the Venezuelan Army, whom the request described as a “former political prisoner” and “survivor of torture” in the case known as *Operación Aurora*. The Venezuelan government is reportedly searching for the proposed beneficiary’s nephew in the case known as *Operación Oro*.

5. On January 24, 2025, the proposed beneficiary was reportedly detained by approximately 40 to 50 armed and hooded DGCIM agents from the General Directorate of Military Counterintelligence (DGCIM) in a raid on his parents’ residence in Caracas. The agents previously allegedly detained his nephew Christian

Hernández's pregnant wife. Unable to find his nephew, the officers decided to detain the proposed beneficiary, despite not having a warrant. The agents reportedly stated that "they did not need one because they are the government." Drones were used in the operation. DGCIM officials reportedly warned the family that if they wanted to see the proposed beneficiary alive again, their relative must turn himself in. The proposed beneficiary's whereabouts and health have been unknown since being detained.

6. On February 5, 2025, family members went to the Palace of Justice to file a writ of *habeas corpus*, but it was not accepted. They were told to go to the DGCIM as the proposed beneficiary was not registered in the court records as "presented." On February 11, 13, and 27 and March 10, 2025, they attempted to file the *habeas corpus* again, but were once again refused. On April 2, 2025, at the Palace of Justice, they were informed that the proposed beneficiary had been brought before the Fourth Court for the Control of Terrorism. They were provided with the case file number and the name of the assigned public defender. Additionally, they were instructed to go to the Platinum Building to determine the detention center where the proposed beneficiary was being held. On April 7, 2025, upon arriving at the Platinum Tower, they were informed that the proposed beneficiary had been transferred to Rodeo I. Upon inquiring at Rodeo I, they were told that the proposed beneficiary had not been transferred there. They received the same information at the Boleíta DGCIM where they were instructed to inquire at the Yare prison.

7. On February 12, 2025, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Justice, and Peace, Diosdado Cabello, confirmed that the proposed beneficiary was in state custody during a press conference. He reportedly showed a photograph of him and identified him as Alias "El Tío," who had been arrested under a terrorist plot. A series of items allegedly seized from his residence during the raid were also displayed, which the applicants challenged. On February 21, 2025, after attempting to file documents with the Public Prosecutor's Office, the proposed beneficiary's sister was allegedly pursued and detained at kilometer 5 of the La Vega parish by officials traveling in an unmarked DGCIM truck and dressed in civilian clothing. The request states that she was warned in a "threatening tone" to stop seeking advice or assistance, as she could be charged with incitement to hatred which is a crime punishable by 10 to 12 years in prison. She was also told that if she did not wish to join her imprisoned brother, she should keep quiet and refrain from reporting the incident.

8. On April 11, 2025, upon arriving at the Palace of Justice, the public defender assigned to the case reportedly told the family members that the proposed beneficiary had been located at Rodeo I. She also informed them that he had been charged with conspiracy, terrorism, criminal association, financing terrorism, and treason. The family members reportedly requested that the defense attorney file a writ of *habeas corpus*, but she refused, instead urging them to trust her and assuring them that the proposed beneficiary was fine. On April 29, 2025, when family members visited Rodeo I, they were told that the proposed beneficiary was being held there. However, they were subsequently told that he was not being held there. On May 5, 2025, at the DGCIM facility in Boleíta, the proposed beneficiary was officially identified, and for the first time, family members were permitted to deliver packages. On May 12, 2025, authorities reportedly wrote down the names of the family members and returned the packages to them. They allegedly said that the intended recipient was not there and that the packages had been accepted due to a mistake.

9. With regard to the search efforts, the proposed beneficiary's relatives reportedly visited several detention centers. The applicants highlighted the following information:

- They went to the DGCIM headquarters in Boleíta on the following dates: January 24, 2025, and his sister was told that it was too early and to come back the next day; January 25, 2025, and the proposed beneficiary's sister was told that information was not shared on Saturdays and that she should come back on Monday; January 27, 28, and 29; and on February 3, 2025, an official from the Directorate of Strategic Affairs (DAE) informed them that the proposed beneficiary could be in a safe house known as a "clandestine torture center"; On February 10, 2025, they were told that he still did not appear on the list of detainees. On February 12 and 17, 2025, On February 24, 2025, an official told the family to tell their relative to turn himself in and everything would be resolved; On March 10, 17, and 24, April 7 and 21, May 17 and 26, and June 2, 2025 (no response).

