



International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance

Distr.: General
17 April 2026
English
Original: Spanish

Committee on Enforced Disappearances

Decision adopted by the Committee under article 34 of the Convention, concerning Mexico*, **

I. Legal framework

1. The aim of the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance is to prevent and eradicate enforced disappearances and to combat impunity for the crime of enforced disappearance. The Convention guarantees the right of every person not to be subjected to enforced disappearance; the right of victims to justice and to reparation; and the right to know the truth about the circumstances of an enforced disappearance and the fate of the disappeared person, as well as the right to freedom to seek, receive and impart information to that end.

2. In article 2 of the Convention, “enforced disappearance” is defined as arrest, detention or abduction by agents of the State (public officials) or by persons or groups of persons acting with the authorization, support or acquiescence of the State, followed by a refusal to acknowledge the deprivation of liberty or by concealment of the fate or whereabouts of the disappeared person. Article 5 of the Convention provides that the widespread or systematic practice of enforced disappearance constitutes a crime against humanity and attracts the consequences provided for under applicable international law. By ratifying the Convention, Mexico undertook to prevent, criminalize and investigate enforced disappearances, punish the perpetrators thereof and guarantee the rights of the victims.

3. Article 34 of the Convention states that if the Committee receives information which appears to it to contain well-founded indications that enforced disappearance is being practised on a widespread or systematic basis in the territory under the jurisdiction of a State Party, it may, after seeking from the State Party concerned all relevant information on the situation, urgently bring the matter to the attention of the General Assembly of the United Nations, through the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

4. Rule 103 (2) of the Committee’s rules of procedure¹ provides that the Committee is to seek from the State Party all relevant information on the situation in order to urgently address incidents of enforced disappearance which it deems is being practised on a widespread and systematic basis in the territory under the jurisdiction of a State Party.

5. Pursuant to rule 106, the Committee, taking into account any observations that may have been submitted by the State Party concerned, may undertake consultations and other measures as necessary in order to take a decision as to whether to urgently bring the matter to the attention of the General Assembly, through the Secretary-General.

6. By means of the present document, and in accordance with article 34 of the Convention, the Committee requests the Secretary-General to transmit to the General Assembly the decision contained herein and informs the State Party of the decision.²

* Adopted by the Committee at its thirtieth session (9–19 March 2026).

** The endnotes and the annex are reproduced in the language of submission only.



II. Background

A. Engagement between Mexico and the Committee since 2012

7. Mexico ratified the Convention in February 2007. In the light of the information available on the situation regarding disappearances in the State Party, the Committee, in accordance with its mandate, has applied the various procedures set forth in the Convention. The State Party has contributed to and cooperated in the implementation of these procedures.

8. Throughout the application of these procedures, there has been ongoing dialogue between the Committee, the State Party, the victims and other civil society actors (see annex showing the timeline of cooperation between the Committee and the State Party and the action taken by the Committee in connection with the different procedures of its mandate).

B. Recommendations issued by the Committee since 2012

9. At every stage of its engagement with the State Party, the Committee has raised concerns and made recommendations urging it to take concrete measures to prevent and eradicate enforced disappearance, search for and locate missing persons and uphold the rights of victims. The main findings and recommendations resulting from the Committee's engagement with the State Party are summarized below.

1. 2015 concluding observations

Situation of widespread disappearances

10. In its 2015 concluding observations,³ the Committee noted that the information received revealed a situation of widespread disappearances across much of the State Party's territory, many of which could be classified as enforced disappearances.

11. The Committee also noted shortcomings in the system established to prevent, investigate and punish enforced disappearance, problems related to the National Register of Missing and Disappeared Persons and the absence of a single register that would allow for the collection of accurate statistics. The Committee recommended that the register should encompass all cases, including information about the age, sex and nationality of the disappeared persons, as well as information that allows for a distinction to be made between enforced disappearance and other types of disappearance.

Prevention and investigation

12. The Committee emphasized the need to take measures to prevent disappearances, conduct diligent investigations and punish the perpetrators and ensure that cases of enforced disappearance are not tried by military courts, even if the victims or perpetrators are members of the military. The Committee also recommended creating a single nationwide register, establishing protocols for immediate searches, strengthening forensic services and ensuring the participation of family members and the civil society organizations that provide them with support.

2. 2018 concluding observations

Persisting disappearances and impunity

13. In 2018, the Committee expressed regret that the phenomenon of disappearance continued to be widespread over much of the State Party's territory and that impunity and revictimization prevailed. Noting the lack of real progress in implementing the recommendations made in its previous concluding observations,⁴ the Committee highlighted the lack of reliable data on cases of enforced disappearance, the very small number of convictions and the emergency situation created by the existence, throughout the State Party's territory, of a large number of unidentified bodies and clandestine graves that had not been duly addressed. It highlighted the existence of structural barriers impeding access to

truth, justice and full reparation and the effective participation of victims and victims' organizations, particularly in search and investigation processes, and noted that the adoption of the General Act on Enforced Disappearance of Persons, Disappearance Perpetrated by Individuals and the National Missing Persons System had had insufficient impact.

Adequate definition of criminal offence

14. While the Committee acknowledged that article 34 of the General Act set out a definition of the criminal offence of enforced disappearance, it expressed concern that the definition did not adequately reflect article 3 of the Convention and that the Act did not include a definition of the offence of enforced disappearance as a crime against humanity. It recommended the amendment of the Act to bring it into line with the Convention.

Criminal responsibility and cooperation

15. The Committee urged the State Party to ensure recognition of the criminal responsibility of superiors in all investigations and judicial proceedings and to exclude all acts of enforced disappearance from military jurisdiction. It recommended strengthening national and international judicial cooperation mechanisms for the investigation of cases of disappearance and the punishment of those responsible.

Registers and searches

16. The Committee acknowledged the establishment of the National Search Commission and the creation of the National Register of Missing and Disappeared Persons, noted the importance of introducing a single register and called on the authorities to continue to improve the collection of disaggregated data and ensure the interconnection of databases, including registers of migrants. It recommended the creation of an autonomous national forensic institution, as well as the establishment of an international technical assistance mechanism to process the thousands of unidentified bodies and remains.

