

OEA/Ser.L/V/II
Doc. 98
26 June 2025
Original: Spanish

REPORT No. 93/25

CASE 14.541

REPORT ON FRIENDLY SETTLEMENT

JOSE ENRIQUE CALDAS AND RELATIVES
COLOMBIA

Approved electronically by the Commission on June 26, 2025.

Cite as: IACHR, Report No. 93/2025. Case 14.541. Friendly Settlement. Jose Enrique Caldas and relatives. Colombia, June 26, 2025.

REPORT No. 93/25
CASE 14.541
FRIENDLY SETTLEMENT
JOSE ENRIQUE CALDAS AND RELATIVES
COLOMBIA¹
JUNE 26, 2025

I. SUMMARY AND RELEVANT PROCEEDINGS OF THE FRIENDLY SETTLEMENT PROCESS

1. On March 10, 2010, the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (hereinafter "the Commission" or "IACHR") received a petition, initially presented by Mr. Nelson de Jesús Ríos Santamaría,² who was replaced by Luz Marina Barahona Barreto,³ representing the next of kin of the alleged victim, whose representation was subsequently assumed by Mr. Juan Sebastián Ríos Barahona (hereinafter "the petitioning party", "the petitioner" or "the petitioners"), alleging the international responsibility of the Republic of Colombia (hereinafter "State" or "Colombian State" or "Colombia"), for the violation of the human rights contemplated in Articles 4 (life), 5 (personal integrity), and 8 (judicial guarantees) of the American Convention on Human Rights, (hereinafter "Convention" or "American Convention"), for the impunity surrounding the murder of Mr. José Enrique Caldas, (hereinafter "alleged victim") by one of the members of the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (hereinafter also "the FARC") and the lack of compensation for harm done to his relatives, who were threatened with death by the members of the FARC if they denounced what had happened.

2. On March 19, 2021, the Commission issued Admissibility Report No. 64/21, in which it declared the petition admissible and declared its competence to hear the complaint lodged by the petitioning party regarding the alleged violation of the rights contained in Articles 8 (judicial guarantees) and 25 (judicial protection) of the American Convention in relation to its articles 5 (personal integrity) and 1.1. (Obligation to Respect Rights).

3. On September 22, 2022, the parties entered into a memorandum of understanding aimed at reaching a friendly settlement, together with a work schedule for the negotiations. In the following months, the parties held bilateral meetings to analyze the reparation measures to be included in the friendly settlement agreement (hereinafter "FSA" or "agreement"), which resulted in the signing of that instrument on September 21, 2023, in the city of Bogotá.

4. On July 8, 2024, the parties presented a joint report in which they disclosed the agreement reached to partially modify the content of the FSA, described progress made in its implementation, and requested the IACHR to approve it, a request that they reiterated on December 2, 2024.

5. This friendly settlement report, in accordance with Article 49 of the Convention and Article 40(5) of the Commission's Rules of Procedure, contains a summary of the facts alleged in the petition and a transcription of the friendly settlement agreement signed on September 21, 2023, by the petitioning party and representatives of the Colombian State. Also, the Commission hereby approves the agreement signed by the parties and decides to publish this report in its Annual Report to the General Assembly of the Organization of American States.

¹ Pursued to Article 17(2)(a) of the Rules of Procedure of the IACHR, Commissioner Carlos Bernal Pulido, a Colombian national, did not participate in the discussion or decision on this case.

² On April 5, 2016, the petitioning party reported that Mr. Elpidio Caldas, brother of the alleged victim, passed away on August 23, 2014, and requested that his wife, Mrs. María Isabel Melo de Caldas, his son Wilson Caldas Melo, and his daughter Sedy Caldas Melo be considered as alleged victims of the petition. On the same date, Mrs. Luz Marina Barahona Barreto replaced Mr. Nelson de Jesús Ríos Santamaría as the representative of the alleged victims.

³ On April 7, 2023, the petitioning party reported the death of Mrs. Luz Marina Barahona, who was substituted as the alleged victims' representative by Mr. Juan Sebastián Ríos Barahona.

II. THE FACTS ALLEGED

6. The petitioner claimed that Mr. José Enrique Caldas was murdered by a member of the “FARC” in the municipality of Puerto Rico, department of Meta. The petitioner argued this act of violence was left unpunished by the state authorities and that it was not possible to seek compensation for the alleged victim’s family, whom the FARC threatened to kill if they reported the crime.

