

**INTER-AMERICAN COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS
RESOLUTION 90/2025**

Precautionary Measure No. 1752-25

Xiomara del Carmen Ortiz Rivero¹ regarding Venezuela

December 11, 2025

Original: Spanish

I. INTRODUCTION

1. On November 20, 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 Carmen Cecilia Parada Ortiz (“the requesting party”) urging the Commission to request that the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela (the “State” or “Venezuela”) adopt the necessary measures to protect the rights of Xiomara del Carmen Ortiz Rivero (“the proposed beneficiary”). According to the request, the proposed beneficiary was parish coordinator for the *Vente Venezuela* party in Lara state. She was reportedly detained by state agents on October 13, 2025, and is currently not permitted family visits. In addition, there is no information on her current health or detention conditions.

2. The Commission requested additional information from the applicant on November 25, 2025, and received a response on December 1, 2025. Pursuant to Article 25(5) of the Rules of Procedure, the Commission requested information from the State on December 5, 2025. To date, the State has not responded, and the granted deadline has expired.

3. Upon analyzing the submissions of fact and law furnished by the applicant, the Commission recognizes that the proposed beneficiary is in a serious and urgent situation, given that her rights are at risk of irreparable harm. Therefore, pursuant to Article 25 of its Rules of Procedure, the Commission requests that Venezuela: a) adopt the necessary measures to protect the rights to life, personal integrity, and health of Xiomara del Carmen Ortiz Rivero; b) implement sufficient measures to ensure that the beneficiary’s detention conditions are compatible with applicable international standards. In particular, the following: i. facilitate contact with her family members, representatives, and trusted attorneys, and give them full access to the judicial file; ii. officially report the legal situation in the framework of the criminal process in which she is allegedly involved, and whether she has been presented to a court for review of her detention; iii. immediately carry out a medical assessment of her health situation, and guarantee timely and specialized medical care and treatment, making the results known to her family members and representatives; c) adopt the necessary measures so that the beneficiary can carry out her political activities, without being subjected to threats, harassment, intimidation, or acts of violence; d) consult and agree upon the measures to be implemented with the beneficiaries and their representatives; and, e) 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. According to the request, Xiomara del Carmen Ortiz Rivero, 63 years old, was the parish coordinator for the *Vente Venezuela* Party in the Juan de Villegas parish, Barquisimeto, Lara state, during the July 28, 2024, elections.

¹ According to the identity document attached by the applicant, her full name is stated as Xiomara del Carmen Ortiz de Parada. However, her daughter identifies her as Xiomara del Carmen Ortiz Rivero, which is the name that will be used throughout the request.

5. It was reported that on October 13, 2025, at around 7:00 p.m., officials of the Strategic Operations Group of the National Police (GOES) allegedly detained the proposed beneficiary in a violent and arbitrary manner, without a warrant, without legal justification, and through deception. According to the information, a woman dressed in civilian clothes arrived in an unmarked vehicle and told the proposed beneficiary that she had brought a “gift” to lure the proposed beneficiary to come out of her residence. When the proposed beneficiary exited her residence, several men dressed in civilian clothes reportedly got out of the same vehicle, and two additional trucks immediately arrived to load her onto one of them. The incident occurred in front of her minor grandchildren, who were in her legal custody. At the same time, it was emphasized that armed officials confiscated the cell phones of those present, thereby preventing any recording of the incident.

6. The request stated that the proposed beneficiary remained in a state of “enforced disappearance” until November 5, 2025, when she received her first visit. In this regard, it was reported that, after visiting various detention centers, her family learned that she was being held at the GOES facility in Cabudare, but this was provided as unofficial information.

7. The applicant stated that the beneficiary had not been allowed family visits, except on three occasions. These visits were allegedly supervised and lasted less than 10 minutes. The applicant further stated that, during the visits, it has only been possible to confirm that she is alive. Her family noted that the proposed beneficiary had a “blank stare,” which, in their opinion, indicates serious emotional distress. The request stated that the procedure for accessing visits consists of reporting to the prison daily and waiting for authorization. According to the complaint, on September 30, 2025, a family visit was scheduled. However, her family was verbally informed that it had not been approved by order of the facility’s director. Similarly, on December 1, 2025, another visit was refused, even though the other detainees did receive visits that day. The applicant stressed that all this information has been transmitted verbally and that there is no official documentation to support the refusals.

8. On October 14, 2025, officials returned to the proposed beneficiary’s residence to demand the surrender of her truck. Although the vehicle was inoperable due to a dead battery, the family was forced to hand it over due to pressure. It was revealed that the vehicle has remained in possession of the GOES in Cabudare since then. They also recalled that, when the proposed beneficiary was being detained, GOES officials took multiple personal documents, including much of her medical history, thus making it difficult to reconstruct her clinical file.

