
**INTER-AMERICAN COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS
RESOLUTION TO LIFT PRECAUTIONARY MEASURES 75/2022**

Precautionary Measure No. 29-15
Nazira María Ugalde Alfaro¹ regarding Peru²
December 19, 2022
Original: Spanish

I. SUMMARY

1. The Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (IACHR) has decided to lift these precautionary measures in favor of Nazira María Ugalde Alfaro. At the time of taking the decision, the Commission assessed the measures that the State adopted internally and identified a factual change in the circumstances regarding Ms. Ugalde. In that regard, the Commission considered that, at present, it is not possible to identify an imminent risk situation within the meaning of Article 25 of the Rules of Procedure. Upon not identifying compliance with the procedural requirements, the IACHR has decided to lift these measures.

II. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2. On September 8, 2016, the IACHR granted precautionary measures in favor of Nazira María Ugalde Alfaro. The request for precautionary measures alleged that Ms. Ugalde, a Costa Rican national, was at risk as a result of being notified on October 15, 2014, that she would be extradited to the United States on charges of first-degree murder and insurance fraud, crimes for which she could be sentenced to death. The applicant also filed petition P-34-15 alleging a series of due process violations, including the lack of adequate analysis of the diplomatic assurances provided by the United States. These could reportedly have an impact on the protection of her right to life and personal integrity due to the possibility of the death penalty. Upon analyzing the submissions of fact and law presented by the parties, the Commission considered that the information provided showed *prima facie* that Nazira María Ugalde Alfaro was at risk, in accordance with Article 25 of the IACHR Rules of Procedure. Consequently, the Commission requested Peru to refrain from extraditing the beneficiary until the IACHR had decided on the pending petition.³

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

3. During the time the precautionary measures were in force, the Commission followed-up on the subject matter of these precautionary measures by requesting information from the parties. The State presented its report on October 13, 2016, in which it requested that the precautionary measures be lifted, which was forwarded to the representatives on February 22, 2017. The representatives submitted a report on March 10, 2017, and the State on June 6, 2017, reiterating the request to lift the measures. These reports were forwarded between the parties on September 6, 2017. The representatives submitted a new report on September 22, 2017, and the State on September 26, 2017. These were forwarded between the

¹ In Resolution 47/2022, the Commission referred to the beneficiary as Nazira María Ugalde Alvaro, having corroborated with the documents provided by the parties that the correct name is Nazira María Ugalde Alfaro.

² In accordance with Article 17(2)(a) of the Commission's Rules of procedure, Commissioner Julissa Mantilla Falcón, a Peruvian national, did not participate in the debate or in the decision on the present decision.

³ IACHR. Resolution 47/2016. Precautionary Measure No. 29-15 Matter of Nazira María Ugalde Alvaro regarding Peru. September 8, 2016, Available at <https://www.oas.org/en/cidh/decisiones/pdf/2016/MC29-15-EN.pdf>

parties on January 18, 2018. The State submitted a report on September 18, 2019, insisting on lifting the precautionary measures. This report was forwarded to the representatives on October 1, 2019. The representatives submitted their observations on October 14, 2019, which were forwarded to the State on October 27, 2020. The State submitted its report on March 20, 2021, in which it requested that the precautionary measures be lifted. This was forwarded to the representatives on September 30, 2021. Lastly, the representatives provided observations on October 23, 2021, and the State sent a last report on April 26, 2022, once again requesting the lifting of the measures.