7. The petitioner alleged that on December 25, 2005, Mr. José Enrique Caldas was at the diner in the district of Buena Vista, in the municipality of Puerto Rico, department of Meta, when a member of the FARC’s 44th Front, who was in plainclothes and inspecting the troops mobilized in that area, asked him for his (the alleged victim’s) permit to visit that place—to visit the district or the town, country people were required to get a permit from the commander of that area. The petitioner recounted that since the alleged victim did not have one such permit, the FARC guerrilla, without saying anything else, stabbed the alleged victim to death in front of the other FARC guerrillas and the people at the diner. No one asked anything and no one could approach or help the alleged victim.

8. Later, Mr. Elpidio Caldas, the alleged victim’s brother, and some members of the Communal Action Board removed the body themselves given the absence of state authorities in that area. According to the petitioner, the alleged victim, who was threatened by the FARC like everyone else was in the town, was just visiting his surroundings; his purported mistake was not carrying an authorization from the local commander, and his death was due to the State’s failure in its duty to protect all its inhabitants as per article 2 of Colombia’s National Constitution.

9. Moreover, the petitioner narrated that the population of the district of Buena Vista was controlled by guerrillas of the FARC, who discretionally killed members of that community. According to the petitioner, these killings were known to the several units of the National Army in the Vargas-21st Battalion, headquartered at the municipality of Granada, near the municipality of Puerto Rico, and the Fourth Division, headquartered at the city of Villavicencio, department of Meta. The petitioner said that since these armed groups of the FARC did not allow state authorities in, the municipality of Puerto Rico was excluded from any protection from the State. The petitioner indicated that it was the FARC that ruled all the civilian population of that municipality and even communities nearby.

10. The petitioner argued that no formal complaint was filed against any of the members of the army nor any administrative authority of the municipality of Puerto Rico, Meta, by the alleged victim’s family because of the prevailing law of silence and because of the fear caused by the threats from the FARC as well as the fear of reprisal from state authorities and paramilitary groups operating in the country, where the military forces were a judge and party in legal proceedings.

11. Finally, the petitioner claimed that the State failed to protect not only the alleged victim but also the whole civilian population of the district of Buena Vista. In their opinion, the state’s bodies did have the adequate means to fight these armed groups of the FARC but failed to do so, even though they knew that human rights violations were being committed in that area. The petitioner also claimed that when the State filed the criminal action ex officio, it did not conduct it effectively and eventually filed the case in the archives without punishing the persons responsible. Moreover, the petitioner pointed the finger at the Minister of National Defense, the Commander of the Fourth Division of the Army, the Commander of the Army’s VII Brigade, and the Director of the National Police, all of whom were in office when the events took place, as the persons responsible for the violation of the alleged victim’s human rights. Furthermore, through the Ministry of the Interior and Justice, the petitioner requested copies of the proceedings and a judicial inspection into the record compiled by the Office of the Prosecutor General, Office of the Public Prosecutor of Puerto Lleras to the Judge of the Circuit of San Martín, Meta.

III. FRIENDLY SETTLEMENT

12. On September 21, 2023, in Bogotá, the parties signed a friendly settlement agreement, which reads as follows:

**FRIENDLY SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT
PETITION 337-10 JOSÉ ENRIQUE CALDAS AND NEXT OF KIN⁴**

On September 21, 2023 in the city of Bogotá D.C., a meeting was held between, Ana María Ordóñez Puentes, Director of International Legal Defense of the National Agency for the Legal Defense of the State, acting on behalf of the Colombian State, hereinafter "the Colombian State", and Sebastián Ríos Barahona, acting on behalf of the victims, hereinafter "the victims' representative", jointly referred to as "the parties", met and decided to enter into this Friendly Settlement Agreement in Petition No. 337-10 José Enrique Caldas and his next of kin, being processed before the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights.

PART ONE: DEFINITIONS

For the purposes of this Agreement, the following definitions shall apply:

IACHR or Inter-American Commission: Inter-American Commission on Human Rights.

Moral damages: Non-economic or assets-related injurious effects of the facts of the case that result in the pain, affliction, sadness, distress, and anxiety of the victims.