3. Report on the Committee's 2021 visit (findings and recommendations)

Widespread practice of disappearance and impunity

17. In its report on its visit to the State Party in 2021, the Committee noted that disappearances continued to be widespread, with almost total impunity. It noted that, according to data provided by the State, only between 2% and 6% of cases of disappearance had been brought before the courts and that only 36 judgments had so far been issued in such cases nationwide. It noted that structural impunity was conducive to the recurrence of disappearances and created distress for the victims and for the individuals and organizations that provide them with support.

Involvement of public officials and criminal groups

18. The Committee received testimonies describing disappearances attributed to federal, state or municipal security forces or to private security firms and criminal groups that operated with the acquiescence of officials at all three levels of government. The Committee reiterated that States are responsible for disappearances committed by their public officials or by persons or groups acting with their authorization, support or acquiescence, including when such acts are committed by criminal or paramilitary organizations. This includes situations where criminal organizations or armed groups are under the de facto control of State authorities, where such organizations receive some form of support from public officials or where there is a known pattern of disappearances and the State fails to take the measures necessary to prevent further disappearances from occurring or to investigate and bring the perpetrators to justice.⁵

Institutional shortcomings

19. In the report, the Committee highlighted the lack of coordination among federal, state and municipal authorities and the absence of public policies to prevent and eradicate disappearances, as well as of any regulations relating to the General Act and the National

Missing Persons System. The Committee noted that the efforts of some authorities were hampered by decisions such as the adoption of the Organic Act on the Prosecutor General's Office, which is incompatible with the General Act and the General Victims Act. The Committee noted that the state search commissions lacked sufficient human and financial resources and that their staff faced job insecurity.

Recommendations in the visit report

20. In its visit report, the Committee urged the State Party to adopt an efficient and effective national policy to prevent and eradicate enforced disappearance and made 84 specific recommendations, divided into two main categories:

- Recommendations relating to the minimum requirements for an efficient and effective national policy, including recognizing and taking into consideration the criteria for determining the responsibility of public officials; eradicating the structural causes of impunity; abandoning the militarization of public security; spotlighting, disseminating information on and raising awareness of disappearances; and duly implementing the framework of regulations, case law and institutions throughout the country.
- Recommendations relating to the priorities that should be addressed in the national policy, including strengthening institutions and search and investigation processes; ensuring systematic and effective coordination of institutions; removing obstacles preventing cases of enforced disappearance from being brought before the courts; duly addressing disappearances occurring in the context of migration; facilitating search, investigation, reparation and memory efforts related to long-standing cases; addressing the forensics crisis; facilitating access to searches, truth, justice and reparation using a differential approach; recognizing the role of victims and duly addressing their support and protection needs; protecting public officials involved in searches and investigations; and addressing deficiencies in registers as a strategy for preventing and eradicating disappearance.

4. 2023 concluding observations

Persisting disappearances and regulatory delays

21. In 2023, the Committee found it regrettable that disappearances continued to be widespread and that the State Party had not adopted regulations relating to the General Act and the National Missing Persons System or a comprehensive national policy to prevent and eradicate disappearances.

Investigations and prosecutions

22. While the Committee welcomed the existence, in all the federative entities of the State Party, of special prosecutors' offices or units responsible for investigating acts of enforced disappearance and the adoption of the Standardized Investigation Protocol, it noted that the investigation and criminal prosecution of enforced disappearance continued to be accorded low priority. It noted the alarming number of disappearances recorded and the inadequate investigation of such cases, which resulted in continuing and almost total impunity. It also noted the fragmented nature of investigations, the limited use of on-site investigations and scientific evidence and the shortcomings in the prosecution of the offence.

Participation and differential approach

23. The Committee emphasized the need to guarantee the effective participation of family members and civil society organizations in all stages of the search, investigation and reparation processes and to adopt a differential approach to address their specific needs. It urged the State Party to step up awareness-raising efforts to combat the stigmatization of victims.

Reiteration of recommendations

24. In its 2023 recommendations, the Committee reiterated many of the recommendations it had made in 2015, 2018 and 2021, highlighting the fact that they had not been implemented.

5. Requests for urgent action and individual communications (articles 30 and 31 of the Convention)

25. As at 28 February 2026 (the date of the Committee's most recent periodic report on requests for urgent action),⁶ the Committee had registered a total of 819 requests for urgent action related to disappearances in Mexico, representing approximately 36.5% of all cases registered under article 30 of the Convention.

26. The information gathered in this context reveals patterns and trends that cause concern to the Committee. It has brought them to the attention of the State Party and, in that connection, has issued specific recommendations aimed at bringing search and investigation efforts into line with the Convention.

27. In this regard, the Committee wishes to emphasize that the disappearances reported under the urgent action procedure involve individuals of different ages and with a range of profiles and social origins.⁷

28. In the majority of cases, the authors allege that disappearance, including enforced disappearance, constitutes a widespread practice in the states in question, including, inter alia, all the federative entities listed in the information received pursuant to article 34. The allegations concern links between public officials and criminal groups, including in connection with cases of disappearance.⁸

29. In this regard, the Committee notes that in some urgent action cases, allegations have been made regarding the direct involvement of public officials in the disappearance. In other cases, there is little information regarding the circumstances of the disappearance and the possible perpetrators but there are convincing claims of links between local authorities and the criminal groups allegedly involved. According to the available information, the investigations conducted do not usually shed light on the truth behind the alleged links.⁹

30. The information submitted reveals other shortcomings in the search and investigation processes, and the State Party's responses generally do not demonstrate that effective measures have been taken to address them. In particular, the Committee has highlighted the following trends in its follow-up with the State Party and in its periodic public reports on requests for urgent action:¹⁰

(a) In most cases, searches appear to be conducted primarily by the family members of disappeared persons. When the competent authorities do intervene, they tend to do so almost exclusively by issuing requests for documentation and making routine requests for cooperation between federal and state institutions, in the absence of a pre-established search and investigation plan or strategy;¹¹

(b) In many cases, serious shortcomings are observed in search and investigation processes, including delays or failures relating to the following activities:

(i) Visiting the alleged place of occurrence of the events or the possible location of the disappeared person;¹²

(ii) Conducting forensic analysis of the available genetic samples and taking of relevant samples with a view to identifying disappeared persons;¹³

(iii) Compiling and analysing data from telephone networks, call logs and mobile phones¹⁴ and videos from security cameras at locations where the acts allegedly occurred;¹⁵

(c) According to the allegations received, the authorities frequently inform victims that a lack of human and financial resources is hindering the investigation and search activities;¹⁶

(d) The available information indicates that the authorities responsible for investigating cases of disappearance often choose to classify them as another type of offence, even when the relatives of the missing person have specifically requested that the case be prosecuted as an enforced disappearance.¹⁷ This trend is particularly evident in cases involving a combination of offences that includes enforced disappearance. Consequently, different investigations are opened with no proper coordination or joint analysis on the part of the specialized prosecutors' offices. This results in the facts of the case being categorized as different offences, most commonly homicide, unlawful deprivation of liberty, kidnapping, possession of prohibited weapons or organized crime, thereby obscuring enforced disappearance;

(e) When the offence of enforced disappearance is prosecuted as such, the accused persons are frequently acquitted due to the particularly high standards of proof required for this type of offence.

31. Lastly, a number of authors of requests for urgent action provide detailed information on the alleged involvement of public officials in acts that have allegedly hindered searches and investigations.¹⁸ Although the Committee has transmitted these allegations to the State Party and reminded it of its obligation to investigate them and punish the perpetrators, the information available does not indicate that systematic and effective measures have been taken in this regard.¹⁹

32. The Committee points out that similar trends were observed in the two individual communications relating to Mexico that it examined under article 31 of the Convention.²⁰

III. Procedure under article 34 of the Convention

33. Between February and April 2025, the Committee received documentation from the International Federation for Human Rights Leagues (FIDH) in which the Federation requested the Committee to activate the procedure under article 34 of the Convention.

34. As noted in the request for information transmitted to the State Party, the Committee reviewed this documentation in the light of all the information gathered throughout its engagement with the State Party since 2012. At its twenty-eighth session,²¹ it decided to request all relevant information from Mexico, in accordance with article 34 of the Convention. The request for information was transmitted on 24 June 2025 and the State Party was invited to respond by 18 September 2025.

35. The State Party responded on that date and requested that its replies should remain confidential in accordance with rule 47 (2) of the Committee's rules of procedure.

36. Between September and February 2026, several civil society organizations and victims' groups submitted information to the Committee under rule 106 of the Committee's rules of procedure, and the Committee held meetings with representatives of the State Party and of civil society.

37. At its twenty-ninth and thirtieth sessions, the Committee reviewed the information received under article 34 of the Convention in the light of all the available information concerning the State Party (see paras. 7–32) and decided to bring the matter to the attention of the General Assembly.

A. Information submitted to the Committee under article 34 of the Convention

38. In the documentation it transmitted to the Committee, FIDH requested the activation of the procedure under article 34 of the Convention, primarily in the light of the patterns observed and the cases documented, as exemplified by the cases in Coahuila between 2009 and 2016,²² in Nayarit between 2011 and 2017²³ and in Veracruz between 2010 and 2016.²⁴ FIDH also drew attention to more recent cases, mainly in Jalisco and Nayarit.²⁵

39. Among its main findings, FIDH includes information on disappearances committed by agents of the State or by non-State persons or groups acting with the authorization, support

or acquiescence of the State, and on patterns of enforced disappearances reflected in specific cases, particularly cases in which authorities at the three levels of government have colluded with criminal groups. One of the most common practices in this regard is the illegal detention by the authorities of individuals who are then handed over to criminal groups or released and then disappeared. FIDH also points out that public resources, including official vehicles and facilities, are sometimes used to carry out enforced disappearances.

40. With regard to recent cases, the information received highlights the 28,880 disappearances recorded between 1 January 2023 and 22 April 2025 in the National Register of Missing and Disappeared Persons; the existence of clandestine graves; the systematic cases of deprivation of liberty in the context of territorial disputes between cartels; and the alleged involvement or acquiescence of public officials.

41. It is emphasized that, despite the recommendations made by the Committee following its visit,²⁶ the number of disappearances continues to rise and the forensic crisis and impunity persist. FIDH and the other organizations that have submitted information under the procedure believe that, although Mexico has adopted laws and policies to address cases of enforced disappearance and facilitate their investigation, those responsible at the highest levels have not been held accountable. It is alleged that impunity is linked to corruption, particularly on the part of local judiciaries and state-level governments, and that this hinders genuine investigations.

42. The request from FIDH for the Committee to activate the procedure provided for in article 34 of the Convention was followed by several public submissions from other civil society actors.²⁷ All of them confirm the trends described by FIDH²⁸ and note that these patterns are observed particularly in the States of Coahuila, Nayarit, Veracruz and Jalisco, as well as in Nuevo León, Guanajuato, Tabasco, Morelos, Baja California and the State of Mexico.²⁹

43. These sources consider that there are *prima facie* indications that enforced disappearance is being practised on a widespread or systematic basis in Mexico. They suggest that the phenomenon of disappearances, including enforced disappearances, is serious enough to warrant the Committee's intervention under article 34 of the Convention.

B. State Party's reply to the Committee's request for information

44. In its reply of 18 September 2025,³⁰ the State Party indicates that it has been among the States that have engaged most cooperatively with the Committee. Noting that article 34 of the Convention applies only when there are well-founded indications of a "widespread or systematic" practice of enforced disappearance, it considers that this article must be interpreted within the material scope of the Convention, which deals only with enforced disappearances committed or authorized by public officials, excluding disappearances committed by private individuals without the State's acquiescence. The State Party argues that the definition of "acquiescence" must be strict and should not be equated with a lack of due diligence, given that only explicit State conduct can constitute support or acquiescence.