4. Representation is exercised by Jorge Mendoza Ariste.

A. Information provided by the State

5. On October 12, 2016, the State reported that the final decision on the extradition of Ms. Nazira María Ugalde Alfaro has not been issued, and there is therefore no “imminent risk”. The State allegedly contacted the corresponding authorities so that, should they accept the request for extradition made by the United States, they would comply with the precautionary measures granted by the IACHR and refrain from extraditing the beneficiary. In this regard, the State considered that at the time of the beneficiary’s extradition study, the State would not take concrete actions, and therefore requests that the precautionary measures be lifted. On June 6, 2017, the State stated that on May 23, 2017, the members of the Official Commission on Extradition and Transfer of Convicted Persons (*Comisión Oficial de Extradiciones y Traslado de Personas Condenadas*, COE-TC) planned to continue with the extradition process and recommend to the Executive Branch that it grant the extradition request made by the United States, which would suspend its execution until the IACHR decides on this matter.

6. On September 25, 2017, the State reported that: (i) on August 25, 2017, the Supreme Resolution that agreed to the beneficiary’s extradition was published in the official journal, the decision of the IACHR in Petition P-34-15 thereby being conditioned⁴; (ii) the United States Embassy issued Diplomatic Note No. 2026 of October 2, 2014, in which it assures that in the event of Ms. Ugalde’s extradition, the death penalty will not be imposed. Lastly, the State requested that the precautionary measures be lifted and that a reasonable period be established to issue the merits decision on Petition P-34-15 since an exaggerated temporality could violate the beneficiary’s right to freedom.

7. On September 18, 2019, the State stated that, by judgment of November 19, 2018, in the framework of the *habeas corpus* proceedings initiated by the beneficiary, the Constitutional Court of Peru ordered that the State refrain from extraditing Ms. Nazira María Ugalde Alfaro to the United States “while the case is pending pronouncement in the inter-American human rights protection system.” According to the decision of the Constitutional Court of Peru, in the judgment EXP. N°05461-2015-PHC/TC, the following was indicated:

“In this regard, and in order to safeguard compliance with the international commitments assumed by the Peruvian State, this Court considers, similar to the Executive Branch, as long as there is no definitive ruling in the framework of the existing procedure in the inter-American system, the delivery of the appellant cannot be effective.”

⁴ The Official Commission on Extradition and Transfer of Convicted Persons proposed granting the request for extradition and recommended that the execution of the final decision of the Peruvian State respond to the recommendation of the IACHR to refrain from executing the extradition of the requested person until the aforementioned Commission pronounces on her pending request. *Diario Oficial de Perú*. Supreme Resolution N°197-2017-JUS. Lima, August 24, 2017.

8. The State indicated that both the Judiciary and the Executive Branch have made the execution of the beneficiary's extradition conditional on the decision of the IACHR in the framework of Petition P-34-15, and that the requirements of urgency and seriousness of Article 25 of the Commission's Rules of Procedure are therefore no longer met. In that regard, they requested that the precautionary measures be lifted. Additionally, the State stated that there are guarantees that in the event of extradition the death penalty will not be applied: (i) letter of April 22, 2019, in which the California State Attorney indicates that he will not request the death penalty against the beneficiary; and (ii) Executive Order of March 13, 2019, in which the Governor of California imposes suspension of the death penalty in the state.

9. On March 19, 2021, the State reported that, by judgment of November 19, 2018, the Constitutional Court of Peru has indicated that it does not observe that there is an imminent violation of the rights to life and integrity against the beneficiary, while the same Supreme Resolution that accesses passive extradition has conditioned the execution on the final pronouncement made by the IACHR in Petition P-34-15. The State reiterated its request to lift the measures.

10. The State submitted a report on April 26, 2022. The State indicated that although the Supreme Resolution that resolves extradition has been issued, it is conditional on the resolution of P-34-15 before the IACHR, now Case 13.573. In addition, it recalled that beyond the guarantees granted through Diplomatic Note 2026 of October 2, 2014, new guarantees reported on September 18, 2019 have been granted, consisting of: a) the Department of Justice validated that the prosecutor of the case's decision in the State of California to not request the death penalty, submitted under diplomatic note 2026 of October 2, 2014, has general effects such as "guarantees offered by the United States" and that the death penalty can not be imposed if the prosecutor does not request it⁵; b) the Department of Justice also reported that the Governor of California issued an executive order which the entry into force of the death penalty in the state for 10 years; and, c) in the state of Nevada, the crime for which the beneficiary's extradition is requested is not punishable by death.

