
**INTER-AMERICAN COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS
RESOLUTION 84/2021**

Precautionary Measure No. 845-21
Ligia del Carmen Ramos Zúniga regarding Honduras
October 12, 2021
Original: Spanish

I. INTRODUCTION

1. On September 11, 2021, the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (“the Inter-American Commission,” “the Commission” or “the IACHR”) received a request for precautionary measures filed by two human rights organizations¹ (“the applicants”), urging the IACHR to require that the State of Honduras (“the State” or “Honduras”) adopt the necessary protection measures to guarantee the life and personal integrity of Ligia del Carmen Ramos Zúniga (“the proposed beneficiary”). According to the request, the proposed beneficiary is being subjected to threats, harassment, and acts of violence, including an alleged plan to assassinate her, the reason of which is purportedly her work in the defense of human rights and in denouncing alleged cases of corruption.

2. The Commission requested information from the State and the applicants on September 17, 2020. The applicants provided additional information on September 14 and 22, 2021. The State submitted its report on September 23, 2021.

3. Having analyzed the submissions of fact and law offered by the parties, the Commission considers that the proposed beneficiary is *prima facie* in a serious and urgent situation, given that her rights to life and personal integrity are at risk. Consequently, in accordance with Article 25 of the IACHR Rules of Procedure, it requests that Honduras: a) adopt the necessary measures to protect the rights to life and personal integrity of Ligia del Carmen Ramos Zúniga. In particular, the State must ensure that state actors respect the life and personal integrity of the beneficiary, as well as protect her rights in relation to acts of risk that are attributable to third parties, in accordance with the standards established by international human rights law; b) adopt the necessary measures so that Ligia del Carmen Ramos Zúniga can carry out her activities as human rights defender without being subjected to acts of violence, threats, harassment, or other violent events in the exercise of her work. The above includes the adoption of measures so that she can properly exercise her right to freedom of expression; c) consult and agree upon the measures to be adopted with the beneficiary and her representatives; and d) 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

1. Information provided by the applicants

4. The proposed beneficiary is 49 years old, is a physician and human rights defender, president of the Medical Association of the Honduran Social Security Institute (IHSS), was a prosecutor of the Medical College of Honduras (CMH) and is currently a candidate for representative (*diputada*). It was indicated that Ms. Ramos Zúniga is recognized in Honduras for complaints about acts of corruption, especially in the health system. The request provides information on her complaints and work since 2015. The request indicates that, recently, in the face of criticism and public complaints that she had expressed against the government in relation to the management of the COVID-19 pandemic, she was

¹ They requested that the Commission keep their identities confidential.

being persecuted, even by State officers, and she claimed having received “multiple threats” in social networks and “serious, real threats to death.”

5. The applicants provided information on different threatening events over the past years. On August 17, 2015, as a result of her medical support for people who were on hunger strike as part of protests called “outraged opposition,” she was referred to on social media as follows: “Ligia, you’re so close to going down in history as a martyr, go on as a fool, because the jug is dipped so often into the water that eventually it breaks” (sic). This fact was informed to the Special Prosecutor for Human Rights, but it was indicated that no progress had been reported. On June 14, 2016, Ms. Ligia del Carmen published a complaint for the alleged distribution of medicines during the electoral campaign, a publication that was shared more than a thousand times and where she received threats from unknown persons (without specifying) and through social networks a message stating that they were going to “expose her dirty laundry.”

6. In November 2017, in the middle of a process of negotiating a salary adjustment for the medical union, of which she was part as a CMH Prosecutor, after discussions with senior public officials, she was allegedly chased by 3 motorcycles while on her way to her home. Later, the proposed beneficiary learned that a member of the Social Security Audit Board made expressions related to the implementation of the Social Security Framework Law, indicating that “this will not work until Ligia Ramos and Suyapa Figueroa disappear.” The first incident was allegedly reported to the National Mechanism for the Protection of Human Rights Defenders, Journalists, Social Communicators, and Justice Operators (Protection Mechanism) and a complaint concerning both events was filed “through ordinary procedure” (without any further details or information about its progress).

