
INTER-AMERICAN COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS
RESOLUTION TO LIFT PRECAUTIONARY MEASURES 98/2025

Precautionary Measure No. 175-18
Giomar Patricia Riveros Gaitán regarding Colombia¹
December 24, 2025
Original: Spanish

I. SUMMARY

1. The Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (IACHR) decides to lift these precautionary measures in favor of Giomar Patricia Riveros Gaitán in Colombia. At the time of making the decision, the Commission assessed the actions taken by the State during implementation, and the change in the factual circumstances assessed in 2018, as well as the absence of events that would be sufficient to continue to find a situation presenting a risk under the terms of Article 25 of the Rules of Procedure. Consequently, the IACHR decided to lift these measures.

II. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2. On August 27, 2018, the IACHR granted precautionary measures in favor of Giomar Patricia Riveros Gaitán, in Colombia.² The request alleged that she was a human rights defender and representative on the "National Board of Victims," and was reportedly receiving threats for having denounced various acts of corruption and other crimes. The IACHR assessed the State's response, but identified that she did not have protection measures in place despite new events that had occurred. There was also no specific information indicating that her risk was duly assessed. Consequently, the Commission required that Colombia:

- a) Adopt the necessary measures to guarantee the rights to life and personal integrity of Giomar Patricia Riveros Gaitán;
- b) Adopt the necessary measures to guarantee that Giomar Patricia Riveros Gaitán can continue to carry out her work as a human rights defender without being subjected to threats, harassment, or acts of violence in the exercise thereof;
- c) Consult and agree upon the measures to be implemented 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 resolution, so as to prevent such events from reoccurring.

3. The beneficiary herself exercises direct representation before the Commission.

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

¹In accordance with Article 17(2) of the Rules of Procedure of the IACHR, Commissioner Carlos Bernal Pulido, a Colombian national, did not participate in the debate and deliberation of this matter.

²IACHR, [Resolution No. 66/18](#), PM No. 175-18, Giomar Patricia Riveros Gaitán regarding Colombia.

4. During the time the precautionary measures were in force, the Commission followed up on the situation by requesting information from the parties. In this regard, communications have been received from the parties and sent from the IACHR on the following dates:

	State	Communications by the representation	IACHR
2018	September 12	No communications	December 21
2019	October 15	January 4, July 8	September 17, November 15
2020	No communications	September 14	August 26
2021	No communications	August 25, September 7	No communications
2022	October 7	December 2	July 7, October 25
2023	April 4	January 26	September 1, February 6, July 20
2024	June 25, October 30	February 19, March 4, September 25, October 11, November 10 and 12, December 12	April 15, August 21, September 24, September 30, October 15, November 5, November 26
2025	January 24, June 20, June 23, September 24	February 24 and 27, May 5	February 10, April 24, June 3

5. On October 30, 2024, the State requested that these precautionary measures be lifted, stating that the procedural requirements were not met to keep them in force. This request was subsequently reiterated during 2025, on January 24, June 23, and September 24, 2025. The representation was aware of the request to lift and had the opportunity to present her observations. In particular, by communication of May 5, 2025, the beneficiary requested that the precautionary measures remain in force, but without reporting the occurrence of recent events against her.

A. Information provided by the State

6. In 2018, the State reported on six investigations at the investigation stage in which the beneficiary was listed as a victim. The State pointed out that a conciliation meeting was held on September 6, 2018, and another was scheduled for September 13 of the same year. On that occasion, the National Protection Unit (UNP) committed to maintain the protection measures until the risk reassessment of the beneficiary was carried out. In October 2018, the State reported on the status of four additional investigations. In summary, it was indicated that six of the investigations were filed and one of them was inactive due to procedural overlap with another investigation.

7. In 2022, the State indicated that the beneficiary had a protection detail that extended to her family group. This detail was composed of an armored vehicle, two protection agents, a means of communication, and an armored vest. The State referred to the accumulation of the investigation into acts of threats of July 10, 2018, with other investigations. This arose after the beneficiary received insistent calls from people who identified themselves as officials of the Prosecutor's Office and the SIJIN, who requested her personal address to carry out an *arrailo* proceeding.

8. In 2023, the State held a concertation meeting between the Human Rights Office of the Metropolitan Police of Bogotá, the beneficiary and her representation. On that occasion, the beneficiary stated that she did not require the implementation of preventive measures due to the risk involved and refused to provide location data. In that same space, the beneficiary filed a complaint that was sent to the Office of the Attorney General.