9. The applicant mentioned that, on its social networks, GOES published a video accusing the proposed beneficiary of terrorism. An official reportedly stated unofficially that they were going to accuse the proposed beneficiary of: (i) treason; (ii) incitement to hatred; (iii) conspiracy with a foreign power; and (iv) criminal association. In addition, the family was told that weapons and grenades had been “planted” on the proposed beneficiary in order to fabricate crimes against her. Although the family knew the case file number and that it had been assigned to the 59th National Prosecutor’s Office, they did not have access to the contents of the file or the formal charges.

10. Regarding her health, the request stated that the proposed beneficiary has depressive disorder, anxiety disorder, systemic arterial hypertension, cardiac arrhythmia (ventricular extrasystoles), angina pectoris, and sleep disorder associated with anxiety.² In this regard, the applicant reported that the proposed beneficiary has remained deprived of her liberty without access to adequate medical care. In addition, they reaffirmed that they do not have any information on her current health, given that they have not had access to new visits or official information.

² A medical report prepared by a cardiologist on June 23, 2025 was attached. It diagnosed the proposed beneficiary with “systemic arterial hypertension, cardiac arrhythmia (ventricular extrasystole).”

11. It was reported that the proposed beneficiary had a scheduled appointment with her treating physician on November 11, 2025, but the authorities denied her permission to attend the appointment. Furthermore, it was revealed that, on the instructions of the GOES physician, her blood pressure medication was changed without the corresponding tests being carried out. This caused an adverse reaction, despite which she did not receive adequate medical attention nor was she transferred to her trusted physician. In this regard, her family was informed that they should seek the previous medication. The applicant described this situation as negligence and a direct threat to the proposed beneficiary's health.

12. The request indicated that attempts have been made to activate the internal mechanisms, but these attempts have not been successful. In particular, they stated that medical reports and documents regarding the proposed beneficiary's health were submitted to the assigned public defender. However, the defender reportedly does not provide information on the proposed beneficiary's health or her procedural situation; he refuses to receive or acknowledge medical evidence provided by her family; and he claims "not to have received" documents, even though they were delivered. He also does not guarantee any kind of contact, assistance, or effective defense. The public defender even allegedly advised that the proposed beneficiary "confess to resolve this quickly." The applicant considers that this constitutes a serious ethical and legal violation. It was stated that medical and testimonial evidence had been disregarded and deemed "invalid."

13. In addition to the above, on November 18, 2025, the proposed beneficiary's son went to the Ombudsperson's Office to deliver documentation related to the case. At that time, they told him that they would "keep him updated," but to date there has been no update. The applicant also attached a letter denouncing the "enforced disappearance and arbitrary detention" of the proposed beneficiary to the Attorney General of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela. However, the request reported that there are no effective avenues for recourse, due to the refusal to respond and the vulnerability of the family. Lastly, it was also reported that the family members have received verbal warnings to stop publicizing the case.

B. Response from the State

14. The IACHR requested information from the State on December 5, 2025. To date, no information has been received from the State, and the granted timeline has expired.

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

15. 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.

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.³ Regarding the protective nature, these measures seek to avoid irreparable harm and to protect the exercise of human rights.⁴ To do this, the IACHR shall assess the

³ 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.

⁴ 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,

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.⁵ 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.⁶ 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 analyzing those requirements, the Commission reiterates that the facts supporting a request for precautionary measures need not be proven beyond doubt; rather, the information provided should be assessed from a *prima facie* standard of review to determine whether a serious and urgent situation exists.⁷ Similarly, the Commission recalls that, by its own mandate, it is not within its purview 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.⁸ This is better suited to be addressed by the Petition 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 determination on the merits.⁹

18. As regards the *context*, the Commission has been monitoring the rule of law and human rights situation in Venezuela since 2005,¹⁰ and has included the country in Chapter IV.B of its Annual Report. The

considerandum 5; [Matter of Milagro Sala](#), Provisional measures regarding Argentina, Order of November 23, 2017, considerandum 5 (Available only in Spanish).

⁵ 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).

⁶ 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 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 (Available only in Spanish).

⁷ 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.

⁸ 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.

⁹ 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).

¹⁰ IACHR, [2023 Annual Report, Ch. IV.B, Venezuela](#), OEA/Ser.L/V/II. Doc. 386 rev. 1, approved on December 31, 2023, para. 1.

Commission has also issued press releases and country reports, and established a special follow-up mechanism for the country, known as MESEVE.