7. The applicants indicated that, in January 2018, she and a human rights defender were attacked by the Honduran National Police in a demonstration with a tear gas aimed directly at them. Later, when leaving an interview, a car purportedly collided “voluntarily” against hers.

8. In July 2020, following public complaints against the government for alleged mismanagement of the pandemic, her car was reportedly intercepted by a police patrol in which “[t]he Military Police officers got out of the patrol and surrounded her vehicle. One of the officers asked the physician where she was going. When she answered the question, the military officers got in the patrol and then left.” On August 13, 2020, the proposed beneficiary observed that the Honduran National Police remained outside her home for 10 minutes, taking photographs of the property. Regarding this last fact, Ms. Ramos filed a complaint with the National Commissioner for Human Rights.

9. The request indicates that, during 2021, the proposed beneficiary continued to file complaints about the situation of the health sector and hospitals, and the lack of diligence to obtain vaccines against COVID-19. It was indicated that on May 24, 2021, she directly referred to the president during an interview, denouncing, *inter alia*, an alleged use of vaccines for political campaign purposes. The interview reportedly went viral. Following the foregoing, the request indicates that on May 26, 2021, one of the human rights organizations received information, purportedly from a reliable source with government information, about an alleged plan to assassinate Dr. Ligia Ramos, in which a criminal organization dedicated to hitman activities is said to be involved.

10. Due to the foregoing, the proposed beneficiary purportedly relocated outside the country for three months and returned to Honduras on August 26, 2021. Upon arrival at the airport, the proposed beneficiary was allegedly approached by reporters who were waiting for her, for which she was publicly exposed along with the team for transfer and security hired to protect her. The following morning, the proposed beneficiary gave a press conference explaining the situation that forced her to leave the country. The request informs that the person in charge of coordinating the security of the proposed beneficiary, using her own cell phone, was intercepted on August 27 by two people on motorcycles, who threatened her with a firearm and demanded her to hand over her phone. In view

of the refusal, they allegedly fired at her leg without hitting it. The request indicates that this shows the risk that the proposed beneficiary faces, as a member of her logistics team has been attacked.

11. The applicants indicated that the assassination plan against the proposed beneficiary is part of a broad context of violence against popularly elected candidates and social leaders in the country, providing data and acts of violence as an example. In this regard, it was recalled that Ms. Ligia Ramos is a candidate for representative to the National Congress of Honduras.

12. In relation to requests for protection before the State, it was reported that a complaint was received from the Protection Mechanism in 2018. An analyst contacted the proposed beneficiary to request information and inform her that, as security measures, patrols and police liaisons were recommended. Given that she did not consider such measures as suitable, as they only involved police officers and there is mistrust in the institution, Ms. Ligia Ramos communicated her decision not to continue with the process on February 2, 2018. On August 30, 2018, the file was purportedly closed before the Protection Mechanism.

13. Recently, on August 3 and 12, 2021, the proposed beneficiary decided to continue with the process before the Protection Mechanism, updating the information concerning 2020 and 2021 that forced her to leave the country. On August 16, 2021, a Resolution was issued by the Protection Mechanism, agreeing to open the procedure, providing an emergency number, and sending the file to the Risk Analysis Unit for the risk assessment to be carried out.

14. On September 14, 2021, additional information was provided, indicating that, after spending the night of September 11, 2021, in her home and not where she is purportedly currently located for security reasons, on September 12, she noticed through the security cameras of her house the presence of two subjects on a motorcycle and a subject on another motorcycle, who were in the place for approximately 10 minutes (photographs of the people were provided).

15. On September 22, 2021, it was indicated that the events of September 12, 2021, were reported to the Protection Mechanism, without any proceedings or response having been carried out by the date of the brief. The applicants reiterated the risk faced by Ms. Ligia Ramos, informing that, although she is temporarily relocated, she continues with her daily activities in the hospital, defending human rights, and with political campaigns.

