
**INTER-AMERICAN COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS
RESOLUTION TO LIFT PRECAUTIONARY MEASURES 19/2022**

Precautionary Measure No. 364-17

G.Y.G.R. regarding Mexico¹

April 10, 2022

Original: Spanish

I. SUMMARY

1. The Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (IACHR) decides to lift these precautionary measures in favor of the adolescent G.Y.G.R. in Mexico. At the time of making the decision, the Commission assessed the change of circumstances, as well as the measures adopted by the State during the implementation. It was determined that Mr. González is the father of G.Y.G.R. and the precautionary measure of 2011 that prevented their relationship was lifted. Similarly, it was observed that the process towards rebuilding the relationship continues to progress with the aid of specialists and the assessments of judicial authorities. Upon not identifying compliance with the procedural requirements, the IACHR has decided to lift these measures.

II. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2. On July 29, 2019, the IACHR granted precautionary measures in favor of G.Y.G.R. (13 years old at the time), in Mexico. In the matter at hand, the representatives are Luis Enrique González González, Andrea Rodríguez Zavala, and Mario Alberto Salinas Saenz. The request for precautionary measures alleged that Mr. Luis Enrique González González was the father of G.Y.G.R. and, following a precautionary measure issued on March 28, 2011 by the Eleventh Family Court of the First Judicial District, Monterrey, Nuevo León, (*Juzgado Undécimo de lo Familiar del Primer Distrito Judicial*), in the framework of an ordinary civil trial on the annulment of paternity and cancellation of the birth certificate, the limitation of his parental authority towards her had been determined, as well as the fact that the father had no contact with G.Y.G.R.

3. Upon analyzing the submissions of fact and law offered by the parties, the Commission considered that the information presented showed *prima facie* that G.Y.G.R. was in a serious and urgent situation, given that the mere passage of time, the prolonged delay in defining the situation of her rights, including the alleged lack of determination regarding their filiation, could imply irreparable harm to the protection of the family, integrity, and identity of G.Y.G.R. Consequently, in accordance with Article 25 of the Rules of Procedure, the Commission requested that Mexico adopt the necessary measures to safeguard the rights of G.Y.G.R. In particular, the State was requested to immediately carry out a determination of the filiation of G.Y.G.R. through the competent authorities. In addition, the Commission requested an evaluation of the precautionary measure issued on March 28, 2011 by the Eleventh Family Court of the First Judicial District, Monterrey, Nuevo León, which determined the lack of contact between the girl G.Y.G.R. and her alleged father, taking into account the current circumstances and the best interests of the girl G.Y.G.R., in accordance with international standards in the matter and, especially taking into account the above in paragraphs 25, and 28 to 31 of the decision to grant precautionary measures.²

¹ In accordance with Article 17(2)a of the IACHR Rules of Procedure, Commissioner Joel Hernández García, a Mexican national, did not participate in the debate and deliberation of this matter.

² IACHR. Resolution 38/2019. Precautionary Measure No. 364-17. G.Y.G.R. regarding Mexico. July 29, 2019. Available [in Spanish] at <https://www.oas.org/en/cidh/decisiones/pdf/2019/38-19mc364-17-mx.pdf>

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

4. During the time the precautionary measures were in force, the Commission has followed-up on the situation that is the subject matter of these precautionary measures by requesting information from the parties. On August 19, 2019, the State submitted a report. On August 29, 2019, the Commission forwarded the State's response to the representatives. On September 29, 2019, the representatives also sent a report. On April 8, 2020, the Commission forwarded the representatives' response to the State. On June 3, 2020, the State presented its report. On October 15, 2020, the Commission forwarded the State's response to the representatives. On October 30, 2020, the representatives submitted a report. On April 20, 2021, the Commission forwarded the information sent by the representatives to the State. On July 16, 2021, the State submitted a report and requested that the precautionary measures be lifted. On September 29, 2021, the Commission forwarded the State's response to the representatives. On December 30, 2021, the representatives also presented a report.