11. Moreover, the State reiterated that the diplomatic guarantees sent in 2014 indicate that the beneficiary will not be imposed the death penalty. In addition, the United States Department of Justice issued a letter on April 22, 2019, indicating that the death penalty will not be requested for the beneficiary. On the other hand, the State reported that the beneficiary is not complying with the rules to which she is obliged in her situation of domiciliary imprisonment, such as the payment of a bond and biometric registration required.

B. Information provided by the representatives

12. On March 9, 2017, the representatives reported that: (i) on December 12, 2016, the Minister of Justice and Human Rights was requested to send the beneficiary's extradition notebook to the 13th Criminal Court of Lima to resolve the request for variation of the provisional arrest for restricted appearance in house arrest made on October 31, 2016; due to the lack of a decision to have filed *habeas corpus* on January 26, 2017, which is being processed before the Criminal Court of Chorrillos; and (ii) there are reports from the Commissions of the Ministries of Foreign Affairs and Justice and Human Rights, which expressed their opinion on the origin of the extradition, as well as a Diplomatic Note sent by the Republic of Costa Rica, in which it is requested that extradition not proceed.

⁵ Communication to the International Judicial Cooperation and Extradition Unit of the Prosecutor's Office of Peru of April 22, 2019, sent by the Criminal Division of the United States Department of Justice, signed by Kyle A. Ary, Senior Litigant Lawyer, with stamp of receipt in the Public Ministry of Peru of April 25, 2019. Attached to the State's communication of September 18, 2019.

13. On September 22, 2017, the representatives stated that: (i) on June 9, 2017, the First Criminal Chamber for Trials with Prisoners in the Superior Court of Lima issued the restricted appearance in the modality of home detention in favor of the beneficiary; (ii) on July 14, 2017, the beneficiary was forwarded to her home where she is under house arrest; (iii) on August 25, 2017, by Supreme Resolution, the beneficiary was extradited; (iv) there are two constitutional processes or *habeas corpus* established by the beneficiary before the Constitutional Court of Peru that have not been resolved; and (v) the representatives considers the request to lift made by the State to be inadmissible, considering that there is already a Supreme Resolution granting the beneficiary's extradition.

14. On October 14, 2019, the representatives considered that the guarantees presented by the United States government are not sufficient, as these have not been ratified by the Department of Justice nor do they meet the minimum requirements of a diplomatic guarantee under Peruvian law. In addition, although the governor of California suspended the death penalty, this does not imply that the beneficiary is not sentenced to this penalty. They consider that the beneficiary's situation has not changed and request to maintain the precautionary measures.

15. On October 23, 2021, the representatives reiterated the previously presented information and requests that the lift not proceed, since it considered that the decision of the Constitutional Court of Peru of January 23, 2018 assesses that the requesting State has not granted an effective guarantee that it will provide protection to the right to life and personal integrity of the beneficiary, all in the sense of opposing that the precautionary measures be lifted, as requested by the State.⁶ The representatives therefore consider that an effective guarantee has not been granted, and alleges that Letter from the Department of Justice of April 22, 2019 and the executive order of the Governor of California do not constitute diplomatic guarantees.

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

16. 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 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 this Article, the IACHR grants precautionary measures in urgent and serious situations in which these measures are necessary to avoid irreparable harm to persons or to the subject matter of a petition or case before the organs of the inter-American system.