Non-material damage: Includes both the suffering and affliction caused to the victims, the impairment of values of great importance to the persons concerned, as well as alterations, of a non-pecuniary nature, in the living conditions of the victim or his family.⁵

State or Colombian State: In accordance with Public International Law, the State is understood to be the entity that has agreed to abide by the American Convention on Human Rights, hereinafter the "American Convention" or "ACHR."

Satisfaction measures: Non-pecuniary measures that are intended to ensure the recovery of the victims from the harm caused to them.⁶

Parties: State of Colombia, relatives of José Enrique Caldas.

Acknowledgement of responsibility: Acceptance of the acts and omissions attributed to the State that violate one of its obligations under international human rights law.

Comprehensive reparation: All those measures that objectively and symbolically restore the victim to the state prior to the infliction of the damage.

Friendly Settlement: Alternative dispute resolution mechanism used for peaceful and consensual settlement before the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights.

Victims: Relatives of Mr. José Enrique Caldas.

⁴ The Commission has verified that the parties referred to the original Petition No. 337-10 rather than at Case number 14,541, but it refers to the same matter.

⁵ I/A Court H.R. Case of Caesar v. Trinidad and Tobago, (Merits, Reparations, and Costs) Judgment of March 11, 2005. Series C No. 123, paragraph 125.

⁶ Examples of such measures include public disclosure of the truth and acts of atonement.

PART TWO: BACKGROUND

1. On March 10, 2010, the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights received a petition presented by Mr. Nelson de Jesús Ríos,⁷ in which he denounced that Mr. José Enrique Caldas was a victim of homicide by members of the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (hereinafter "the FARC") in the municipality of Puerto Rico, department of Meta.

2. According to the initial petition, on December 25, 2005, when Mr. José Enrique Caldas was in the inn of the Buena Vista Village located in the Municipality of Puerto Rico, Meta, an individual belonging to the 44th Front of the FARC, who was not wearing a uniform, but was inspecting the personnel who were moving in that area, asked him about his permission to stay in that place, due to the fact that to go outside or to the village they had to have a permit from the commander of that area. As the alleged victim did not have such a permit, the member of the FARC attacked him with a knife in front of other FARC guerrillas and people in the inn, causing his death.

3. Subsequently, Mr. Elpidio Caldas, brother of Mr. José Enrique Caldas, accompanied by members of the Communal Action Board carried out the removal of the body in the absence of state authorities in the area. The petitioning party asserted that the homicide was committed due to the lack of security and presence of the State.⁸

4. The Attorney General's Office initiated a criminal investigation into the murder of Mr. José Enrique Caldas under file No. 148.749 based on the complaint filed and the body removal report No. 0043 of December 26, 2005, verified by the Puerto Rico-Meta Police Inspector.

5. Subsequently, on January 20, 2006, the 39th Sectional Prosecutor's Office of Villavicencio opened a preliminary investigation. On April 16, 2006, it ordered the taking of evidence and, on July 21 of the same year, the Prosecutor in the case issued a restraining order.

6. On December 15, 2007, a Technical Legal Committee meeting was held in the Sectional Directorate of Prosecutor's Offices and Citizen Security of Meta regarding case No. 148.749, where it was decided to reopen the investigation and pursue certain inquiries.

7. On June 30, 2021, an order to reopen the investigations was issued, as a result of which the case was referred to the Villavicencio decongestion unit, which is why it was handled by the 3rd Sectional Prosecutor's Office of Villavicencio. In the process, orders to take and examine evidence were issued, the last of which was dated March 23, 2022.⁹

8. In the international proceeding, in Admissibility Report No. 64/21 of March 19, 2021, the IACHR considered the petition admissible in relation to Articles 8 and 25 of the American Convention in conjunction with Articles 5 and 1.1 of the same instrument.

9. On August 3, 2020 (sic), the petitioning party expressed its intention to initiate a process of seeking a friendly settlement, which it brought to the attention of the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights. In connection with the above, the parties decided to sign a Memorandum of Understanding to begin the search for a friendly solution.

10. The Memorandum of Understanding for the Search for a Friendly Settlement was signed on September 22, 2022.¹⁰

11. Over the months that followed the parties held joint meetings to analyze the reparation measures to be included in the friendly settlement agreement now being signed.