A. Information provided by the representatives

5. On September 29, 2019, the representatives reported that on August 16, 2019, the court of competent jurisdiction agreed that Mr. Luis Enrique González is the biological father of the adolescent G.Y.G.R. and that the precautionary measure that was decreed on March 28, 2011, must be lifted. The court further indicated that Mr. Luis Enrique González is able to exercise parental authority and deems it suitable for him to cohabit with adolescent, proving that Mr. González does indeed have parental skills; he does not display inappropriate sexual behavior, and there are no traits of deviant behavior. In addition, the court indicated that the adolescent has not suffered sexual abuse at hands of her father; and that, although the time which she was separated from her parent has affected the adolescent, with due therapy family, proper reintegration can be achieved. In this sense, the court ordered to carry out preparation sessions to rebuild the parent-child relationship, which was reportedly to be carried out through the following: (i) four sessions of individual therapy preparation for the father and his daughter within the period of no more than five calendar days between sessions; and (ii) subsequently, a video call that cannot last more than 30 minutes, (iii) integration therapy will then be indicated. Both parties will attend this therapy during the period that a professional designates and, (iv) lastly, the aforementioned psychologist will indicate when both parties are ready to progress into cohabitation.

6. On August 16, 2019, a final judgment was issued in which it was resolved, among other aspects, to declare the judgment on the annulment of paternity recognition and cancellation of the civil status record inadmissible. Moreover, it was stated that on August 28, 2019, it was reported that the therapy sessions would be carried out on September 5, 9, 12, and 19, 2019. On September 5, 2019, the scheduled therapy was not carried out as the psychologist was not present, and there were no material resources available to videotape the session. It was indicated that a certified copy of the family file was submitted to the Investigative Public Prosecutor's Office (*Agencia del Ministerio Público Investigadora*) for the possible commission of crimes. Consequently, a criminal folder was allegedly opened but the representatives are uncertain if any involved authorities have been summoned.

7. On October 30, 2020, the representatives reported that the adolescent suffered "parental alienation" and, as a result, rejects her father. They believed that the adolescent may be the victim of threats to return to the Nuevo León System for the Integral Development of the Family (*Desarrollo Integral de la Familia, DIF*). They suspect this may be the reason why the beneficiary had stated "that she is well with her substitute family." The representatives reported that the beneficiary and her father held videoconferences to interact, and that these would reportedly continue in the future. The representatives

further indicated that the beneficiary was in a situation of violence in her current home, and that the State has not relocated her. They considered that appointing G.R.G. as the beneficiary's representative before the IACHR would constitute "a conflict of interest" since she has always been in favor of the State.

8. On December 30, 2021, the representatives stated that they consider that the measures taken by the State to guarantee family reunification are "deceptive." They allegedly do not aim to return G.Y.G.R. to her family of origin or compensate for the harm but rather to "*de facto* prohibit" family reunification and allegedly hide the reasons why she was separated from her father in the first place. On June 22, 2021, Mr. González requested that a professional in psychology be assigned to G.Y.G.R. in order to remedy the emotional effects that the beneficiary reportedly suffered as a result of the judicial procedure. On July 6, 2021, the First Family Judge (*Jueza Primero de lo Familiar*) determined that as a result of the integration therapies that were carried out, they could not determine that the beneficiary suffers from parental alienation. It was therefore decided that there was no need to carry out the evaluation requested by the father. This denial was confirmed by a resolution of August 23, 2021. Against this resolution, Mr. González filed an appeal for *amparo* that has not yet been resolved. Mr. González alleged that the Mexican State's assertion regarding the alleged love and affection received by the beneficiary in her surrogate family has no basis in any expert study or professional opinion. In that regard, the representatives opposed that the precautionary measures be lifted.