45. The State Party recalls that, under the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, enforced disappearance can amount to a crime against humanity when it is committed as part of a widespread or systematic attack directed against any civilian population, with knowledge of the attack. The State Party rejects the allegation that there is a practice of enforced disappearance constituting a crime against humanity in Mexico. It identifies the following requirements for such a determination: (a) the existence of enforced disappearance; (b) the commission of an attack directed against a civilian population; (c) the "widespread" or "systematic" nature of such an attack; and (d) the perpetrator having knowledge of the attack. The State Party emphasizes that it shares the Committee's concern for providing the greatest possible degree of protection to victims of disappearance; however, from a strictly jurisdictional perspective, the Committee's statement on non-State actors in the context of the Convention³¹ cannot have the effect of extending the obligations of States Parties.

46. The State Party contends that the information submitted by FIDH attributes most of the cases to cartels or other non-State actors and that the criterion of State involvement has

thus not been met. It asserts that there is no plan, policy or course of conduct aimed at attacking the civilian population in Mexico that is attributable to the State. On the contrary, it emphasizes that the adoption of local laws and the establishment of special prosecutors' offices, missing persons' commissions and coordination mechanisms attest to the State's commitment to supporting victims, which would be incompatible with the existence of such a policy.

47. The State Party also notes that the FIDH analysis is limited to three states (Coahuila, Nayarit and Veracruz) and that it documents only 32 cases involving 73 victims in Coahuila. It considers that the disappearances are the result of isolated criminal acts by armed groups and do not constitute a widespread or systematic policy of the State. It recalls that, as the National Register includes records relating to all missing and disappeared persons, without distinguishing between disappearances and enforced disappearances, the figures in the Register cannot be used to argue that there is a widespread pattern of enforced disappearances in the country. It concludes that the disappearances have not been shown to be either "widespread" or "systematic" and that there are no indications of acquiescence or knowledge on the part of the authorities.

48. The State Party describes its legal and institutional framework, demonstrating its commitment to implementing measures to prevent and eradicate enforced disappearance. It cites the 2017 General Act on Enforced Disappearance and the 2025 amendment thereto, as well as the presidential decree of 18 March 2025 instructing all states to intensify the search for missing persons.

49. In chapter IV of the replies submitted to the Committee, the State Party explains the National Public Security Strategy, which focuses on combating organized crime and restoring State control throughout the country, and analyses the situation in Coahuila, Jalisco, Nayarit and Veracruz. It claims that most cases of disappearance occurred in the past, in particularly complex situations associated with violent crime, which led to profound changes in the legal framework, including the creation of missing persons' commissions and grant programmes to improve search operations.

50. Emphasizing its willingness to continue cooperating with the Committee and to provide the information necessary to assess the situation, the State Party concludes by reiterating that there is no "widespread or systematic practice of enforced disappearance" in Mexico and that the constituent elements of crimes against humanity are not present.

IV. Issues and proceedings before the Committee

51. In accordance with article 34 of the Convention, the Committee must assess whether the information received appears to contain well-founded indications that enforced disappearance is being practised on a widespread or systematic basis in Mexico.

52. This assessment is based on the State Party's reply to the Committee's request for information dated 18 July 2025 (see paras. 44–50), on the information submitted by civil society under article 34 of the Convention (see paras. 38–43) and on the information gathered by the Committee since 2012 (see paras. 9–32). The Committee will describe each of the legal criteria applicable under international law and will apply them to the available information.

A. "Well-founded indications"

53. The Committee considers that the notion of "well-founded indications", referred to in article 34 of the Convention, means that the Committee must be satisfied, *prima facie*, that it has received detailed and accurate information, from a reliable source, indicating that acts falling within its competence have occurred. This means that the Committee does not act as a commission of inquiry and is not required to make a finding of fact. Therefore, it need not apply evidentiary standards such as "reasonable suspicion" or "a reasonable basis to believe", which are used by commissions of inquiry and the Prosecutor of the International Criminal Court (Rome Statute, art. 53).³²

54. In accordance with the “well-founded indications” standard, the Committee must decide whether the available information raises sufficient concern to warrant bringing the matter to the attention of the General Assembly so that it can verify the facts and address the situation in accordance with its mandate.

B. Enforced disappearances

Applicable standard

55. The Committee recalls that, under the Convention, enforced disappearances may be committed by either State or non-State actors in circumstances that the Committee has detailed in its report on its visit to Mexico³³ and in its statement on non-State actors in the context of the Convention.

56. The Committee agrees with the State Party that such a statement, like any other statement of this kind, “cannot have the effect of extending the obligations of States Parties”, but must be understood “as a supplementary means of interpretation of the Convention [that] assists in determining the ordinary meaning of its terms in their context and in the light of its object and purpose, as provided for in article 31 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties”.³⁴

57. With regard to the State Party’s view that paragraph 17 of the statement is aimed at “extending the scope of article 5 of the Convention to acts committed by non-State actors acting without the authorization, support or acquiescence of the State”,³⁵ the Committee emphasizes that article 5 does not contain a definition of the concept of crimes against humanity, but rather refers to “applicable international law”, which includes general international law (customary international law and general principles of international law) and the treaties that the State concerned has ratified, acceded to or otherwise accepted. In the case of Mexico, such treaties include the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, which the State Party ratified on 28 October 2005. In this connection, the Committee recalls that, as noted by the Working Group on Enforced Disappearances, the definition given in the chapeau of article 7 (1) of the Rome Statute “now reflects customary international law”.³⁶

58. Therefore, when referring to enforced disappearance as a crime against humanity, the Committee considers that “applicable international law” refers to article 7 of the Rome Statute and the case law of the International Criminal Court and other international or hybrid courts, which describe in detail the conditions that must be met in order to establish the existence of crimes against humanity.³⁷

59. Article 7 (1) of the Rome Statute refers to enforced disappearance “when committed as part of a widespread or systematic attack directed against any civilian population, with knowledge of the attack”. Under article 7 (2) of the Statute, an “attack directed against any civilian population” may be carried out “pursuant to or in furtherance of a State or organizational policy to commit such attack”, and “enforced disappearance of persons” is defined as “the arrest, detention or abduction of persons by, or with the authorization, support or acquiescence of, a State or a political organization”.

60. On this basis, and interpreting article 5 in good faith in the light of the object and purpose of the Convention, the Committee has concluded that enforced disappearance as a crime against humanity may be committed by non-State actors such as organizations or political groups, even when they act without the authorization, support or acquiescence of the State.