⁷The petition was initially filed by Mr. Nelson de Jesús Ríos. However, on April 5, 2016, Mrs. Luz Marina Barahona Barreto replaced him as the representative of the alleged victim's relatives. Due to the death of Dr. Luz Marina Barahona and in connection with the signing of this Friendly Settlement Agreement, Mr. Sebastian Rios Barahona took over as the alleged victims' representative.

⁸The original FSA included a footnote referring to the initial Petition dated March 10, 2016, but the Commission understands that this was a mistake and corrected the date to read March 10, 2010.

⁹ Office of the Attorney General No. 20221700021631 March 28, 2022

¹⁰ Due to the death of Dr. Luz Marina Barahona, the process was suspended while new arrangements were made for granting power of attorney to Dr. Sebastián Ríos B.

PART THREE: BENEFICIARIES

The Colombian State recognizes the following victims in this agreement:

Name	ID	Relationship
Elpidio Caldas ¹¹ (R.I.P.)	(...)	Brother
María Isabel Melo de Caldas	(...)	Sister-in-law <i>Affected third party</i>
Wilson Caldas Melo	(...)	Nephew
Sedy Caldas Melo	(...)	Nephew

The victims recognized in this Friendly Settlement Agreement shall benefit from it as long as they prove that they are related by blood (consanguinity) and affinity to Mr. José Enrique Caldas. In any case, they must prove the harm done to them in accordance with the parameters established by the Council of State.

Paragraph: By signing this Friendly Settlement Agreement, the petitioner declares that the persons listed above are the next of kin of José Enrique Caldas, with legal standing and interested in pursuing this proceeding and that they were alive at the time of the occurrence of the facts.

Thus, following the signing of the Friendly Settlement Agreement, no new beneficiaries will be included.

PART FOUR: ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF RESPONSIBILITY

The Colombian State acknowledges that it bears international responsibility for the violations of the rights recognized in Articles 8 and 25 of the American Convention, in relation to Article 1(1) of the same instrument, to the detriment of the relatives of Mr. José Enrique Caldas, due to failure to conduct a diligent investigation of the events that occurred, which resulted in the failure to identify, prosecute, and punish those responsible for his murder.

PART FIVE: MEASURES OF SATISFACTION

The Colombian State undertakes to adopt the following satisfaction measures:

i) Act of Acknowledgment of Responsibility:

The Colombian State shall carry out a virtual Act of Acknowledgment of Responsibility, which shall be presided over by the Director General or the Director of International Legal Defense of the National Agency for the Legal Defense of the State. All aspects related to the ceremony will be agreed upon with the representative of the victims and family members.

The ceremony shall be consistent with the acknowledgment of responsibility set forth in the present Agreement. The National Agency for the Legal Defense of the State shall be responsible for the fulfillment of this measure of satisfaction.¹²

ii) Publication of the Article 49 Report:

The Colombian State shall publish the pertinent sections of the friendly settlement report, once it has been issued by the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, on the web page of the National Agency for the Legal Defense of the State, for a period of six (6) months.

¹¹ Died on August 23, 2014.

¹² On July 8, 2024, the parties jointly informed the IACHR that they agreed to amend this aspect of the FSA to include the commitment to "Carry out an Act of Delivery of a Commemorative Plaque in Case 14.541 José Enrique Caldas and family members, on June 26, 2024, at 3:00 p.m., at the facilities of the National Agency for the Legal Defense of the State. That plaque shall contain the recognition of international responsibility in the terms established in the Friendly Settlement Agreement."

PART SIX: COMPENSATION MEASURES

The State shall apply Law 288 of 1996, with a view to making reparation for any immaterial and material damages that may be proven for the victims recognized in the third paragraph of this Friendly Settlement Agreement in petition 337-10 José Enrique Caldas and Next of Kin. For these purposes, the criteria and amounts recognized by current national jurisprudence shall be applied.

In the event that any victim has been compensated through the administrative litigation jurisdiction system and/or has benefited from administrative reparation measures, the amounts he or she has been granted shall be discounted from the monetary compensation provided in accordance with the procedure envisaged herein to avoid double or excessive compensation.

Likewise, the evidence used to assess damages for reparation purposes shall be that allowed by Colombian procedural regulations.

PART SEVEN: APPROVAL AND FOLLOW-UP

The parties request the Inter-American Commission to approve and follow up on this agreement.