- On January 28, 2025, the proposed beneficiary's sister went to the DGCIM headquarters in Chacao. She was told that there was no record of her brother and that she should go to the DGCIM headquarters in Boleíta.
- The proposed beneficiary's sister visited the Bolivarian National Police (PNB) Detention Center in La Yagüara on January 28, February 6, and February 18, 2025, and was told that there was no record of the proposed beneficiary and that she should go to the DGCIM headquarters in Boleíta.
- They went to the Bolivarian National Intelligence Service (SEBIN) headquarters in El Helicoide on January 29, 30; on February 4, 6, 18, 2025, where they were told that he was being held in the Boleíta DGCIM.
- On January 30, 2025, his sister went to the SEBIN headquarters in Plaza Venezuela. On February 20, 2025, they went to the Public Prosecutor's Office and submitted a letter to the Attorney General. On February 22, 2025, they returned with a letter addressed to the Ombudsperson's Office.
- The family went to the Rodeo I Penitentiary Center on March 16 and May 17, 2025, and were told that he was not in the system; On May 22, 2025, they were told that they could not be given any information. On June 7, 2025, an official told them that if the proposed beneficiary happened to be there, they would have to wait 30 days after the adaptation process to obtain information about him. On June 12, 2025, they were told that they were not authorized to give the family any information.
- They went to the Platinum Tower on May 19, 2025, and were told that he was being held in Rodeo I. On June 16, 2025, the family reportedly sent documents to the Public Prosecutor's Office. On June 26, 2025, the family members again spoke with the public defender, who referred them to the judge; however, the judge declined to meet with them.
- Between June 21 and July 13, 2025, authorities at the DGCIM facility in Boleíta and at Rodeo I reportedly stated that they had no information regarding the proposed beneficiary.

10. In relation to internal actions, on February 20, 2025, the family members filed a complaint for the crime of enforced disappearance and unlawful deprivation of liberty with the General Directorate for the Protection of Human Rights of the Public Prosecutor's Office in Caracas, and on February 21, 2025, they filed another complaint with the Office of the Attorney General of the Republic. However, the receipt stamp of both complaints shows the following: "The receipt of the document does not imply acceptance of the content". Subsequently, on June 16, 2025, the proposed beneficiary's mother filed a complaint with the Ombudsperson's Office. The complaints stated that, after attempting to obtain information on the proposed beneficiary location during various visits to the DGCIM, they were informed that "those who have not been released are those held by the Directorate of Strategic Affairs (DAE), and that while they are on Floors 4, 5, or 6, they are under investigation or may be in a safe house." It was indicated that the family members were unable to access the proposed beneficiary's file.

11. Lastly, it was highlighted that the proposed beneficiary's wife and son have been in hiding since the security agencies detained the wife of the former lieutenant even though she was pregnant. Furthermore, the proposed beneficiary's sister decided to leave the country after being harassed at her residence by state security forces and by drones that had been flying over her parents' residence since Henry Alberto Castillo Molero was detained.

B. Response from the State

12. The IACHR requested information from the State on July 8, 2025. However, despite the expiration of the given deadline, the State has not submitted its response to date.

III. ANALYSIS OF THE ELEMENTS OF SERIOUSNESS, URGENCY, AND IRREPARABLE HARM

13. The precautionary measures mechanism is part of the Commission's function of overseeing compliance with the human rights obligations set forth 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. The mechanism of precautionary measures is set forth in Article 25 of the Commission's Rules of Procedure. In accordance with that Article, the Commission grants precautionary measures in serious and urgent situations in which these measures are necessary to avoid irreparable harm to persons.

14. 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.¹ Regarding the protective nature, these measures seek to avoid irreparable harm and to protect the exercise of human rights.² To do this, the IACHR shall assess the problem raised, the effectiveness of State actions to address the situation, and how vulnerable the proposed beneficiaries would be left in case the measures are not adopted.³ As for their precautionary nature, these measures have the purpose of preserving legal situations while under the study of the IACHR. 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 (*effet utile*) of the final decision. In this regard, precautionary or provisional measures enable the State concerned to comply with the final decision and, if necessary, to implement the ordered reparations.⁴ 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.