61. The Committee also takes note of the State Party’s concern that the statement on non-State actors in the context of the Convention reflects an interpretation of the concept of acquiescence that “goes beyond the scope of the rule established in general international law”. The State party maintains that:

in public international law, acquiescence is equivalent to tacit recognition manifested by unilateral conduct which the other party – in this case non-State actors – may interpret as consent³⁸

and that:

the acquiescence test requires a demonstration that the State had prior knowledge of a real and imminent risk of violations of the rights of persons under its jurisdiction. In order to establish acquiescence, it is necessary to analyse the reasonableness of the State's actions, a determination which must be achieved by demonstrating that the conduct of the acquiescing State is manifest and is proven beyond doubt in the light of the relevant facts.³⁹

62. There are similarities and differences between these positions and the Committee's interpretation. The Committee nonetheless considers that an analysis of the information provided to it does not require a further examination of these legal issues. As explained above (see paras. 18, 28, 29, 31 and 38–43), the allegations referred to in the information received by the Committee mention the direct or indirect involvement of public authorities at the three levels of government (federal, state and municipal). The reported cases of alleged "acquiescence" are consistent with the interpretation of this concept presented by Mexico, according to which: (a) the State has prior knowledge of a real and imminent risk of violations of the rights of persons under its jurisdiction; (b) the State's acquiescence is manifest and leaves no room for doubt; and (c) such conduct amounts to tacit recognition which the other party – in this case non-State actors – interprets as consent.

Assessment of the available information

63. In its visit report, the Committee notes that between 2006 and 2021 there was a steep rise in the number of disappearances in the country, with more than 98% of such cases occurring during that period. These data show the close correlation between the increase in the number of disappearances and the so-called "war on drugs", which began during the six-year term of Felipe Calderón (2006–2012), when a policy characterized by the deployment of the armed forces to perform public security functions was implemented. This policy was maintained and has even been stepped up in subsequent presidential terms. Thus, while in the second half of the last century disappearances were mainly characterized as a means of political repression and committed by government agents and the armed forces, mostly against opposition social groups, from 2006 onward, they have involved a wide range of perpetrators, modalities and victims.⁴⁰ This trend is also reflected in the information received under article 34 (see paras. 38–43).

64. In its visit report, the Committee noted that it had received alarming information about the emergence of several patterns in the commission of acts of enforced disappearance, which were observed in the vast majority of states. Acts of enforced disappearance continue to be committed directly by public officials at the federal, state and municipal levels. In addition, persons involved in organized crime, with various forms of collusion and varying degrees of participation, acquiescence or omission by public officials, have become some of the main perpetrators of disappearances.⁴¹

65. The information received by the Committee under article 34 also contains well-founded indications that this trend is continuing.⁴²

66. For example, FIDH alleges that the catastrophic failure of local authorities to investigate the events at Rancho Izaguirre, as shown by the fact that the ranch was allowed to operate unchecked for years and that, even after it was raided by local authorities, the investigation failed to identify the clandestine graves or the perpetrators until victims' groups brought these issues to light and two former police officers were arrested, suggests that the "New Generation" cartel in Jalisco was likely to have acted with the authorization, support or acquiescence of at least some State authorities. The involvement of former police officers in that cartel's recruitment activities at the ranch also suggests possible support or acquiescence by certain State authorities.⁴³ More broadly, Amnesty International notes that "the narrative presented by Mexican authorities in response to international scrutiny is that disappearances in Mexico are carried out by organised crime. While this assertion is partially correct, it oversimplifies the phenomenon of disappearances in the country and ignores the fact that in many of these cases, organised crime operates with the authorisation, support or acquiescence of the authorities."⁴⁴

67. The Committee acknowledges that not all disappearances in Mexico are enforced disappearances. Of the 123,981 people listed in the National Register of Missing and Disappeared Persons and classified as “disappeared”, it is known that some were not deprived of their liberty, but “disappeared” for other reasons, such as “voluntary” disappearances or migration. However, the Committee emphasizes that, pursuant to article 12 (2) of the Convention, it is the State Party’s responsibility to undertake an investigation where there are reasonable grounds for believing that a person has been subjected to enforced disappearance.

68. In this regard, as noted in its visit report, the Committee is concerned that the National Register of Missing and Disappeared Persons does not provide a clear picture of the proportion of registered cases that might involve enforced disappearance. Although a suspected case of enforced disappearance can only be confirmed once the investigation has been concluded, it is essential that it be recorded as such at the initial stages, if there are indications to this effect, in order to spotlight these cases and to allow the adoption of efficient strategies for conducting searches and investigations, providing support and reparation to victims and preventing disappearances.⁴⁵

69. Pending the receipt of more reliable data from the State Party after it has conducted independent and effective investigations, the Committee, on the basis of the credible information it has received and its previous findings, can only conclude that there are well-founded indications that an alarming number of acts of enforced disappearance have been committed in the State Party.

C. “Widespread or systematic practice of enforced disappearance”

70. Below is a description of the main constituent elements of the definition of crimes against humanity under customary international law and the case law of the International Criminal Court and other international or hybrid courts.

71. The Committee notes that the State Party, in its reply to the request for information, agrees with the Committee’s understanding that the Rome Statute should always be used as a reference with regard to the concept of crimes against humanity as referred to in article 34 of the Convention. The Committee will analyse the situation in Mexico from this perspective.

1. Attack carried out “pursuant to or in furtherance of a State or organizational policy to commit such attack”

Applicable standard

72. Pursuant to article 7 (2) (a) of the Rome Statute, “attack directed against any civilian population” means:

a course of conduct involving the multiple commission of acts referred to in paragraph 1 against any civilian population, pursuant to or in furtherance of a State or organizational policy to commit such attack.