B. Information provided by the State

9. On August 19, 2019, the State reported the following: (i) derived from the measure issued on March 28, 2011, the search for the host family was initiated to restore the beneficiary's right to live with her family; this was in order to prevent G.Y.G.R. from being institutionalized during the judicial process; (ii) throughout the foster care process, psychological care and aid has been provided in favor of the beneficiary to ensure that her psycho-emotional status as an adolescent is stable and she is properly adapted to her host family; (iii) the Office of the Child Protection Attorney, Girls and Adolescents of the Nuevo León DIF System (*Procuraduría de Protección de Niños, Niñas y Adolescentes del Sistema DIF Nuevo León*, PPNNA-DIF) has followed-up on the beneficiary in her foster family environment, particularly in the following aspects: food and nutrition, shelter and care, protection, health, psychosocial, education and skill training, and spiritual development; (iv) on August 9, 2019, the beneficiary went to an appointment with the pediatrician who provided the adolescent with adequate follow-up care, the physician reported that the beneficiary's weight and height are in normal parameters for her age; (v) it was reported that the beneficiary has a pathological history of functional murmur detected when she was four months old, with a normal echocardiogram, and therefore, a chest x-ray and an echocardiogram were carried out, both with normal results; moreover, it was mentioned that, upon admission, a treatment for viral rhinopharyngitis was started and routine laboratory tests were requested. Intestinal parasites were detected and medical treatment was provided; (vi) in April 2019, the adolescent was evaluated for onychomycosis in her left middle finger and then treatment with terbinafine was initiated, she was reported allergic and therefore treatment was then changed to griseofulvin the following month, and subsequently, on June 28, control laboratory studies were taken, without pathological data; (vii) the PPNNA-DIF maintained the psychosocial follow-up of the beneficiary on a biweekly basis through the Foster Family Department, providing support to the adolescent and her family; and (viii) on August 9, 2019, the PPNNA-DIF requested that the First Family Judge of the First Judicial District of the state of Nuevo León (*Juez Primero de lo Familiar del Primer Distrito Judicial del estado de Nuevo León*) issue the corresponding judgment relating to the Ordinary Civil Trial on the Annulment of Paternity Recognition and Cancellation of the Civil Status Act.

10. On June 3, 2020, the State stated that: (i) the reunification sessions between G.Y.G.R. and her father were carried out without any inconvenience on October 23, 25, and 30, 2019, and consequently, on December 6, 2019, the video call between the beneficiary and her father was carried out with the due therapeutic support; (ii) on January 14, 2020, the judge having jurisdiction decreed that the integration therapies between the beneficiary and her father would be carried out on January 16, 23, and 30, 2020 and that the first two sessions were held without any inconvenience and the last session was rescheduled for February 13, 2020; (iii) on March 10, 2020, the expert in charge of the integration sessions stated that an integration therapy between Mr. González and the beneficiary must be resumed before continuing with a cohabitation modality, it was further recommended to help the parties to develop a sense of closeness and cordiality; and (iv) to date the provisional guardianship of the beneficiary is in charge of the professional (*licenciada*) Guadalupe Rodríguez González. In this regard, the State considered that in order to avoid any conflict of interest it would be more appropriate that the beneficiary's representation before the IACHR be exercised by the beneficiary's guardian.

11. On July 16, 2021, the State reported the following: (i) due to the health contingency of COVID-19, Agreements 6-11, 7-11, and 8-11 of 2020 were issued, whereby the legal terms and deadlines of the parties, lawyers, and third parties were suspended from March 18 to May 5, 2020; (ii) on June 2, 2020, the Director of the Family Research Center (*Centro de Investigación Familiar*) was ordered to issue a statement to determine if he had the necessary resources and the availability to carry out a comprehensive diagnosis of the situation between Mr. González and his daughter G.Y.G.R. to find the best treatment and achieve an adequate restoration of the parent-child bond; in this sense, he was given the responsibility of informing on the progress of the diagnosis and therapy, as well as of any relevant situation between Mr. González and his daughter every 15 days (however, the Center was closed due to the COVID contingency); (iii) the professional M.A.B.M., a specialist in psychology, reported that in her opinion, an integration therapy between Mr. González and the beneficiary should be resumed before continuing with the cohabitation modality. Similarly, it was recommended that Mr. González visit the therapist himself to discuss issues such as: the criticisms he expresses to people in the environment of G.Y.G.R., his anger at the circumstances that generated his separation from the beneficiary, the anger that he openly expresses to the child, understanding the feelings of a person going through adolescence, among others; (iv) the beneficiary must be informed about her legal situation, as her father is allegedly informing her that she would eventually return to live with him, however, the beneficiary expressed her will to be adopted by her host family; (v) the professional M.A.B.M. recommended carrying out eight integration therapy sessions by videoconference, and the authorities recommended that Mr. González go to therapy to learn to put the needs of the beneficiary before his anger; (vi) on August 5, 2020, a virtual interview was ordered with the beneficiary to be carried out on August 17, 2020. The meeting was carried out on August 26, 2020, during which the beneficiary indicated that she did not want to continue seeing her biological father for various reasons; (vii) it was believed that the beneficiary reportedly had very few opportunities to interact with her biological father, it was therefore recommended that the beneficiary receive the opportunity to continue interacting and getting to know her father in order to strengthen her filiation bond; (viii) through an order of August 27, 2020, the Court presiding the case recommended that the integration therapies between the beneficiary and her biological father continue. In this sense, the court recommended carrying out eight integration sessions which were subsequently held on the following dates: September 2, 9, 16, and 30; October 7, 13, and 21; and November 11, 2020; (ix) on September 8, 2020, the psychology professional H.A.R.G. was appointed to carry out psychological therapy in favor of the biological father of G.Y.G.R. However, it was not possible to find the whereabouts of the first professional and instead professional L.L.L. was appointed; (x) on April 20, 2021, it was ordered that, parallelly to the ordered individual psychological therapy, integration therapy between Mr. González and his daughter be resumed under the supervision of the psychology expert, M.A.B.M. However, this decision was left without effect to safeguard the best interests of the beneficiary; (xi) regarding the possible