15. In analyzing those requirements, the Commission reiterates that the facts supporting a request for precautionary measures need not be proven beyond doubt. The information provided should be assessed from a *prima facie* standard of review to determine whether a serious and urgent situation exists.⁵ Similarly, the Commission recalls that, by its own mandate, it is not called upon to determine any individual liabilities for the facts alleged. Moreover, in this proceeding, it is not appropriate to rule on violations of rights enshrined in the American Convention or other applicable instruments.⁶ This is better suited to be addressed by the Petition

¹ Inter-American Court of Human Rights (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.

² 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).

³ 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).

⁴ I/A Court H.R., [Matter of the Capital El Rodeo I and El Rodeo II Judicial Confinement Center](#), Provisional Measures regarding Venezuela, Order of February 8, 2008, considerandum 7; [Matter of “El Nacional” and “Así es la Noticia” newspapers](#), Provisional Measures regarding Venezuela, Order of November 25, 2008, considerandum 23; [Matter of Luis Uzcátegui](#), Provisional Measures regarding Venezuela, Order of January 27, 2009, considerandum 19.

⁵ I/A Court H.R., [Matter of Members of the Miskitu Indigenous Peoples of the North Caribbean Coast regarding Nicaragua](#), Extension of Provisional Measures, Order of August 23, 2018, considerandum 13 (Available only in Spanish); [Matter of children and adolescents deprived of liberty in the “Complexo do Tatuapé” of the Fundação CASA](#), Provisional Measures regarding Brazil, Order of July 4, 2006, considerandum 23.

⁶ IACHR, [Resolution 2/2015](#), Precautionary Measure No. 455-13, Matter of Nestora Salgado regarding Mexico, January 28, 2015, para. 14; [Resolution 37/2021](#), Precautionary Measure No. 96-21, Gustavo Adolfo Mendoza Beteta and family regarding Nicaragua, April 30, 2021, para. 33.

and Case system. The following analysis refers exclusively to the requirements of Article 25 of its Rules of Procedure, which can be resolved without making any determinations on the merits.⁷

16. In the same sense, in analyzing the facts alleged by the requesting party, the Commission observes that the Inter-American Convention on Forced Disappearance of Persons, to which the State of Venezuela has been annexed since its ratification on July 6, 1998,⁸ interprets forced disappearance as the act “[...] perpetrated by agents of the state or by persons or groups of persons acting with the authorization, support, or acquiescence of the state, followed by an absence of information or a refusal to acknowledge that deprivation of freedom or to give information on the whereabouts of that person, thereby impeding his or her recourse to the applicable legal remedies and procedural guarantees.”⁹ In addition, the Inter-American Commission highlights what was established by the United Nations Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances, in the sense that “there is no minimum time, however short, to consider that an enforced disappearance has occurred.”¹⁰

17. As regards the *context*, the Commission has been monitoring the rule of law and human rights situation in Venezuela since 2005,¹¹ and has included the country in Chapter IV.B of its Annual Report. The Commission has also issued press releases and country reports, and established a special follow-up mechanism for the country, known as MESEVE.

18. On December 27, 2024, the IACHR approved the report titled “Venezuela: Serious Human Rights Violations in the Electoral Context” and reaffirmed that the State has been engaging in practices such as the arbitrary detention of opponents, human rights defenders, and social leaders,¹² while using “terror as a tool of social control.”¹³ In the framework of its 191st Period of Sessions between November 4 and 15, 2024, the IACHR held a hearing and a press conference where it addressed the generalized situation of human rights violations in Venezuela in the post-electoral context. The IACHR emphatically called on the current regime to put an end to the repression and release those identified as political prisoners.

19. In 2025, the IACHR condemned the situation of persons deprived of their liberty in Venezuela in the context of the country.¹⁴ The IACHR identified that relatives have not yet received a formal communication about the detention center where their loved ones are held.¹⁵ In other cases, they have only been able to find out that they are alive and where they are being held through information shared by other inmates, or because officials from the Bolivarian National Intelligence Service call them to request medicine or to collect dirty clothes for washing.¹⁶

20. Consequently, the Commission understands that the circumstances in which the proposed beneficiary’s disappearance has taken place, along with the country contextual monitoring carried out by the IACHR, are relevant in the analysis of the procedural requirements.