The requirement that the act form part of a “course of conduct” indicates that article 7 is meant to cover a series of acts or an overall flow of events, as opposed to a mere aggregate of random or isolated acts.⁴⁶

73. According to the case law of the International Criminal Court, “policy”, within the meaning of article 7 (2) (a) of the Rome Statute, refers essentially to the fact that a State or organization intends to carry out an attack against a civilian population, whether through action or deliberate failure to take action.⁴⁷ The phrase “pursuant to” underscores the existence of a nexus between the policy and the attack.⁴⁸

74. Whether a specific group of people can be called an “organization” depends on whether the organization has “a set of structures or mechanisms, whatever those may be, that are sufficiently efficient to ensure the coordination necessary to carry out an attack directed against a civilian population. Accordingly, ... the organisation concerned must have sufficient means to promote or encourage the attack, with no further requirement necessary. Indeed, by

no means can it be ruled out, particularly in view of modern asymmetric warfare, that an attack against a civilian population may also be the doing of a private entity consisting of a group of persons pursuing the objective of attacking a civilian population; in other words, of a group not necessarily endowed with a well-developed structure that could be described as quasi-State.⁴⁹ It is not necessary to show that all of the organization's activities are linked to a policy of attacking a civilian population.⁵⁰ Indeed, a single incident or operation involving the multiple commission of such acts could constitute a crime against humanity, provided that the relevant contextual elements are present, regardless of the broader activities of the State or organization in question.⁵¹

75. The policy itself can be inferred from factors such as the following: (a) a recurrent pattern of violence; (b) the existence of preparations or collective mobilization orchestrated and coordinated by the organization; (c) the use of public or private resources to further the policy; (d) the involvement of organizational forces in the commission of crimes; (e) statements, instructions or documentation attributable to the organization condoning or encouraging the commission of crimes; and (f) an underlying motivation.⁵² In principle, a State or organization committing a systematic attack against a civilian population will satisfy the policy requirement.⁵³

Assessment of the available information

(a) *“Attack”*

76. The information provided to the Committee and its previous conclusions refer to “attacks” that have occurred and continue to occur in Mexico. This information reveals well-founded indications that, since 2006, there have been “attacks” in various parts of Mexico, some of which are attributable to State authorities and others to drug cartels and other criminal organizations, often with specific patterns of participation by state or federal public officials.

77. In its reports, FIDH documents examples of such attacks in connection with incidents that occurred in Coahuila between 2009 and 2016, in Nayarit between September 2011 and September 2017, and in the State of Veracruz between 2010 and 2017. It also refers to recent cases in Jalisco and Nayarit that provide strong indications that disappearances have been committed systematically by persons involved in organized crime, with specific patterns of direct involvement, or support or acquiescence, by certain State officials (see paras. 38–40 and 42). The other reports received by the Committee refer to attacks in other parts of the country (see para. 42).

78. Recalling that an “attack”, in the definition of crimes against humanity, means “conduct involving the multiple commission of acts”, among them enforced disappearance, the Committee notes that neither the Rome Statute nor international case law requires that an “attack” be carried out over the entire territory of a State. “Attacks” may occur in specific parts of the territory and may be limited in their temporal and spatial scope, provided that they constitute “conduct involving the multiple commission” of crimes, including enforced disappearance.⁵⁴

79. In the light of the foregoing, the Committee considers that there are well-founded indications that “attacks” within the meaning of article 7 (2) (a) of the Rome Statute have occurred in Mexico.

(b) *“Pursuant to or in furtherance of a State or organizational policy to commit such attack”*

80. To determine whether there is a State or organizational policy to commit an attack against a civilian population, whether through action or deliberate failure to take action, account must be taken of factors such as a recurrent pattern of violence and the involvement of organizational forces in the commission of crimes.

81. While Mexico acknowledges that disappearances and other crimes are committed on a large scale by criminal organizations, it does not agree that such groups can be classified as “organizations” (art. 7 (2) (a)) or “political organizations” (art. 7 (2) (i)) within the meaning of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court.

82. The Committee recalls that the chambers of the International Criminal Court have relied on criteria such as structure, hierarchy, command and control over the population and/or territory, albeit in a flexible and non-cumulative manner. Case law has generally rejected the notion that every “organization” must possess quasi-State characteristics and be regarded almost as a State.⁵⁵ Although the International Criminal Court has not yet had occasion to conclude that “drug cartels” as such can be considered “organizations”, it has done so with regard to other types of criminal gangs or armed groups operating at the local level.⁵⁶ In the light of the available information, the Committee considers that there are well-founded indications that at least some of the criminal organizations operating in Mexico meet the criteria laid down in article 7 of the Rome Statute to be considered an “organization”.⁵⁷

83. The Committee also notes that, in the vast majority of the cases reported, it has received well-founded allegations that the “attacks” followed a pattern involving the direct participation, or the authorization, support or acquiescence, of certain federal, state and municipal public officials (see paras. 18, 28, 29, 59 and 66).

84. Notable among the examples provided in the information received are the forced recruitment camps in Tala and Teuchitlán, which:

operated for years in plain sight, without any action being taken by the authorities, despite complaints from community groups and communities. The current context of the discovery has demonstrated the active participation of the municipal president in the operation of the municipality, who allegedly supported the Jalisco New Generation Cartel ... with patrols, weapons, and municipal machinery.⁵⁸

85. The clandestine use of public mass graves to hide bodies, which was found to have occurred in Tetelcingo and Jojutla, in the State of Morelos, revealed “the direct involvement of forensic institutions in the illegal concealment of human remains, leading to the coining of the term ‘state-run clandestine graves’, used by search groups to denounce these practices”.⁵⁹

86. The Committee finds that the available information reveals well-founded indications that most of the enforced disappearances reported took place according to similar patterns of conduct, as part of planned operations, and rules out the possibility that they might have been perpetrated by individuals acting randomly on their own initiative.

87. Accordingly, the Committee concludes that there are well-founded indications that enforced disappearances took place in the context of various “attacks” carried out at different times and places in Mexico, pursuant to a State or organizational policy, i.e. policies conceived and carried out by “organizations” acting autonomously or with the complicity and, at a minimum, the acquiescence of public officials at the federal, state and municipal levels.