2. Response from State

16. The State sent its report on September 23, 2021, indicating that it has acted within the framework of compliance with its international obligations, having activated the Protection Mechanism. Similarly, it was reported that the Protection Mechanism is the entity in charge of implementing protection measures, and that should precautionary measures be granted, this would be the institution in charge of implementing them, following a risk analysis. Therefore, it was alleged that as Ms. Ligia Ramos did not agree with the protection measures suggested in the previous risk analysis, the State requests that the precautionary measures be denied, considering the principle of subsidiarity.

17. More specifically, the State argued that the measures rejected in the past, consisting of a recommendation of patrols and police liaisons, were suitable, because they linked police security forces that make it possible to preserve her rights to life and integrity and prevent threats from coming to fruition. In addition, the State indicated that these were effective, because police liaisons have been used in other cases, serving in accompanying the filing of complaints.

18. Moreover, the state report indicates that the Protection Mechanism must carry out a risk analysis and, subsequently, agree on the measures to be implemented. Therefore, it was pointed out that, if precautionary measures are granted, they must be implemented by the Protection Mechanism,

based on the risk analysis underway and that will be agreed with the proposed beneficiary. In turn, it was stressed that the auxiliary and complementary nature of the inter-American system prevents making a ruling in this matter.

19. On the other hand, a report from the General Directorate of the Protection System was provided, which informs on the protection request of August 16, 2021, which is at the stage of risk assessment and, when concluded, it will be presented in a session of the Technical Committee of the Protection Mechanism to determine, in consultation with the beneficiary, the appropriate measures.

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

20. The precautionary measures mechanism is part of the Commission's function of overseeing compliance with human rights obligations, as established in Article 106 of the Charter of the Organization of American States. These general oversight functions are established in Article 41(b) of the American Convention on Human Rights, as well as in Article 18(b) of the IACHR Statute. 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 an irreparable harm to persons.

21. The Inter-American Commission and the Inter-American Court of Human Rights (hereinafter "the Inter-American Court" or "I/A Court H.R.") have established repeatedly that precautionary and provisional measures have a dual nature, both precautionary and protective.² Regarding the protective nature, these measures seek to avoid irreparable harm and protect the exercise of human rights.³ To do this, the IACHR shall assess the problem raised, the effectiveness of state actions to address the situation described, and how vulnerable the persons proposed as beneficiaries would be left in case the measures are not adopted.⁴ Their precautionary nature is intended to preserve a legal situation while it is under consideration of the organs of the inter-American system of human rights. Their precautionary nature aims at safeguarding the rights at risk until the request pending before the inter-American system is resolved. The object and purpose are to ensure the integrity and effectiveness of an eventual decision on the merits and, in this way, 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.⁵ In the process of reaching a decision, and according to Article 25(2) of the Rules of Procedure, the Commission considers that:

² See in this regard: I/A Court H.R. [Matter of the Yare I and Yare II Capital Region Penitentiary Center](#). Request for Provisional Measures submitted by the IACHR regarding the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Order of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights of March 30, 2006, considerandum 5; I/A Court H.R. [Case of Carpio Nicolle et al. v. Guatemala](#). Precautionary Measures, Order of July 6, 2009, considerandum 16.

³ See in this regard: I/A Court H.R. [Matter of Capital El Rodeo I and El Rodeo II Judicial Confinement Center](#). Provisional Measures regarding Venezuela, Order of the Court of February 8, 2008, considerandum 8; I/A Court H.R. [Case of Bámaca Velásquez](#). Provisional measures regarding Guatemala, Order of the Court of January 27, 2009, considerandum 45; I/A Court H.R. [Matter of Fernández Ortega et al.](#) Provisional Measures regarding Mexico, Order of the Court of April 30, 2009, Considerandum 5; I/A Court H.R. [Matter of Milagro Sala](#). Request for Provisional Measures regarding Argentina, Order of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights of November 23, 2017, considerandum 5.

⁴ See in this regard: I/A Court H.R. [Matter of Milagro Sala](#). Request for Provisional Measures regarding Argentina, Order of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights of November 23, 2017, considerandum 5; I/A Court H.R. [Matter of Capital El Rodeo I and El Rodeo II Judicial Confinement Center](#). Provisional Measures regarding Venezuela, Order of the Court of February 8, 2008, Considerandum 9; I/A Court H.R. [Matter of the Criminal Institute of Plácido de Sá Carvalho](#). Provisional Measures regarding Brazil, Order of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights of February 13, 2017, considerandum 6.