9. In 2024, the State reported that there were seven investigations for the crime of threats in which the beneficiary was listed as a victim. She reiterated that she refused to provide her location for the implementation of preventive actions by the Public Force. On October 30, 2024, the State recalled that the beneficiary's protection measures were ratified by a resolution of December 21, 2022, that assessed her level of risk as extraordinary, taking into account her status as a representative of the victims' organization *Federación Colombiana de Víctimas de la FARC* (FEVCOL).

10. At the time of supporting its request to have the measures lifted, the State referred to the following allegations: (i) the beneficiary posed as a lawyer without being one; (ii) she had contracted with a public entity despite being disqualified from doing so; (iii) she claimed to be part of a former senator's team, which was denied by him; (iv) she participated in an irregular manner in the National Board of Victims and was not registered in the Single Registry of Victims; (v) was expelled from the National Table of Effective Participation of Victims in the framework of a file for the alleged misuse of the charge against the general welfare of the victims; (vi) it was indicated by a communication signed by the coordinators of 32 Tables of Effective Participation for Victims of departmental order, together with the District Table of Bogotá, for the political persecution that she would have carried out and for the dissemination of biased information without being a victim of the conflict; (vii) she was found responsible on August 3, 2020, for crimes against the public administration and was being investigated for the alleged conduct of threats against social leaders; and (viii) the criminal process from which the risk for which the precautionary measures were granted was concluded with the conviction of the accused person.³

11. On January 24, 2025, the State remarked that the beneficiary had been expelled from the "National Table of Victims."⁴ On January 14, 2025, the Chief of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the Military Forces indicated that the occurrence of new threats was not mentioned for a year. The State stressed that the beneficiary was being investigated for alleged threats against social leaders and that she had been convicted on August 3, 2020, for being responsible for the crime of violation of the legal regime of incompatibilities and disabilities. Since December 21, 2022, the beneficiary had a protection detail that extended to her family group, consisting of an armored vehicle, a conventional vehicle, six protection personnel, a ballistic protection vest, and a means of communication. In the last contact with the beneficiary, when she met with the National Police in March 2023, the proposed institutional preventive offer was not accepted. In addition, the State submitted information in relation to three investigations.⁵

12. On June 23, 2025, the State indicated that, due to events in 2024 and 2025, five investigations are being carried out for the crime of threats in which the beneficiary is listed as a victim. In addition, four investigations were active against the beneficiary for crimes such as slander, scams and insults by de facto means. The State reported that the beneficiary was deprived of her liberty due to a conviction for crimes against the Public Administration of August 3, 2020 (confirmed on August 20, 2021, and for which the Cassation Chamber of the Supreme Court of Justice rejected the appeal filed). She was sentenced to deprivation of liberty.

13. On September 24, 2025, the State recalled that the beneficiary's protection detail has varied over time according to the technical evaluations, starting with an extraordinary risk in 2016 that justified the implementation of an armored vehicle, two protection men, a means of communication, and a bulletproof vest. The measures were subject to multiple administrative adjustments and judicial decisions between 2017 and 2022, maintaining reinforced protection details that included up to six people for protection and extension to the immediate family members.

³ The State indicated that the beneficiary reported a former mayor for money laundering and illegal urbanization. The UNP pointed out that he was sentenced to 45 months in prison in March 2017 and there was no evidence in the last risk level study of threats against the person assessed for these facts.

⁴ The beneficiary held the status of human rights defender and representative on the National Board of Victims. However, she was expelled from the National Board of Victims through a disciplinary process in which due process was guaranteed, as well as the right to defense and contradiction, and the presentation of the available resources to attack the decision, including an appeal for protection in which the request was denied. In conclusion, she is not part of the National Table of Victims at present as she has been expelled for acting contrary to the nature of said table.

⁵ The first investigation concerned events that occurred on July 10, 2018, when the beneficiary received a phone call from people who posed as officials and requested her address. In this regard, the State indicated that the last investigative activity was carried out on May 29, 2024, when the judicial police report was received, which was under analysis to establish the orders that the office would issue to continue with the momentum of the investigation. The second investigation referred to an accusation issued by other people, according to which the beneficiary had participated in the death of another person. This investigation was closed on August 15, 2024. Regarding a third investigation, it was indicated that it was referred to the Specialized Directorate against Human Rights Violations for the study of its appointment to a specialized Prosecutor's Office for the investigation of violence based on sexual orientation or gender identity.