19. In 2024, the Commission condemned the practices of institutional violence in the context of the electoral process in Venezuela, such as violent repression, arbitrary detentions, and political persecution.¹¹ The strategy of detention and criminalization appears to be specifically targeted at individuals perceived as opponents of the regime, including journalists, opposition leaders, human rights defenders, and others.¹² On December 27, 2024, the IACHR approved the report titled “Venezuela: Serious Human Rights Violations in Connection with the Elections” and reaffirmed that the State has been engaging in practices such as “arbitrary arrests of opponents, human rights defenders, and social leaders,”¹³ while using “terror as a tool of social control.”¹⁴

20. In 2025, the IACHR condemned the situation of persons deprived of their liberty in Venezuela in the context of the country.¹⁵ The IACHR identified that relatives have not yet received a formal communication about the detention center where their loved ones are held.¹⁶ 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 ask them to bring medicine or collect dirty clothes for washing.¹⁷

21. During its 192nd session, the Commission was able to obtain information on the situation of persons deprived of their liberty in the post-election context and received testimonies from relatives of victims and civil society on arbitrary detentions, torture, and serious detention conditions.¹⁸

22. On September 8, 2025, during the 60th Session of the United Nations Human Rights Council, the Independent International Fact-Finding Mission on the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela reaffirmed its concern about the state’s practice of solitary confinement and incommunicado detention, which, it noted, often amounts to enforced disappearances, as well as the widespread lack of effective judicial protection.¹⁹ It said that, for the most part, the search processes undertaken by family members, human rights organizations, and private lawyers began immediately after the detention.²⁰ However, in most cases, the authorities consulted denied having the detainees in their custody, even though they were in fact detained under their authority.²¹

23. The Mission described that, in the context of the apprehension, interrogation and detention of political opponents or perceived as such, patterns have been identified that include incommunicado detention, prolonged isolation, the use of punishment cells, physical and psychological ill-treatment, acts of sexual violence, forced nudity, coercive transactional sex, the use of electricity on the genitals, threats to force self-incrimination or incriminate third parties, as well as threats to cause harm the family members of detainees.²² In addition to the above, the Mission highlighted that a sustained and systematic pattern of detention of family

¹¹ IACHR, [Press Release No. 184/24](#), IACHR and SRfOE condemn State terrorism practices in Venezuela, August 15, 2024.

¹² IACHR, Press Release No. 184/24, previously cited.

¹³ IACHR, Venezuela: Serious Human Rights Violations in the Electoral Context, OEA/Ser.L/V/II Doc. 253/24, December 27, 2024, para. 3.

¹⁴ IACHR, Venezuela: Serious Human Rights Violations in the Electoral Context, previously cited, para. 5.

¹⁵ IACHR, [Press Release No. 72/25](#), IACHR urges Venezuela to immediately release political prisoners and to end the practice of holding them incommunicado, April 11, 2025.

¹⁶ IACHR, Press Release No. 72/25, previously cited.

¹⁷ IACHR, Press Release No. 72/25, previously cited.

¹⁸ IACHR, [Press Release No. 50/25](#), IACHR ends the 192nd Period of Sessions with 32 hearings on human rights, March 7, 2025.

¹⁹ United Nations Human Rights Council, [Detailed conclusions of the independent international fact-finding mission on the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela](#), September 8, 2025, A/HRC/60/CRP.4, para. 103.

²⁰ United Nations Human Rights Council, [Detailed conclusions of the independent international fact-finding mission on the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela](#), previously cited, para. 267.

²¹ United Nations Human Rights Council, [Detailed conclusions of the independent international fact-finding mission on the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela](#), previously cited, para. 267.

²² United Nations Human Rights Council, [Detailed conclusions of the independent international fact-finding mission on the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela](#), previously cited, para. 308.

members of opponents or perceived as such has been identified, which responds to a policy of repression aimed at generating fear and social control.²³

24. Consequently, the Commission understands that the circumstances that the proposed beneficiary faces, along with the country contextual monitoring carried out by the IACHR, are relevant in the analysis of the procedural requirements.