⁵ See in this regard: I/A Court H.R. [Matter of Capital El Rodeo I and El Rodeo II Judicial Confinement Center](#). Provisional Measures regarding Venezuela, Order of the Court of February 8, 2008, considerandum 7; I/A Court H.R. [Matter of "El Nacional" and "Así es la Noticia" newspapers](#). Provisional Measures regarding Venezuela, Order of the Court of November 25, 2008, considerandum 23; I/A Court H.R. [Matter of Luis Uzcátegui](#). Provisional Measures regarding Venezuela, Order of the Court of January 27, 2009, considerandum 19.

- 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.

22. In analyzing those requirements, the Commission reiterates that the facts supporting a request for precautionary measures need not be proven beyond doubt; rather, the purpose of the assessment of the information provided should be to determine *prima facie* if a serious and urgent situation exists.⁶ Similarly, the Commission recalls that, by its own mandate, it is not called upon to determine any criminal liabilities for the facts alleged. Moreover, it is not appropriate, in this proceeding, to rule on violations of rights enshrined in the American Convention or other applicable instruments.⁷ The analysis performed herein relates exclusively to the requirements set forth in Article 25 of the Rules of Procedure, which can be resolved without making any determinations on the merits.⁸

23. Thus, following the terms of Article 25, paragraph 6, the Commission recalls that, in its country report on the Situation of Human Rights in Honduras in 2019, it observed the situation placing human rights defenders at extreme risk in the country, in the face of the permanent violence, criminalization, and delegitimization to which they are exposed. The Commission received information on threats, harassment, acts of aggression, assassinations, and other acts of violence against them, of which, more than 95 % remain purportedly in impunity.⁹ Similarly, in relation to the Protection Mechanism, during 2020, the Commission received information about a significant delay in the implementation of protection measures, lack of confidence in it due to high levels of State participation in attacks against defenders, officers’ lack of knowledge on issues concerning human rights and defenders, as well as the implementation of inappropriate measures in the face of the risks faced by defenders.¹⁰

24. In the specific matter, the Commission notes that the reported situations presenting a risk are the following: a) in 2015, she received stigmatizing and threatening messages in the midst of her medical support for demonstrations; b) in 2016, she received messages regarding a public complaint; c) in 2017, around her role in discussions about the medical union, she was persecuted and she later learned of threatening expressions against her; c) in 2018, in the middle of a protest, it was said that she had been the target of a tear gas canister; d) also in 2018, when leaving an interview, a car “voluntarily” collided with her own; e) in July 2020 she was harassed by the police when they detained and questioned her; f) in August 2020, her house was watched and photographed by the police; g) in May 2021, following her comments in an interview, there were reports on a plan to assassinate her, allegedly set to be executed by hitmen; h) on August 27, 2021, the person in charge of coordinating

⁶ In this regard, for example, referring to provisional measures, the Inter-American Court has indicated that a minimum of detail and information is required to assess, *prima facie*, whether an extremely serious and urgent situation exists. I/A Court H.R., *Matter of Children and adolescents deprived of liberty in the “Complejo do Tatuapé” of the Fundação CASA*. Request for extension of provisional measures. Provisional Measures regarding Brazil. Resolution of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights of July 4, 2006. Considerandum 23.

⁷ IACHR. [Resolution 2/2015](#). Precautionary Measure No. 455-13. Matter of Nestora Salgado regarding Mexico. January 28, 2015, para. 14; IACHR. [Resolution 37/2021](#). Precautionary Measure No. 96-21. Gustavo Adolfo Mendoza Beteta and his family regarding Nicaragua. April 30, 2021, para. 33 [only in Spanish].

⁸ In this regard, the Court has indicated 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, urgency, and the necessity to avoid irreparable damage to persons.” See in this regard: I/A Court H.R. [Matter of James et al. regarding Trinidad and Tobago](#). Order of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights of August 29, 1998, considerandum 6; I/A Court H.R. [Case of Barrios Family v. Venezuela](#). Provisional Measures, Order of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights of April 22, 2021, considerandum 2 [only in Spanish].