88. The Committee must also consider whether this constitutes a single attack characterized by a “policy” conceived and implemented at the national level. In its visit report, the Committee noted that there is a close correlation between the situation regarding enforced disappearances from 2006 to the present and the implementation of the national “war on drugs” policy, and specifically urged the State Party to abandon its militarized approach to public security.⁶⁰

89. However, even though this policy has led to widespread and systematic human rights violations and serious crimes against a large portion of the civilian population,⁶¹ the Committee has not identified any well-founded indications that the militarized approach to public security in itself amounts to a federal policy that necessarily and intentionally involves the commission of acts of enforced disappearance.

90. The Committee must then examine whether a “policy” conceived and implemented at the national level could result from a “deliberate failure to take action” against “attacks” involving the commission of acts of enforced disappearance as crimes against humanity. In this connection, the Committee recalls that, over the past 10 years, the State Party has claimed to have taken measures at the federal and state levels to counter the rise in cases of enforced disappearance throughout the country, a position reiterated in its replies to the Committee’s request for information pursuant to article 34 of the Convention.⁶² The State Party also argues that the development of national policies to search for missing persons and to investigate and

punish perpetrators of enforced disappearance is incompatible with the existence of a policy of attacks against the civilian population.⁶³

91. The Committee has repeatedly acknowledged and welcomed the measures taken by the State Party and has cited the country's legal and institutional framework as a positive example for other States. However, the Committee has also had to emphasize that these efforts have been insufficient and ineffective (see paras. 9–32) and have failed to halt the steady rise in the number of missing persons, the lack of effective progress in searches and investigations in most of the cases reported, the withholding of information, the near-total impunity of perpetrators, the alarming forensic crisis and the lack of support for victims' relatives in their daily struggle to find their loved ones.

92. However, the State's failure may be due not to a deliberate policy, but to other factors such as administrative complexities and inefficiencies, difficulties related to the State's federal structure, a lack of resources, corruption and ties between public officials and criminal organizations, sometimes at a high level.

93. The Committee therefore considers that the available information does not disclose any well-founded indications that the failure to take action to address enforced disappearances is "deliberate" within the meaning of article 7 (2) (a) of the Rome Statute.

94. The Committee reiterates that neither the Rome Statute nor international case law requires that an "attack" be perpetrated throughout the territory of the State concerned (see para. 74). It is likewise not necessary that the attack be conceived "at the highest level of the State machinery".⁶⁴

95. Accordingly, the Committee concludes that there are well-founded indications that enforced disappearance has been and continues to be committed as part of various "attacks" in different parts of the country, pursuant to a State or organizational policy to commit such attacks, i.e. policies conceived and carried out by "organizations" acting autonomously or with the complicity and, at a minimum, the acquiescence of public officials at the federal, state and municipal levels. At the same time, the Committee considers that there are no well-founded indications of any federal policy aimed at the commission of such acts, whether through action or a deliberate failure to take action.

2. "Widespread or systematic"

Applicable standard

96. According to the applicable standard, the "attack" must be widespread or systematic, but it may be either one or the other. The case law of international and hybrid courts highlights the following:

(a) "Widespread" adverts to the large-scale nature of the attack and to the number of targeted persons;⁶⁵

(b) "Systematic" reflects the organized nature of the acts of violence and the improbability of their random occurrence. Case law further holds that the "systematic" character of the attack refers to the existence of "patterns of crimes" reflected in the non-accidental repetition of similar criminal conduct on a regular basis.⁶⁶ The *Katanga* and *Ntaganda* cases provide clear examples of the application of these principles.⁶⁷

Assessment of the available information

(a) "Widespread"

97. While the Committee is aware that the National Register of Missing and Disappeared Persons records cases of persons who are "missing" in a general sense and that not all such cases can be classified as enforced disappearances within the meaning of article 2 or article 5 of the Convention, the Committee considers that the number of missing persons recorded (more than 132,400 missing and disappeared persons as at 19 February 2026) and the steady increase in such cases are in themselves indications of the magnitude of the phenomenon at the national level, with no sign of a reversal in this trend.

98. In its visit report, the Committee had already concluded, after having carried out an exhaustive analysis of the information received, that disappearances continue to be widespread over much of the State Party's territory and that almost absolute impunity and revictimization prevail in this regard.⁶⁸

99. The scale of the phenomenon is also reflected in the increase in the number of clandestine graves discovered in recent years. As an example, the Committee cites data from the monitoring carried out by the data centre at Ibero-American University León, which indicate that in Guanajuato 723 clandestine graves were recorded between 2009 and March 2025, with some 1,352 bodies recovered. According to these figures, Irapuato is the municipality with the most clandestine graves and bodies found, followed by Salamanca, Juventino Rosas, Acámbaro, Celaya, Villagrán and Salvatierra. In Baja California, according to data from Elementa DDHH (2025), between October 2009 and March 2025, 415 clandestine graves were found. In addition, between 2010 and March 2025, 14,378 unidentified bodies were reported to have been buried in mass graves in the municipalities of Mexicali, Tijuana and Ensenada.⁶⁹

100. Although figures on mass graves discovered in the country vary depending on the source, current estimates indicate that there are more than 4,500 clandestine graves in Mexico containing over 6,200 bodies and 4,600 human remains.⁷⁰ As of early 2026, official figures show that there are approximately 72,000 unidentified human remains, compared to 52,000 at the time of the Committee's visit in 2021.⁷¹ In 2025, according to the offices of state attorneys general, three states accounted for 37% of all mass graves reported in the country: Sonora, with 972 mass graves; Veracruz, with 523; and Tamaulipas, with 541.⁷²

101. The Committee considers that, in most of the attacks reported to it, the large number of victims provides well-founded indications that these attacks were carried out on a large scale.

102. Therefore, while it has concluded that there are no well-founded indications that enforced disappearances have occurred as part of a single "attack" covering the entire territory of Mexico, the Committee finds that there are well-founded indications that widespread "attacks" have been and continue to be committed at different times and in different parts of the country.

(b) *"Systematic"*

103. As noted above (see para. 86), having reviewed the information submitted to it, the Committee considers that the facts reported rule out the possibility that the disappearances in question could have been perpetrated by individuals acting randomly on their own initiative.