⁷ In this regard, the Court has stated that “[it] cannot, in a provisional measure, consider the merits of any arguments pertaining to issues other than those which relate strictly to the extreme gravity and urgency and the necessity to avoid irreparable damage to persons.” I/A Court H.R., [Matter of James et al. regarding Trinidad and Tobago](#), Provisional Measures, Order of August 29, 1998, considerandum 6 (Available only in Spanish); [Case of the Barrios Family v. Venezuela](#), Provisional Measures, Order of April 22, 2021, considerandum 2 (Available only in Spanish).

⁸ [Inter-American Convention on Forced Disappearance of Persons](#), Belém do Pará, Brazil, June 9, 1994, [Signatories and current status of ratifications of the Inter-American Convention on Forced Disappearance of Persons](#).

⁹ [Inter-American Convention on Enforced Disappearance of Persons](#), Belém do Pará, Brazil, June 9, 1994.

¹⁰ IACHR, [2021 Annual Report, Ch. IV.B. Venezuela](#), OEA/Ser.L/V/II, approved on May 26, 2022, para. 85; United Nations Human Rights Council, Report of the Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances, August 10, 2015, A/HRC/30/38, para. 102.

¹¹ IACHR, [2023 Annual Report, Ch. IV.b. Venezuela](#), OEA/Ser.L/V/II. Doc. 386 rev. 1, approved on December 31, 2023, para. 1.

¹² IACHR, Venezuela: Serious Human Rights Violations in the Electoral Context, OEA/Ser.L/V/II Doc. 253/24, December 27, 2024, para. 3.

¹³ IACHR, Venezuela: Serious Human Rights Violations in the Electoral Context, previously cited, para. 5.

¹⁴ IACHR, [Press Release 72/25](#), IACHR urges Venezuela to immediately release political prisoners and to end the practice of holding them incommunicado, April 11, 2025.

¹⁵ IACHR, Press Release 72/25, previously cited.

¹⁶ IACHR, Press Release 72/25, previously cited.

21. In reviewing the requirement of *seriousness*, the Commission takes into consideration that, since January 24, 2025, the proposed beneficiary's whereabouts have been unknown since he was deprived of his liberty by DGCIM agents in Caracas, Venezuela. The information provided indicates that DGCIM detained the proposed beneficiary at his parents' residence without a warrant. These agents allegedly apprehended him after failing to locate his relative, who they were looking for. Since being detained, to date, his family members do not have any information regarding his location, legal status, or health.

22. The Commission observes that, according to the applicant, state agents detained the proposed beneficiary with the aim of persuading his nephew to surrender. In this regard, the Commission has identified, within the framework of the precautionary measures mechanism and in the current context of the country, that relatives of recently detained persons are receiving warnings that they will be deprived of their liberty,¹⁷ which, in the case of the proposed beneficiary, have been carried out with the aim of locating his nephew.

23. The Commission also notes that, nearly six months after being detained, and despite searches conducted by family members in detention centers and internal actions taken, the Venezuelan authorities have not provided official information on the proposed beneficiary's whereabouts. Furthermore, the response provided by the public defender assigned to the case could not be corroborated, as the family has not been allowed to access the proposed beneficiary's file or confirm his place of detention. Moreover, the judge hearing the case refused to see them. In this regard, despite the family's efforts, they have not been able to obtain official information about the proposed beneficiary, among other basic details that a detained person or their relatives should be entitled to know.

24. The Commission highlights the family's inability to effectively pursue the protection of the proposed beneficiary's rights. In this regard, the Commission has been informed that, despite having filed various complaints of disappearance and attempting to file writs of *habeas corpus* with various government agencies, no response to these requests has been received to date, nor is any effective action known to have been taken. The proposed beneficiary has a public defender assigned to him, but she has reportedly refused to take any constitutional action to protect him. In summary, the Commission notes that the State's refusal to provide an official response regarding the legal situation and whereabouts of the proposed beneficiary remains unchanged despite the efforts made by his family members.