⁹ IACHR, [Situation of Human Rights in Honduras](#), OAS/Ser.L/V/II., Doc. 146, August 27, 2019, par. 149.

¹⁰ IACHR, [Annual Report 2020, Chapter IV.A](#), OAS/Ser.L/V/II., Doc. 28, March 30, 2021, par. 502.

her security was threatened and, after refusing to hand over her phone, they attacked this person with a firearm; i) on September 12, 2021, she noticed people on motorcycles observing her house at night, after a campaign event.

25. The Commission considers, first, that the threatening events reported have taken place on most occasions at moments close to her public complaints or her work in highly relevant roles. In this sense, the Commission highlights the role of the proposed beneficiary as an opponent of the government and a human rights defender, and that she allegedly files complaints on issues of high public interest, while also performing relevant functions in the medical union. In this sense, for the Commission it is especially relevant that this role allegedly gives her a high level of public visibility, which, due to the controversial nature of her statements, purportedly also generates animosity against her. In this regard, an example of this level of visibility is the reception that included the press when she returned to the country. Also, this visibility is said to be currently increased by her role as a political candidate. The Commission observes the foregoing in light of the extreme risk faced by defenders that was noted in 2019 during its visit to the country.

26. As a second point, the Commission notes that although the reported events have not been constant since 2015, various situations have occurred over time, the events have been sustained since then and have greater intensity based on the activities of Ms. Ligia Ramos. Thus, it is observed that the incidents have reached the highest point in 2021, as indicated in paragraph 24, having she learned of an alleged plan to assassinate her, which forced her to leave the country and, upon returning, she had to take shelter in another residence.

27. Third, according to the request, most of the events have been reported to the public authorities, both by filing complaints and by making them known to the Protection Mechanism. However, it was indicated that there has been no progress in the pertinent investigations, a point that was not disproved by the State. In this sense, the lack of progress in the investigations able to mitigate the risk factors reported over the years is worrying, generating a situation of impunity that enables their repetition and persistence.

28. On the other hand, the Commission notes that as indicated by both parties, in 2018 the Protection Mechanism was activated, and an analyst indicated that he would recommend patrols and police liaisons, which were not considered suitable by Ms. Ligia Ramos. The State has indicated that this was a suitable and effective action, and that insofar as these recommendations were rejected, the request at hand should be denied. On this point, the Commission considers that, as indicated above, it is not possible to consider that the situation of the proposed beneficiary is currently the same as that derived from a risk analysis in 2018. The information provided indicates that the situation presenting a risk has changed and, even more, it is said to be worse at present. It is not pertinent to assess the current risk in light of the measures that were to be implemented in 2018, about three years ago. The foregoing, without prejudice to their suitability and relevance.

29. Finally, the Commission emphasizes that, although information on situations presenting a risk have been constantly brought to various authorities and the Protection Mechanism launched a procedure at the request of a party on August 16, 2021, no protection measures have been implemented in favor of Ms. Ligia Ramos, which is consistent with the information previously received by the IACHR (see *supra* para. 23). The Commission observes that the foregoing enables the persistence of the reported situations presenting a risk, leaving the proposed beneficiary exposed to them.

30. Based on the information received from both parties, considering the visibility of the proposed beneficiary and the ongoing situations presenting a risk over time that are said to have been currently exacerbated, given the lack of investigation of the reported situations, and in view of the lack of implementation of protection measures, seeing all in light of the context indicated, the Commission

considers that the situation of Ms. Ligia del Carmen Ramos Zúniga is sufficient to consider that her rights to life and personal integrity are *prima facie* in a serious situation.