25. With regard to the requirement of *seriousness*, the Commission considers that it has been met. Upon analyzing the proposed beneficiary's situation, the Commission notes that the detention occurred in the context described above and identifies the following:

- a. The proposed beneficiary was the coordinator of the *Vente Venezuela* Party in the Juan de Villegas parish, Lara state, during the elections of July 28, 2024. The Commission observes that this party is reportedly led by María Corina Machado, who is currently the beneficiary of precautionary measures granted by the Commission and was a leading figure of the opposition in the country during the electoral process.²⁴
- b. At the time the beneficiary was detained on October 13, 2025, GOES state agents reportedly acted without a warrant. It was alleged that her whereabouts were unknown until November 5, 2025, that is, for approximately 23 days. During this time, the family did not receive any official response regarding her situation.
- c. Although her family was able to visit her three times at the GOES facilities, it was reported that these visits were supervised and lasted less than 10 minutes. According to the request, since there is no clear procedure for processing visits, families must go to the detention center and wait to be authorized, which was not permitted on recent occasions. Currently, the proposed beneficiary is unable to access visits, and her family lacks information about her health or detention conditions.
- d. Her family members do not officially know the charges against her or whether there was a court order that led to her detention.
- e. The available information reveals that the proposed beneficiary is reportedly incommunicado. In this regard, the Commission recalls that the Court has established that holding a detained person incommunicado could constitute treatment contrary to human dignity, given that it can cause extreme psychological and moral suffering for the person deprived of liberty.²⁵ It has also considered that prolonged isolation and incommunicado detention constitute, in themselves, forms of cruel and inhuman treatment.²⁶ The Court has also established that the incommunicado detention "not only makes it impossible to verify the current situation of the proposed beneficiaries, their detention conditions, and their health status, but also it implies a curtailment of the procedural guarantees of all detainees."

²³ United Nations Human Rights Council, [Detailed conclusions of the independent international fact-finding mission on the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela](#), previously cited, para. 116.

²⁴ IACHR [Resolution 89/24](#), Precautionary Measure No. 125-19, María Corina Machado Parisca regarding Venezuela (Follow-up and Modification), November 25, 2024; [Resolution 22/19](#), Precautionary Measures No. 125-19, María Corina Machado Parisca, regarding Venezuela, April 12, 2019 (Available only in Spanish).

²⁵ I/A Court H.R. [Case of Espinoza Gonzales v. Peru](#), Preliminary Objections, Merits, Reparations, and Costs, Judgment of November 20, 2014, para. 186; [Case I. v. Peru](#), Judgment of November 27, 2013, considerandum 376 (Available only in Spanish); [Case of Cantoral-Benavides v. Peru](#), Fondo, Serie C No. 69, para. 82 (Available only in Spanish); [Case of Suárez Rosero v. Ecuador](#), Judgment of November 12, 1997, Series C No. 35, considerandum 90 (Available only in Spanish); [Matter of Guanipa Villalobos](#), Provisional Measures regarding Venezuela, Order of October 15, 2025, para. 41 (Available only in Spanish).

²⁶ I/A Court H.R. [Case of Maritza Urrutia v. Guatemala](#), Merits, Reparations, and Costs, Series C No. 103, para. 87; Matter of Guanipa Villalobos, Provisional Measures regarding Venezuela.

²⁷ For this reason, the Court has also highlighted that States must ensure that persons deprived of their liberty are able to contact their relatives.²⁸

- f. Regarding the proposed beneficiary's health, the request alerted that she has depressive disorder, anxiety disorder, systemic arterial hypertension, cardiac arrhythmia (ventricular extrasystoles), angina pectoris, and sleep disorder associated with anxiety. However, the applicant reported that she is still unable to access adequate medical care, and that her current health is unknown given that she has not had access to visits or an official response.
- g. The family was aware of the change of medication when the state authorities requested that they obtain the medication that the proposed beneficiary had previously been taking. According to the request, the GOES physician modified her treatment without performing the corresponding tests, which caused an adverse reaction. In the applicant's opinion, the foregoing reveals an inadequate management of the proposed beneficiary's health.
- h. In addition to the above, the Commission finds that the proposed beneficiary is an older adult, which puts her in a situation of special vulnerability. In this sense, the Inter-American Court considers age as a factor to be taken into account in the intersectional approach that requires special measures of protection due to their life cycle, their condition as persons who are developing or for factors of risk associated with aging.²⁹ The Court has highlighted that older persons are particularly vulnerable as regards access to health, due to various factors such as physical limitations, mobility problems, economic status, severity of an illness, and the possibilities of recovery, it has therefore underlined the need to guarantee older persons, in a clear and accessible way, the necessary information to understand their diagnosis or particular situation, as well as the measures or treatments available to address the situation.³⁰ Consequently, the Court has determined that they are entitled to reinforced protection that requires the adoption of differentiated measures,³¹ and therefore, as members of a vulnerable or high-risk group.³²
- i. It was stated that there are no effective internal channels for requesting protection in favor of the proposed beneficiary. As mentioned, the assigned public defender has not responded regarding her legal or health, has refused to receive or acknowledge medical documents provided by the family, and has not taken any action to address her case. It was also noted that the family approached other institutions, such as the Ombudsperson's Office and the Office of the Attorney General of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, but to date there has been no response or progress.