cohabitation between Mr. González and his daughter, it was recommended that Mr. González's progress be reported after four sessions of individual psychological therapy, and the professional was ordered to state if he is prepared to start remote cohabitation with his daughter G.Y.G.R.; and (xii) on May 26, 2021, Mr. González expressed his dissatisfaction with the psychological expert L.L.L. Instead, he wished to appoint J.G.N.S. who holds a master's degree in Psychology.

12. Lastly, in 2021, the State requested that the precautionary measures be lifted as it considers that it has complied with the precautionary measures and, in that sense, the situation in which G.Y.G.R. finds herself no longer complies with the requirements of Article 25 of the IACHR Rules of Procedure.

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

13. 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 that Article, the Commission grants precautionary measures in serious and urgent 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.

14. The Inter-American Commission and the Inter-American Court of Human Rights ("the Inter-American Court" or "I/A Court H.R.") have repeatedly established that precautionary and provisional measures have a dual nature, protective and precautionary.³ Regarding the protective nature, these measures seek to avoid irreparable harm and preserve the exercise of human rights.⁴ 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.⁵ 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. The 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 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:

³ See in this regard: I/A Court H.R. 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. Available [in Spanish] at https://www.corteidh.or.cr/docs/medidas/penitenciarioregion_se_01.pdf

⁴ 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 [only in Spanish].

⁵ 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 [only in Spanish].

- 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.

15. With respect to the foregoing, 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 should assess if the serious and urgent situation and possible irreparable harm that caused the adoption of the precautionary measures persist. Moreover, the Commission shall consider whether new situations have subsequently arisen that might meet the requirements set forth in Article 25 of the Rules of Procedure.

16. 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.⁶ In this sense, when no imminent risk is identified, the burden of proof and argument increases over time.⁷ 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 lifting of international protection measures.⁸

17. When analyzing whether these precautionary measures should remain in force, the Commission recalls that, in July 2019, these measures were granted considering the passage of time and the prolonged delay in defining the situation regarding the rights of the now adolescent G.Y.G.R., including the alleged lack of determination regarding their affiliation, which could imply irreparable harm if this situation had continued. Since then, and following the parties’ submissions, the Commission understands that the factual framework it assessed in 2019 has changed significantly. In this regard, the Commission notes that the following facts are not disputed between the parties:

- i. Given the precautionary measure issued in 2011, the State proceeded to seek a foster family in favor of the beneficiary to avoid her institutionalization (see *supra* para. 9);
- ii. Psychological care was provided in favor of the beneficiary and institutional support was provided on various topics, such as: food and nutrition, shelter and care, protection, health, psychosocial, education and training skills, and spiritual development (see *supra* para. 9);
- iii. In August 2019, the court with jurisdiction determined that Mr. Luis Enrique González is the biological father of the beneficiary, and that the judgment on the annulment of paternity recognition and cancellation of the civil status record was “inadmissible.” The precautionary measure from 2011 was also lifted. Consequently, the court with jurisdiction determined that Mr. González fulfills the following characteristics: suitable to exercise parental authority; has parental skills; may coexist with his daughter; that the beneficiary has not suffered inappropriate sexual behavior; and given the elapsed time, therapy would be necessary to achieve family reintegration (see *supra* para. 5);

⁶ I/A Court H.R., Provisional Measures regarding Mexico, Order of February 7, 2017, paras. 16 and 17. Available [in Spanish] at http://www.corteidh.or.cr/docs/medidas/fernandez_se_08.pdf