31. Regarding the requirement of urgency, the IACHR observes that, according to the information provided, the proposed beneficiary has constantly faced incidents presenting a risk, which purportedly persist to date. This makes it foreseeable that events may continue to occur and become more intense. In this sense, the Commission underscores the visibility of the proposed beneficiary due to the nature of her tasks, through which she purportedly makes complaints of high media sensitivity and of high interest to the public. Faced with these issues, it is particularly worrying for the Commission that, to date, a risk analysis has not been carried out to assess the measures to be adopted and agree on them with the proposed beneficiary, while more than a month and a half has gone by after opening the procedure before the Protection Mechanism. In this regard, the Commission recalls that protection measures must be suitable and effective, in the sense that they should enable the defender to face the risk and should also mitigate such a risk, focusing special relevance on the principle of consultation.¹¹

32. In this sense, the situation presenting a risk is likely to persist, insofar as the proposed beneficiary allegedly continues with her work in denouncing and in defending human rights. In light of the foregoing, given the threatening events and the visibility of the proposed beneficiary, joined to the alleged lack of protection measures, the Commission considers that it is urgent to adopt immediate measures to safeguard the life and personal integrity of the proposed beneficiary.

33. As it pertains to the requirement of irreparable harm, the Commission finds that it is met, since the possible impact on the rights to life and personal integrity constitutes the maximum situation of irreparability.

34. Finally, in relation to the principle of complementarity on the matter of precautionary measures referred to at the time by the State, the Commission recalls that invoking this principle to support that the adoption of precautionary measures is unwarranted requires that the State concerned satisfy the burden of proving that the proposed beneficiaries are no longer in a situation established in Article 25 of the Rules of Procedure, in the sense that the measures adopted by the State have had a substantive impact in reducing or mitigating the risk, so that compliance with the requirements of seriousness and urgency is no longer fulfilled and that therefore international intervention to prevent irreparable harm is not required.¹² In this regard, as indicated when analyzing the procedural requirements in this matter, it is not possible to find that this is the case, given that the situation presenting a risk allegedly persists to date, while the State has not adopted suitable and effective measures for the protection of the proposed beneficiary.

IV. BENEFICIARY

35. The IACHR considers that the beneficiary of this precautionary measure is Ms. Ligia del Carmen Ramos Zúniga, who is fully identified in the request for precautionary measures.

V. DECISION

¹¹ IACHR, Second Report on the Situation of Human Rights Defenders in the Americas, December 31, 2011, paras. 521-524.

¹² See, *inter alia*, IACHR, Daniel Ramírez Contreras regarding Mexico (PM-1375-18), Resolution 95/2018 of December 28, 2018, para. 16; Francisco Javier Barraza Gómez, regarding Mexico (PM 209-17), Resolution 31/2017, para. 22; Santiago Maldonado, regarding Argentina (PM 564-17), Resolution 32/2017, para. 16; Yaku Perez Guartambel regarding Ecuador (PM 807-18), Resolution 67/2018, para. 36.

36. In view of the aforementioned background information, the IACHR considers 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 Honduras:

- a) adopt the necessary measures to protect the rights to life and personal integrity of Ligia del Carmen Ramos Zúniga. In particular, the State must ensure that state actors respect the life and personal integrity of the beneficiary, as well as protect her rights in relation to acts of risk that are attributable to third parties, in accordance with the standards established by international human rights law;
- b) adopt the necessary measures so that Ligia del Carmen Ramos Zúniga can carry out her activities as human rights defender without being subjected to acts of violence, threats, harassment, or other violent events in the exercise of her work. The above includes the adoption of measures so that she can properly exercise her right to freedom of expression;
- c) consult and agree upon the measures to be adopted with the beneficiary and her representatives; and
- d) 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.

37. The Commission also requests that the Government of Honduras kindly inform the Commission, within a period of 15 days as of the date of this communication, on the adoption of the precautionary measures that have been agreed upon and to periodically update this information.

38. The Commission stresses that, pursuant to Article 25(8) of the Rules of Procedure of the Commission, 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.

39. The Commission instructs its Executive Secretariat to notify this resolution to the State of Honduras and the applicants.

40. Approved on October 12, 2021, by Antonia Urrejola Noguera, President; Julissa Mantilla Falcón, First Vice-President; Flávia Piovesan, Second Vice-President; Margarette May Macaulay, Esmeralda Arosemena de Troitiño, and Joel Hernández García, members of the IACHR.