17. The Inter-American Commission and the Inter-American Court of Human Rights ("the Inter-American Court" or "I/A Court H.R.") have established repeatedly that precautionary and provisional measures have a dual nature, both protective and precautionary.⁷ Regarding the protective nature, these

⁶ Paragraph 30 of the judgement states that "the guarantees must be signed by an official or authority competent to decide on matters relating to the execution of extradition, in addition to the obligations it will assume in the course of criminal proceedings". The decision of the Constitutional Court is that "as long as there is no definitive ruling in the framework of the existing procedure in the Inter-American System, the delivery of the [beneficiary] cannot be made effective," while indicating that, if the petition is rejected before the Commission, the Peruvian State must demand the presentation of sufficient guarantees that prove the non-application of the death penalty. Judgment of the Constitutional Court of January 23, 2018, EXP. No. 05461-2015-PHC/TC. Attached to the communication of the State of September 19, 2019.

⁷ 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](#). Provisional Measures, Order of July 6, 2009, considerandum 16.

measures seek to avoid irreparable harm and protect the exercise of human rights.⁸ To do this, the IACHR shall assess the problem raised, the effectiveness of state actions to address the situation described, and the vulnerability to which the persons proposed as beneficiaries would be exposed if the measures are not adopted.⁹ Regarding their precautionary nature, these measures have the purpose of preserving a legal situation while under consideration by the organs of the inter-American system. They aim to safeguard 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. 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.

18. With respect to the foregoing, Article 25(7) of the Commission’s Rules of Procedure establishes that “[t]he decisions granting, extending, modifying or lifting precautionary measures shall be adopted through reasoned resolutions.” Article 25(9) establishes that “[t]he Commission shall evaluate periodically, at its own initiative or at the request of either party, whether to maintain, modify or lift the precautionary measures in force.” In this regard, the Commission shall assess whether the serious and urgent situation and the risk of irreparable harm that caused the adoption of the precautionary measures persist. Moreover, the Commission shall consider if new situations have arisen that might meet the requirements set forth in Article 25 of the Rules of Procedure.

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

⁸ 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.

⁹ 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.

¹⁰ I/A Court H.R. [Matter of Fernández Ortega et al. Provisional measures regarding Mexico](#). Order of February 7, 2017, paras. 16 and 17.

¹¹ *Ibidem*

¹² *Ibidem*

20. In this logic, the Commission observes that the State has requested that these precautionary measures be lifted between 2016 and 2022, which is equivalent to a temporary period of six years after the precautionary measures were granted. Specifically, the State made this request in its communication of October 12, 2016, which was subsequently reiterated in its communications of September 25, 2017, September 18, 2019, March 19, 2021, and April 26, 2022. Under the terms of Article 25(9) of the Rules of Procedure, the request to lift the measures was forwarded to the representatives, who reiterated their allegations over time and expressed the need to maintain the precautionary measures.

21. In this regard, the Commission recalls that when a State requests that a precautionary measure be lifted, it must present sufficient evidence and arguments to support its request.¹³ By the same token, the representatives of the beneficiaries that want the measures to continue must present evidence of any reasons why.¹⁴ Similarly, Article 25, subparagraph 11 of the Rules of Procedure sets forth that the Commission may lift or review a precautionary measure when the beneficiaries or their representatives, without justification, fail to provide a satisfactory reply to the Commission on the requirements presented by the State for their implementation.

22. Moreover, the Commission recalls that, in accordance with the Rules of Procedure, granting precautionary measures and keeping them in force, whether of a precautionary or protective nature, is subject to compliance with the requirements established in Article 25 of the IACHR Rules of Procedure. In this sense, if the Commission identifies that the requirements are no longer present, the Commission can assess lifting the precautionary measures. The foregoing, considering the temporary and exceptional nature of the precautionary measures.