Having been read, and the parties being aware of its scope and legal content, this Agreement is signed.

PART EIGHT: CONFIDENTIALITY

The content of this Friendly Settlement Agreement is confidential and may not be published/disseminated by any means of communication until it is approved by the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights through the issuance of the Report referred to in Article 49 of the American Convention on Human Rights.

IV. DETERMINATION OF COMPATIBILITY AND COMPLIANCE

13. The IACHR reiterates that in accordance with Articles 48(1)(f) and 49 of the American Convention, the purpose of this procedure is to “reach a friendly settlement of the matter based on respect for the human rights recognized in the Convention.” The acceptance to pursue this process expresses the good faith of the State to comply with the purposes and objectives of the Convention pursuant to the principle of *pacta sunt servanda*, by which States must comply with the obligations assumed in the treaties in good faith.¹³ It also wishes to highlight that the friendly settlement procedure set forth in the Convention allows for conclusion of individual cases in a non-contentious manner, and has proven, in cases involving a variety of countries, to provide an important vehicle for resolution that can be used by both parties.

14. The Inter-American Commission has closely monitored the progress of the friendly settlement reached in this case and appreciates the efforts made by both parties during negotiations to reach this friendly settlement, which is compatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

15. The IACHR notes that by joint communication of July 8, 2024, the parties informed the Commission of their decision to substitute the act of acknowledgment of responsibility established in paragraph i of clause five (measures of satisfaction) of the FSA, for an act of delivery of a commemorative plaque, for which reason, the IACHR declares, based on the will of the parties, that said substitution is an integral part of the friendly settlement agreement signed between the parties and has the corresponding legal effects.

16. In accordance with seventh clause of the agreement signed by the parties, in which they requested the Commission to approve the friendly settlement agreement under Article 49 of the American Convention, and pursuant to the parties request of July 8, 2024, reiterated on December 2, 2024, to move forward in this way, it is appropriate at this time to assess compliance with the commitments set forth in this agreement.

¹³ Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, United Nations. Doc A/CONF.39/27 (1969), Article 26: “**Pacta sunt servanda**” Every treaty in force is binding upon the parties to it and must be performed by them in good faith.

17. The Inter-American Commission considers that clauses one (Definitions), two (Background), three (Beneficiaries), four (Acknowledgement of Responsibility), and eight (confidentiality) of the Agreement are of a declarative nature, rendering supervision of their compliance unnecessary.

18. In this regard, the Commission appreciates the fourth declarative clause, in which the Colombian State acknowledges that it bears international responsibility for the violations of the rights recognized in Articles 8 and 25 of the American Convention, in conjunction with Article 1(1) of the same instrument, to the detriment of the relatives of Mr. José Enrique Caldas, due to the lack of a diligent investigation of the events that occurred, which resulted in the failure to prosecute and punish those responsible for his murder.

19. In relation to paragraph i (delivery of a commemorative plaque) of the fifth clause (measures of satisfaction), as jointly informed by the parties, this took place on June 26, 2024, at the facilities of the National Agency for the Legal Defense of the State. The parties reported the existence of constant communication between the State and the representatives of the petitioners, with whom each of the details for the fulfillment of this point of the agreement were agreed upon, such as the measurements, material, and design of the commemorative plaque.

20. Photographs of the event and of the commemorative plaque that was presented were also provided. The content of the agreed agenda was also presented, which included the opening and installation of the space provided, the national anthem of Colombia, and the words by the representative of the victims, Juan Sebastián Ríos Barahona, who attended in person.

21. The State's speech was delivered by the director of the National Agency for the Legal Defense of the State, Jhon Jairo Camargo, who presented the commemorative plaque to the representative of the victims and acknowledged the international responsibility of the Colombian State under the terms established in the friendly settlement agreement, stating the following:

[...]

Acknowledging the pain of the victims and taking measures to repair the damage is not only an act of justice; it is also humane. It is essential that all the agreed comprehensive reparation measures do not seek exclusively to compensate the family of José Enrique Caldas, but also to ensure that these kinds of events are not repeated. (...).

Today we gather in an act of deep meaning and solemnity, to commemorate the memory of José Enrique Caldas, victim of an act of violence that has indelibly marked his family and an entire community. This ceremony not only honors his life, but also represents an important step in the search for justice and reparation. (...).