14. However, the most recent evaluation carried out in 2025 determined a change in the beneficiary's risk circumstances. The UNP issued Resolution 01414 of 2025 by which it adopted the recommendation of the Committee for Risk Assessment and Recommendation of Measures that validated the existence of an ordinary risk for the beneficiary, proceeding accordingly to finalize the protection measures by means of a clearance act dated April 30, 2025. The technical evaluation carried out by the UNP concluded that the circumstances that originally justified the protection measures have undergone substantial changes, particularly with regard to the loss of the representation roles that the beneficiary held in victims' organizations,⁶ as well as her current situation of deprivation of liberty that eliminates the possibility of exercising the activities that could generate the initially identified risks.

15. Lastly, the State specified that, according to the beneficiary's attorney-in-fact, she is serving house arrest, being detained at her place of residence under INPEC surveillance.

B. Information provided by the representation

16. In 2019, the beneficiary indicated that accusations were being made against her on social networks and were requesting information about her location, which was reported to the police on May 20, 2019. She indicated that videos were sent to her of people being beheaded under the inscription "This is how the corrupt are punished."

17. In 2021, the beneficiary filed two complaints with the Prosecutor's Office and one complaint with the Technical Board for Victims against two members of that organization for slander and threats. The beneficiary indicated that on November 15, 2019, she received a strange call from an alleged quality surveyor regarding her protection detail. On February 11, 2021, she received a threatening message from an unknown subject. On March 1, 2021, she received a call from an unknown man. On April 22, 2021, she reported that an unknown subject appeared in her residential complex and, showing her photograph, asked the person in charge of surveillance where she resided. On June 1, 2021, she received three phone calls from private numbers. The beneficiary indicated that since 2016 she had a protection detail that extended to her family, implemented by the UNP and composed of four agents, an armored vehicle, and a conventional vehicle.

18. In 2022, the representation referred to various complaints filed for events that occurred between 2018 and 2022 due to threats and extortion. On January 26, 2023, the beneficiary submitted the complaint filed with the Office of the Attorney General for the alleged profiling and interceptions by the UNP. On December 2, 2022, she reported that she was formally assigned a protection detail consisting of an armored vehicle, two conventional vehicles, and six protection personnel. In this regard, she indicated that the conventional vehicle was broken down. In relation to the investigations, the beneficiary alleged that eleven complaints were ongoing for threats and extortion that took place between 2021 and 2022. However, she questioned the archiving of many of them.

19. In 2024, the beneficiary submitted the decision rejecting the appeal for protection filed regarding her expulsion from the National Board for the Effective Participation of the Victims of the Armed Conflict after a disciplinary process for conduct contrary to the ethics and good practices of the internal regulations of the entity. On February 19, 2024, she alleged that she was threatened in the framework of an event on the elections of the National Table of Victims held in the city of Bogotá between December 12 and 14, 2023. After denouncing alleged irregularities in the handling of money from the Victims' Unit and pointing out specific persons in said space, one of the aforementioned persons allegedly made threats against the

⁶ In addition, by means of a statement dated November 20, 2023, the legal representative of the Colombian Federation of FARC Victims reported that Ms. Riveros Gaitán is not the legal representative of the organization. In the same sense, there is an official letter dated November 6, 2024, from FEVCOL in which it is accredited that the citizen is only part of the Board of Directors of the organization. Regarding her role in the Foundation for the Dignity of the Heroes of Colombia, by means of a statement dated December 30, 2024, the risk analyst requested to verify the situation of the evaluated party, to which a response was received dated January 2, 2025, from the legal representative of the organization, who stated that the citizen is no longer part of the organization, and attached a statement dated December 12, 2024, in which Ms. Riveros Gaitán resigns from the Foundation.

beneficiary. In 2024, the beneficiary also indicated that after complaints were filed against the former mayor of the town of Yopal, he allegedly harassed and threatened her, without referring to the exact date of the events. On October 11, 2024, the beneficiary reported that she received two calls not to appear before the National Board of Victims in the framework of the disciplinary process that was being carried out against her in that entity. She called the calls "threatening."

20. On February 27, 2025, Giomar Patricia Riveros Gaitán sent the appeal for reconsideration filed against the resolution by which the UNP decided to end the protection measures implemented in her favor. She stated that the beneficiary's status as a human rights defender did not derive from her membership in organizations that carry out their activities in this area, but rather from her exercise in the promotion and protection of fundamental rights. In this regard, the beneficiary sent a communication from the Colombian Federation of FARC Victims (FEVCOL) reaffirming her career in said organization. It was indicated that the UNP ended the protection measures despite being aware of the various threats to which it had been exposed. In total, in 2024, eleven complaints were filed with the Office of the Attorney General for threats, and she questioned the inactivity in certain of the complaints filed.