23. In this matter, the Commission observes that, in 2016, it considered that the procedural requirements regarding Ms. Nazira María Ugalde Alfaro were met in the factual circumstances assessed at that time. Consequently, the Commission requested the State of Peru “to refrain from extraditing Nazira María Ugalde Alfaro until the IACHR rules on the petition pending before the IACHR.” After the granting of the precautionary measures, the State reported on decisions taken by internal state institutions, thereby making Ms. Ugalde’s extradition conditional on a final pronouncement by the Commission in the framework of Petition 34-15. Thus, the Commission identifies and highlights the following decisions, based on the information available:

- i. Decision of the Official Commission on Extradition and Transfer of Convicted Persons (COE-TC) of 2017, which recommended that the beneficiary be extradited to the United States, but that her execution be suspended until the IACHR issues a ruling on the matter (see *supra* para. 5);
- ii. Supreme Resolution of 2017 by which the beneficiary’s extradition was granted subject to the decision of the IACHR in Petition 34-15 (see *supra* para. 6);
- iii. Judgment of the Constitutional Court of Peru of January 2018 by which it was decided that the State refrain from extraditing the beneficiary to the United States “while the case is pending pronouncement in the inter-American system for the protection of human rights” (see *supra* para. 7 and footnote 6);
- iv. Judgment of the Constitutional Court of Peru of November 2018 by which it was indicated that there was no imminent violation of the rights to life and integrity against the beneficiary, while

¹³ *Ibidem*

¹⁴ *Ibidem*

the same Supreme Resolution that agrees to extradition had conditioned the execution on the final pronouncement made by the IACHR in Petition 34-15 (see *supra* para. 9).

24. In response to the internal decisions, the Commission understands that, after the granting of the precautionary measures in 2016, national institutions have conditioned an extradition of the beneficiary to a final decision of the IACHR in the framework of Petition 34-15. In this regard, the Commission notes that at least two judgments which have assessed the measures adopted by the Executive Branch have been issued by the Constitutional Court of Peru in 2018. In these judgments, the Constitutional Court of Peru decided that the State should refrain from proceeding with the beneficiary's extradition until the IACHR completes its assessment of the corresponding petition and, after the Commission's decision to reject it, the authorities are still obliged to carry out an assessment of the diplomatic assurances (see *supra* footnote 6). The above consideration is particularly relevant, given that these are decisions of the highest constitutional court in the country. Furthermore, these are two constitutional sentences which have a vocation of permanence in time, with a different nature from precautionary measures, which has a temporary nature.

25. For the Commission, the decisions issued by the Constitutional Court of Peru reflect that the State has adopted mechanisms or protective actions for the beneficiary of the precautionary measures. In line with what was indicated by the Inter-American Court, in this circumstance, it could be decided to lift the measures of international protection thereby discharging the obligation of protection in its primary responsible, that is, the State.¹⁵ As indicated by the Inter-American Court, "should provisional measures be lifted [...], it will correspond to the State, in accordance with its duty to guarantee human rights, and its duty to adopt provisions of domestic law, in accordance with Articles 1 and 2 of the American Convention, to maintain the protection measures that it has adopted and that the Court considered relevant, and to adopt all those that may be subsequently necessary, for as long as the circumstances so warrant."¹⁶

26. In addition to the above considerations, the Commission notes that, at present, the factual situation is different from the one present when the precautionary measures were granted in 2016. In this regard, the Commission notes that, according to the information submitted by the State, on April 22, 2019, the United States Department of Justice sent a letter where it validated that the commitment of the California State Attorney stating that it will not request the death penalty against the beneficiary, binds the United States and, being the authority in charge of requesting the penalty in criminal proceedings, if the death penalty is not requested, it cannot be applied. According to this communication, the judge would not have the power to exceed this request. Additionally, it is relevant to the Commission that, at present, a moratorium on the death penalty is in effect in the state of California, issued on March 13, 2019, by the governor of the state.¹⁷ At the time, the Commission welcomed this decision.¹⁸ In addition to the above, in Nevada, the crime for which the beneficiary is requested does not provide for the death penalty. Notwithstanding the qualification of the diplomatic assurances that the State may make within the scope of its competence, the above circumstances lead the Commission to conclude that the conditions under which the risk of the application of the death penalty, in the event of the beneficiary being extradited, were considered different from the ones at present. Regarding the legal situation of the beneficiary, the Commission understands that she is reportedly currently under house arrest and must comply with certain payments and registrations.