25. Upon requesting information from the State, the Commission regrets its lack of response. Although the foregoing is not enough per se to justify the granting of a precautionary measure if it prevents the Commission from being aware of the observations or measures taken by the State to address the alleged risk that the proposed beneficiary faces. Therefore, the Commission has no grounds to refute the facts alleged by the applicants or to assess whether the risk that the proposed beneficiary faces has been addressed or mitigated. In this context, the Commission expresses its particular concern given that State agents, who hold a special responsibility as guarantors of the proposed beneficiary's human rights, have been identified as being responsible for his detention, since they have him in their custody. Until the State provides a response regarding the situation of the proposed beneficiary, the Commission concludes that he remains in a situation of complete vulnerability.

26. Taking into account the foregoing, the Commission finds that, from the applicable *prima facie* standard, it is sufficiently proven that the rights to life and personal integrity of the proposed beneficiary face a situation of serious risk, since his whereabouts or fate are unknown to date after his detention on January 24, 2025 in Caracas, Venezuela.

¹⁷ IACHR [Resolution 87/24](#), Precautionary Measure No. 409-23, Franklin Alfredo Caldera Cordero, Franklin Caldera Martínez and Yuraima Martínez regarding Venezuela, November 25, 2024; [Resolution 35/25](#), Precautionary Measures No. 1426-24, Sairam Gabriela Rivas Moreno regarding Venezuela, April 24, 2025; [Resolution 38/25](#), Precautionary Measures No. 320-25, Aurora Carolina Silva Uzcátegui and her two daughters regarding Venezuela, May 4, 2025; and [Resolution 44/25](#), Precautionary Measures No. 440-25, Andreina Baduel, regarding Venezuela, June 12, 2025.

27. Regarding the requirement of *urgency*, the Commission finds that it has been fulfilled to the extent that the proposed beneficiary's whereabouts remain unknown. Over time, the likelihood of violations of his rights increases. In addition to the above, the Commission highlights the inability of the proposed beneficiary's family members and legal representatives to obtain official information regarding his legal situation, despite multiple efforts undertaken through internal channels to locate him. Therefore, the Commission considers it necessary to adopt immediate measures to safeguard his rights.

28. Regarding the requirement of *irreparable harm*, the Commission maintains that it has been met, since the potential impact on the rights to life and personal integrity constitutes the maximum situation of irreparability.

IV. BENEFICIARY

29. The Commission declares Henry Alberto Castillo Molero as the beneficiary of the precautionary measures, who is duly identified in this proceeding.

V. DECISION

30. The Commission understands that this matter meets *prima facie* the requirements of seriousness, urgency, and irreparable harm set forth in Article 25 of its Rules of Procedure. Consequently, the Commission requests that Venezuela:

- a) adopt the necessary measures to protect the rights to life and personal integrity of the beneficiary. In particular,
 - i. report whether the beneficiary is in the custody of the State and, if so, indicate the reason and circumstances of his detention; or the measures taken to determine his whereabouts or fate;
 - ii. if the beneficiary is in the custody of the State, specify whether he has been charged and brought before a competent court to review his detention, or if he has not been brought before a court, explain why not;
 - iii. expressly indicate the court that reportedly knows his criminal case, if any, or the reasons why he has not been released to date;
 - iv. allow the beneficiary to communicate with his family and trusted legal representatives, giving them full access to his criminal file, if any; and
 - v. immediately carry out a medical assessment of his health to obtain more information on his state of health; and
- b) report on the actions taken to investigate the alleged events that led to the adoption of this precautionary measure, so as to prevent such events from reoccurring.

31. The Commission requests that Venezuela report, within 15 days from the date of notification of this resolution, on the adoption of the requested precautionary measures and update that information periodically.

32. The Commission emphasizes that, pursuant to Article 25(8) of its Rules of Procedure, the granting of precautionary measures and their adoption by the State do not constitute a prejudgment regarding the possible violation of the rights protected in the American Convention and other applicable instruments.

33. The Commission instructs its Executive Secretariat to notify this resolution to the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela and the requesting party.

34. Approved on July 28, 2025, by José Luis Caballero Ochoa, President; 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