21. On May 5, 2025, the beneficiary described the lifting of the protection measures by the UNP as an "institutional retaliation." It was indicated that the National Police's offer of protection was rejected in March 2023 due to its ineffectiveness and the distrust generated by the history of complicity of some members of the Public Force with actors who had threatened her. She alleged that her expulsion from the National Board of Victims intervened after a disciplinary process that was initiated following the complaints she made against certain members of the Board. In this regard, she filed a request for protection of constitutional rights (tutela) that was rejected because it was assessed that it was an administrative dispute that should be addressed by other means.

22. The beneficiary sent the appeal for reconsideration filed against resolution 001414 of February 12, 2025, issued by the UNP in which it was determined that her level of risk was ordinary. In that appeal, the representation indicated that the IACtHR "did not condition the measure on her participation in the National Board of Victims to which she did not even belong at the time of its recognition." This appeal for reinstatement was rejected and the resolution that ended the protection measures was enforced and became final on April 21, 2025. The beneficiary transferred an official letter issued by the Colombian Federation of FARC Victims (FEVCOL) in which her career as a human rights defender leader was recognized. The beneficiary referred to the following events:

- The satellite blackout of her protection vehicle in November 2022;
- The complaint filed against the director of the UNP on January 25, 2023, for alleged profiling;
- The delay in carrying out the risk study for the period 2023-2024, which should have been completed in 2023;
- The threats to which he was allegedly subjected in December 2023 in the framework of an event held at the National University of Colombia;
- The active status of six complaints filed, as well as the inactivity of other investigations due to lack of momentum from the accusing entity.

23. Finally, the beneficiary referred to the sentence issued against her on August 20, 2021, for which she was sentenced to deprivation of liberty. In this regard, she indicated that her new legal situation did not affect the adoption of the precautionary measures, which is not based on considerations of personal "honorability." Regarding the complaints, six remain active and others were inactive due to lack of momentum from the accusing entity.

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

24. The precautionary measures mechanism is part of the Commission's functions of overseeing compliance with the human rights obligations established in Article 106 of the Charter of the Organization of

American States. These general oversight functions are provided for in Article 41 (b) of the American Convention on Human Rights, as well as in Article 18 (b) of the Statute of the IACtHR; while the mechanism of precautionary measures is set forth in Article 25 of the Commission's Rules of Procedure. In accordance with this Article, the IACtHR 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.

25. 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 measures seek to avoid irreparable harm and to protect the exercise of human rights.⁸ To do this, the IACtHR 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.⁹ Regarding their precautionary nature, these measures have the purpose of preserving a legal situation while under study by the organs of the inter-American system. Their precautionary nature aims at safeguarding the rights at risk until the petition pending before the inter-American system is resolved. Their object and purpose are to ensure the integrity and effectiveness of an eventual decision on the merits and, thus, avoid any further infringement of the rights at issue, a situation that may adversely affect the useful effect of the final decision. In this regard, precautionary or provisional measures allow 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.

26. In this sense, Article 25(7) of the Commission's Rules of Procedure establishes that decisions granting, extending, modifying or lifting precautionary measures shall be adopted through reasoned resolutions. Article 25(9) sets forth that the 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. Furthermore, it shall consider whether there are new situations that may meet the requirements outlined in Article 25 of its Rules of Procedure.

⁷ Inter-American Court of Human Rights (I/A Court H.R.), [Matter of the Yare I and Yare II Capital Region Penitentiary Center](#), Provisional Measures regarding the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Order of March 30, 2006, considerandum 5; [Case of Carpio Nicolle et al. v. Guatemala](#), Provisional Measures, Order of July 6, 2009, considerandum 16.

⁸ I/A Court H.R., [Matter of Capital El Rodeo I and El Rodeo II Judicial Confinement Center](#), Provisional Measures regarding Venezuela. Order of February 8, 2008, considerandum 8; [Case of Bámaca Velásquez](#), Provisional Measures regarding Guatemala, Order of January 27, 2009, considerandum 45; [Matter of Fernández Ortega et al.](#), Provisional Measures regarding Mexico, Order of April 30, 2009, considerandum 5; [Matter of Milagro Sala](#), Provisional Measures regarding Argentina, Order of November 23, 2017, considerandum 5 (Available only in Spanish).