¹⁵ I/A Court H.R. Matter of Communities of Jiguamiandó and Curvaradó regarding Colombia. Provisional Measures. Resolution of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights of May 22, 2013, para. 54

¹⁶ *Ibidem*

¹⁷ Governor of the State of California, [Executive Order N/09/19](#), March 13, 2019.

¹⁸ IACHR, [IACHR Welcomes the Moratorium on Executions of Persons on Death Row in California](#), United States, March 20, 2019; 2019 Annual Report, [Chapter IV.A. Development of Human Rights in the Region](#), para. 287.

27. In this sense, the Commission understands that there is a factual modification of the circumstances that led to the granting of the precautionary measures in 2016, and it is not possible to affirm that the situation remains the same. In this way, the IACHR warns that, although the affiliated case 13,573 (petition P-34-15) is at the merits stage, still pending decision, it is not observed that the imminent risk of the application of the death penalty persists in the beneficiary's current factual circumstances.

28. Considering the analysis previously carried out, and in response to the State's request to lift, the Commission understands that, in light of the measures adopted by the State and the modification of the factual circumstances that motivated the granting of these precautionary measures, it does not have at present elements to support compliance with the requirements of Article 25 of the Rules of Procedure. In view of the above and taking into account the exceptional and temporary nature of precautionary measures,¹⁹ the Commission deems it appropriate to lift these measures.

29. In line with what was indicated by the Inter-American Court in various matters,²⁰ a decision to lift cannot imply that the State is relieved from its general obligations of protection, contained in Article 1(1) of the Convention, within the framework of which the State is especially obliged to guarantee the rights of persons at risk and must promote the necessary investigations to clarify the facts, followed by the consequences that may be established. Furthermore, also based on the assessment of the Inter-American Court, the lifting of the precautionary measures does not imply a possible decision on the merits of the dispute.²¹

30. Lastly, the Commission emphasizes that regardless of the lifting of these measures, in accordance with Article 1(1) of the American Convention, it is the obligation of the State to respect and guarantee the rights recognized therein, including the life and personal integrity of the persons identified in the matter at hand.

V. DECISION

31. The Commission decides to lift the precautionary measures granted in favor of Nazira María Ugalde Alfaro, in Peru.

32. The Commission recalls that the lifting of these measures does not prevent the representatives from filing a new request for precautionary measures should they consider that there is a situation that meets the requirements established in Article 25 of the Rules of Procedure.

33. The Commission instructs its Executive Secretariat to notify this resolution to the State of Peru and the representatives.

¹⁹ I/A Court H.R., Matter of Adrián Meléndez Quijano et al. Provisional Measures regarding El Salvador. Order of the Court of August 21, 2013, para. 22, and Matter of Galdámez Álvarez et al. Provisional Measures regarding Honduras. Order of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights of November 23, 2016, para. 24

²⁰ See: I/A Court H.R. Case of Velásquez Rodríguez. Provisional Measures regarding Honduras. Order of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights of January 15, 1988, Considerandum 3, and Matter of Giraldo Cardona et al. Provisional measures regarding Colombia. Order of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights of January 28, 2015, Considerandum 40.

²¹ See: I/A Court H.R. Matter of Guerrero Larez. Provisional Measures regarding Venezuela. Order of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights of August 19, 2013, Considerandum 16, and Matter of Natera Balboa. Provisional Measures regarding Venezuela. Order of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights of August 19, 2013, considerandum 16.

34. Approved on December 19, 2022, by Edgar Stuardo Ralón Orellana, First Vice-President; Margarete May Macaulay, Second Vice-President; Esmeralda Arosemena de Troitiño; Joel Hernández García; Roberta Clarke; and Carlos Bernal Pulido, members of the IACHR.

Jorge Meza Flores
Assistant Executive Secretary