26. Under the circumstances described above, the Commission finds that the family members have no real possibility of taking internal action on behalf of the proposed beneficiary, which places her in a state of absolute defenselessness. Therefore, while this situation persists, the Commission considers that the proposed beneficiary is completely unprotected against the risks she may be facing in Venezuela.

²⁷ I/A Court H.R., Matter of Juan Sebastián Chamorro et al. regarding Nicaragua, Provisional Measures, Order of June 24, 2021, paragraph 36. (Available only in Spanish).

²⁸ I/A Court H.R., Case J. v. Peru, previously cited; and Case of Espinoza Gonzales v. Peru, previously cited; Matter of Guanipa Villalobos, Provisional Measures regarding Venezuela, previously cited; IACHR Principles and Best Practices on the Protection of Persons Deprived of Liberty in the Americas, adopted by the Commission during the 131st regular session, held from March 3 to 14, 2008, Principle XVIII.

²⁹ I/A Court H.R., Advisory Opinion OC-29/22, [Differentiated Approaches with respect to Certain Groups of Persons Deprived of Liberty](#), May 30, 2022, para. 65.

³⁰ I/A Court H.R., [Case of Poblete Vilches et al. v. Chile](#), Judgment of March 8, 2018, para. 131.

³¹ I/A Court H.R., [Case of Poblete Vilches et al. v. Chile](#), previously cited, para. 127.

³² IACHR, [Principles and Best Practices on the Protection of Persons Deprived of Liberty in the Americas](#), adopted by the Commission during the 131st regular session, held from March 3 to 14, 2008, Principle XVIII.

27. 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, it does prevent the Commission from being aware of the observations or measures taken by the State to address the alleged situation of risk that the proposed beneficiary faces. Therefore, the Commission does not have elements that would allow it to dispute the facts alleged by the applicants, nor to assess whether the risk which the proposed beneficiary faces have been addressed or mitigated.

28. Taking into account the current context of the country, and the previous assessments, the Commission observes that, from the applicable *prima facie* standard, it is sufficiently shown that the proposed beneficiary faces a situation of serious risk to her rights to life, personal integrity, and health in Venezuela.

29. As for the *urgency* requirement, the Commission understands that, if the situation described were to continue, the proposed beneficiary is likely to be exposed to a greater impact on her rights. Therefore, the IACHR warns that, given that she was deprived of her liberty, the lack of access to visits, absence of official information on her detention conditions, and health, as well as the lack of effective response to the steps taken before domestic authorities, there remains an imminent possibility that the risk will materialize in the current context of the country. Additionally, the Commission has not received any response from the State regarding the actions that may be taken to address or mitigate the risk faced by the proposed beneficiary. Therefore, it is necessary to immediately adopt measures to safeguard their rights to life, personal integrity, and health.

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

IV. BENEFICIARY

31. The Commission declares Xiomara del Carmen Ortiz Rivero, who is duly identified in this proceeding, to be the beneficiary of the precautionary measures.

V. DECISION

32. 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, it requests that Venezuela:

- a) adopt the necessary measures to protect the rights to life, personal integrity, and health of Xiomara del Carmen Ortiz Rivero;
- b) implement sufficient measures to ensure that the beneficiary's detention conditions are compatible with applicable international standards. In particular, the following:
 - i. facilitate contact with her family members, representatives, and trusted attorneys, and give them full access to the judicial file;
 - ii. officially report the legal situation in the framework of the criminal process in which she is allegedly involved, and whether she has been presented to a court for review of her detention;
 - iii. immediately carry out a medical assessment of her health situation, and guarantee timely and specialized medical care and treatment, making the results known to her family members and representatives;

- c) adopt the necessary measures so that the beneficiary can carry out her political activities, without being subjected to threats, harassment, intimidation, or acts of violence;
- d) consult and agree upon the measures to be implemented with the beneficiaries and their representatives; and,
- e) report on the actions taken to investigate the alleged events that led to this resolution, so as to prevent such events from reoccurring.

33. 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.

34. 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.

35. The Commission instructs its Executive Secretariat to notify this resolution to the State of Venezuela and the requesting party.

36. Approved on December 11, 2025, by José Luis Caballero Ochoa, President; Andrea Pochak, First Vice-President; Edgar Stuardo Ralón Orellana, Second Vice-President; Roberta Clarke; Carlos Bernal Pulido; and Gloria Monique de Mees, members of the IACHR.

Tania Reneaum Panszi
Executive Secretary