⁷ *Ibid.*

⁸ *Ibid.*

- iv. Therapy sessions were scheduled and carried out by both the father and the beneficiary, and they were given time and place for interaction aiming at family reintegration (see *supra* paras. 5-7, and 10);
- v. It was reported that Mr. González and the beneficiary would continue their integration therapy sessions before continuing with the cohabitation modality (see *supra* para. 11);
- vi. The bonding sessions between Mr. González and the beneficiary were allegedly institutionally supported and reportedly monitored by the judicial authority, which has been analyzing the decisions to be taken for the benefit of the beneficiary and her best interests;
- vii. Following Mr. González's allegations that G.Y.G.R. was subject to "parental alienation," a domestic court assessed the beneficiary's situation, in the light of information from psychologists, and did not identify that the beneficiary has suffered from "parental alienation" (see *supra* para. 8).

18. Thus, the Commission understands that the factual circumstances are not the same as those assessed in 2019. In arriving at this determination, the Commission notes the following: i) it was determined that Mr. González was the biological father of the beneficiary; ii) the internal process on the annulment of paternity recognition and cancellation of the civil status record was declared "inadmissible"; iii) the precautionary measure from 2011 that prevented the relationship between Mr. González and the beneficiary was lifted; iv) the process of rebuilding the relationship between the father and the beneficiary for family reunification has begun; and v) specialists in the matter and the judicial authority have been monitoring the family reunification process with a view to the best protection of the beneficiary.

19. Although the representatives indicated, in a general manner, that between 2020 and 2021 "threats" and "violence" have taken place towards the beneficiary (see *supra* paras. 7 and 8), the available information does not indicate that the representatives have detailed these acts, if they have filed the complaints internally, or if they have presented these allegations to the judicial authority which has been accompanying the family reunification process. Moreover, although the representatives described the actions of the State as "misleading" and stated that they do not aim at family reunification (see *supra* para. 8), the Commission notes that the available information makes it possible to verify various efforts on the part of the competent institutions based on the assessments of specialists in psychology to achieve the relationship. It is reasonable for the Commission to involve specialists in psychology in order to ensure that the beneficiary's rights are effectively respected, which requires understanding the situation in the best interests of the beneficiary. Lastly, the Commission notes that the representatives also requested compensatory damages (see *supra* para. 8). In this regard, the Commission recalls that the mechanism of precautionary measures only analyzes compliance with the requirements of seriousness, urgency, and irreparable harm in the terms of Article 25 of its Rules of Procedure. In this sense, determining damages requires an assessment on the merits that exceed this mechanism and which are better suited to the petition and case system if the procedural requirements for such purposes are identified.

20. Considering that the State requested the lifting of these precautionary measures on July 16, 2021, the Commission recalls that when a State requests the lifting of a precautionary measure, it must present sufficient evidence and arguments to support its request.⁹ In the same manner, the representatives that want the measures to continue must present evidence of any reasons to do so.¹⁰

21. In this regard, considering the analysis that was previously carried out and in view of the State's request to have the measures lifted, the Commission understands that the factual circumstances that

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Ibid.

called for these precautionary measures to be granted have changed significantly due to the measures taken in favor of the beneficiary. Thus, the Commission deems that it is not possible to identify any situation that currently fulfills 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,¹¹ the Commission deems it appropriate to lift these measures.

22. In line with what was indicated by the Inter-American Court in various matters,¹² a decision to lift does not 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. In the same way, also based on the assessment of the Inter-American Court, the lifting of the precautionary measures does not imply an eventual decision on the merits of the controversy if the case were to be brought before the inter-American system through a petition, nor does it prejudice state responsibility for the events denounced.¹³

23. 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 of Mexico to respect and guarantee the rights recognized therein. In particular, the Commission calls on the State to continue with the actions it has been implementing in favor of the relationship between Mr. González and G.Y.G.R.

V. DECISION

24. The Commission decides to lift the precautionary measures granted in favor of G.Y.G.R., in Mexico.

25. 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.

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

27. Approved on April 10, 2022, by Julissa Mantilla Falcón, President; Margarette May Macaulay, Second Vice-President; Esmeralda Arosemena de Troitiño; and Roberta Clarke, members of the IACHR.

Tania Reneaum Panszi
Executive Secretary

¹¹ 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 [only in Spanish].

¹² 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 [only in Spanish], 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 [only in Spanish].

¹³ 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.