⁹ I/A Court H.R., [Matter of Milagro Sala](#), Provisional Measures regarding Argentina, Order of November 23, 2017, considerandum 5 (Available only in Spanish); [Matter of Capital El Rodeo I and El Rodeo II Judicial Confinement Center](#), Provisional Measures regarding Venezuela, Order of February 8, 2008, considerandum 9; [Matter of the Criminal Institute of Plácido de Sá Carvalho](#), Provisional Measures regarding Brazil, Order of February 13, 2017, considerandum 6 (Available only in Spanish).

27. Similarly, the Commission recalls that while the assessment of the procedural requirements when adopting precautionary measures is carried out from a *prima facie* standard of review, 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, added to the lack of imminent risk, may lead to the lifting of international protection measures.¹²

28. In this matter, the Commission emphasizes that the precautionary measures were granted in 2018 in favor of Giomar Patricia Riveros Gaitán, then identified as a human rights defender and representative on the “National Board of Victims,” due to the risk arising from the threats she had been receiving for having denounced various acts of corruption or other crimes.

29. In this regard, and with regard to implementation by the State, the Commission observes that Colombia:

- (i) held consultation meetings with the beneficiary;
- (ii) carried out risk assessments of the beneficiary to determine the protection measures to be implemented, the last being that of 2025 that led to the completion as it was understood to be an “ordinary risk”;
- (iii) granted the beneficiary material protection measures that, over time, have included conventional and armored vehicles, bulletproof vests, communication equipment, and protection agents;
- (iv) reinforced the detail based on supervening events, being that, for example, she came to have an armored vehicle, two conventional vehicles and six protection personnel;
- (v) protected the beneficiary’s family as the protection details were extensive; and
- (vi) continued to report on the status of the investigations carried out, as well as the criminal convictions for acts related to the granting of the precautionary measures.

30. The Commission positively appreciates the measures implemented by the State during the time the measures were in force. Considering that the State requested the lifting in 2024, and has reiterated it in its communications of 2025, and after requesting information from the representation for its observations, the Commission proceeds to analyze whether the requirements of Article 25 of its Rules of Procedure persist.

31. In this regard, the Commission understands that the 2018 factual framework on which it granted the measures has changed significantly. The available information reveals that the beneficiary is no longer part of the “National Table of Victims” and is currently serving a sentence for crimes against the Public Administration. Although the beneficiary identifies herself as a human rights defender and indicated that she is part of other human rights organizations, the Commission understands that, after her criminal conviction, no elements were provided to indicate the occurrence of events against her under her current conditions of deprivation of liberty under house arrest. In addition, the facts alleged by the beneficiary in her last communication of 2025 are not recent and refer to events that occurred until 2023; that is, for about two years, without subsequent factual elements that would allow to assess her situation.

32. The Commission observes that the representation considers that the risk faced by the beneficiary persists. However, although it labels past situations as threatening or risky, at the present time, this Commission does not notice detailed and concrete factual elements that would be sufficient to continue to find

¹⁰ I/A Court H.R., [Case of Fernandez Ortega et al.](#), Provisional Measures regarding Mexico, Order of February 7, 2017, considerandums 16 and 17.

¹¹ I/A Court H.R., [Case of Fernandez Ortega et al.](#), previously cited.

¹² I/A Court H.R., [Case of Fernandez Ortega et al.](#), previously cited.

that the procedural requirements are met. The foregoing is relevant given that she is under a modality of deprivation of liberty.

33. In summary, the Commission considers that the factual situation that gave rise to these precautionary measures is not the same as it is to date, and there are no sufficient elements of assessment to identify a current imminent risk with respect to the beneficiary. In view of the above and taking into account that exceptional and temporary nature of precautionary measures, the Commission considers that it currently has no elements to support compliance with the requirements of Article 25 of the Rules of Procedure, and that it is appropriate to lift these precautionary measures.

34. The Commission recalls that the lifting of these measures does not prevent the representation 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 its Rules of Procedure.

35. 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 of Colombia to respect and guarantee the rights recognized therein, including the life and personal integrity of the individuals.

V. DECISION

36. The Commission decides to lift the precautionary measures granted in favor of Giomar Patricia Riveros Gaitán, in Colombia.

37. The Commission instructs its Executive Secretariat to notify this Resolution to the State of Colombia and the representation.

38. Approved on December 24, 2025, by José Luis Caballero Ochoa, President; Andrea Pochak, First Vice-President; Edgar Stuardo Ralón Orellana, Second Vice-President; Roberta Clarke; and Gloria Monique de Mees, members of the IACtHR.

María Claudia Pulido
Assistant Executive Secretary