Dr. Juan Sebastián Ríos Barahona, in your capacity as representative(s) of the victims, I present you with this commemorative plaque, to commemorate the life of José Enrique Caldas and to ask your forgiveness for these painful events that should never have happened. The Colombian State acknowledges that it bears international responsibility for the violations of the rights recognized in Articles 8 and 25 of the American Convention, in relation to Article 1(1) of the same instrument, to the detriment of the relatives of Mr. José Enrique Caldas, due to the lack of a diligent investigation of the events that occurred, which resulted in the failure to prosecute and punish those responsible for his murder.

[...]

22. Based on the information provided by the parties, the Commission considers, and hereby declares, that full compliance has been achieved with paragraph i (delivery of a commemorative plaque) of the fifth clause (measures of satisfaction) of the signed FSA.

23. In addition, in relation to paragraph (ii) (publication of the Article 49 Report) of clause five (satisfaction measures) and clause six (compensation measures) of the friendly settlement agreement and bearing in mind the joint request of the parties to proceed with the approval of the agreement prior to its

implementation, the Commission observes that those measures must be complied with after the publication of this report. Therefore, it considers, and hereby declares, that compliance with them is still pending. Considering the above, the Commission will await updated information from the parties on their execution during subsequent monitoring of the friendly settlement.

24. Lastly, the Commission takes note that, during the negotiation process, the parties decided not to include a measure of justice in the friendly settlement agreement of the present matter. Nevertheless, and without prejudice to the will of the parties, the Commission considers it appropriate to recall the State's duty to investigate the facts ex officio and diligently within the ordinary jurisdiction, and, if applicable, to determine the corresponding criminal responsibilities within a reasonable time, in accordance with international standards. Likewise, the Commission recalls that this obligation must be assumed by States as a legal duty of their own and not as a mere formality doomed in advance to be ineffective, or as a mere handling of private interests dependent on the procedural initiative of the victims or their relatives, or on the private provision of evidence.

25. In light of the above, the Commission understands, and hereby declares, that there has been full compliance with paragraph i (delivery of a commemorative plaque). At the same time, the Commission notes, and hereby declares, that compliance with paragraph ii (publication of the Article 49 Report) of clause five (satisfaction measures) and clause six (compensation measures) of the friendly settlement agreement is still pending.

26. Finally, the Commission reiterates that the rest of the content of the agreement is of a declarative nature and therefore it is not the IACHR's responsibility to supervise compliance with it. Finally, the Commission notes that partial compliance with the agreement has been achieved and it will continue to monitor implementation of the above-mentioned clauses until full compliance has been achieved.

V. CONCLUSIONS

27. Based on the foregoing and in keeping with the procedure provided for in Articles 48(1)(f) and 49 of the American Convention, the Commission would like to reiterate its profound appreciation of the efforts made by the parties and its satisfaction that a friendly settlement has been arrived at in the present case on the basis of respect for human rights and consistent with the object and purpose of the American Convention.

28. Based on the reasons and conclusions contained in this report,

THE INTER-AMERICAN COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

DECIDES:

1. To approve the terms of the friendly settlement agreement that the parties signed on July 8, 2024.

2. To declare full compliance with paragraph i (act of delivery of a commemorative plaque) of the fifth clause (measures of satisfaction) of the friendly settlement agreement, based on the analysis contained in this report.

3. To declare that, based on the analysis contained in this report, compliance is still pending with paragraph ii (publication of the Article 49 Report) of clause five (measures of satisfaction) and clause six (compensation measures) of the friendly settlement agreement.

4. To continue monitoring the commitments undertaken in section ii (publication of the Article 49 Report) of the fifth clause (satisfaction measures) and the sixth clause (compensation measures) of the

friendly settlement agreement, in accordance with the analysis contained in this report. To that end, to remind the parties of their commitment to keep the IACHR regularly informed regarding compliance.

5. To publish the present report and include it in its Annual Report to the General Assembly of the OAS.

Approved by the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights on the 26th day of the month of June 2025. (Signed): José Luis Caballero Ochoa, President; Andrea Pochak, First Vice President; Arif Bulkan, Second Vice President, Edgar Stuardo Ralón Orellana, Gloria Monique de Mees, and Roberta Clarke, Commissioners.