104. FIDH has documented systematic practices that followed a consistent pattern in Coahuila between 2006 and 2016. This analysis was based on more than 500 cases of enforced disappearance, of which FIDH examined 32 as representative examples. These cases involve 73 victims, 33 of whom remain missing. The information analysed enabled FIDH to identify the following two patterns regarding enforced disappearances: (a) between 2009 and 2011/12, the Coahuila police forces abducted the victims, who were then handed over to the Zetas cartel; and (b) between 2011/12 and 2016, state security authorities directly carried out acts of enforced disappearance through their special forces, including the Special Weapons and Tactics Unit, established in December 2011; the Municipal Special Weapons and Tactics Unit; the Elite Unit; and the Reaction and Joint Operations Unit.⁷³

105. In its second submission, FIDH addresses the situations in Jalisco and Nayarit, and concludes that they provide well-founded indications that disappearances have been committed systematically as a form of organized crime with specific patterns and with the direct involvement, or the support or acquiescence, of certain public officials.⁷⁴

106. The other public reports submitted to the Committee under rule 106 of the rules of procedure, as well as the information gathered by the Committee, support the conclusion that, in most of the cases documented, enforced disappearances "are systematic because they involve the use of public resources, including military personnel and facilities, and criminal patterns can be identified".⁷⁵

107. The Committee therefore considers that there are well-founded indications that the attacks reported were “systematic” in the sense that all the enforced disappearances committed as part of these attacks followed similar patterns, reflecting the non-accidental repetition of conduct in different parts of the country at different times.

3. “Directed against any civilian population”

Applicable standard

108. According to the case law of the International Criminal Court, an “attack” must be “directed against any civilian population”. “Directed against” means that the civilian population must be the primary target and not the incidental victim of the attack.⁷⁶ “Population” means that the attack was not directed against a limited group of randomly selected persons.⁷⁷ However, it is not necessary to prove that the entire population of a geographic area was targeted at the time of the attack.⁷⁸

109. The term “civilian” must be understood, in accordance with article 50 of the Protocol Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, and relating to the Protection of Victims of International Armed Conflicts, to mean all persons who are not members of the armed forces.⁷⁹ The presence within a civilian population of individuals who do not qualify as “civilians” does not deprive the population of its civilian character.⁸⁰ It is not necessary to establish that “the main aim or object of the relevant acts was to attack civilians”. An attack directed against a civilian population may also serve other objectives or motives.⁸¹

Assessment of the available information

110. In all the cases reported to the Committee, civilians were not accidental victims, but were deliberately targeted by the attack. The cases reported by FIDH concern attacks against the civilian population in Coahuila, Nayarit and Veracruz.⁸² In Jalisco, which is currently the Mexican state with the largest number of missing persons, the Office of the Special Prosecutor for Missing and Disappeared Persons has reported that, between December 2018 and June 2025, it processed 205 clandestine burial sites located in 19 municipalities, accounting for 1,956 deceased persons, of whom 1,054 have been identified.⁸³ In Guanajuato, the number of missing persons grew eightfold between 2017 and April 2025, while in Tabasco, the number of missing persons increased exponentially in 2024 and 2025, with girls and young women as the main victims.⁸⁴

111. The information received also includes specific examples and notes that “although in some cases the attacks were directed at security forces, the most frequent attacks were against the civilian population”.⁸⁵

112. In the light of the foregoing, the Committee considers that the available information discloses well-founded indications that the “attacks” in question have been or are being directed “against the civilian population”.

4. “With knowledge of the attack”

Applicable standard

113. The crimes must be committed “with knowledge of the attack”. This means that the perpetrator must know that the act is part of a widespread or systematic attack against the civilian population. However, this condition should not be interpreted as requiring proof that the perpetrator had knowledge of all characteristics of the attack or the precise details of the plan or policy of the State or organization.⁸⁶

114. Since the Committee is not called upon to examine individual responsibility but to determine whether there are well-founded indications that enforced disappearance has been and continues to be committed as a crime against humanity, it does not consider it necessary to examine this criterion in the present assessment.

D. Conclusion

115. Under the “well-founded indications” standard laid down in article 34 of the Convention, the Committee does not act as a commission of inquiry and is not required to make a finding of fact. Rather, the Committee must determine whether it can be satisfied that the available information raises sufficient concern to warrant urgently bringing the matter to the attention of the General Assembly so that the Assembly can verify the facts and address the situation in accordance with its mandate (see paras. 53 and 54).

116. In the light of the information received pursuant to article 34 and all the information gathered since the beginning of its engagement with the State Party in 2012, the Committee finds that there are well-founded indications that enforced disappearance has been and continues to be committed in Mexico as a crime against humanity, through various widespread or systematic “attacks” in different places and at different times, directed against the civilian population pursuant to or in furtherance of State or organizational policies to commit such attacks, i.e. policies conceived and/or implemented by public authorities at the federal, state or municipal level or by “organizations” acting autonomously or with the complicity and, at a minimum, the acquiescence of public authorities at the municipal, state and federal levels.

117. However, while the national “war on drugs” policy has in part created the conditions for such “attacks” to be committed at the local level, there are no well-founded indications that this policy in itself constitutes a federal policy to commit such acts within the meaning of the Rome Statute. Similarly, although the lack of effective action to prevent enforced disappearances in Mexico and to punish perpetrators has helped to foster a climate of insecurity and impunity and to create conditions in which crimes against humanity could be committed, there are no well-founded indications that this amounts to a policy of deliberate commission within the meaning of article 7 (2) (a) of the Rome Statute.

118. The Committee therefore concludes that, although various “attacks” and crimes against humanity are being committed in Mexico, there are no well-founded indications of a federal policy to commit such acts, whether through action or a deliberate failure to take action.

119. The Committee recalls that neither the Rome Statute nor international case law requires that widespread or systematic attacks against the civilian population be perpetrated throughout the territory of a State. It is likewise not necessary that the attack be conceived “at the highest level of the State machinery”.⁸⁷

120. The situation regarding enforced disappearances has not improved since the Committee’s visit to the State Party in 2021, despite the efforts made and the steps taken in this regard. The authorities responsible remain overwhelmed by the scale of the crime, and structural changes are still needed to address and prevent it effectively and efficiently.

121. In the light of the foregoing, and taking into account all the information before it, the Committee finds that there are well-founded indications that enforced disappearance has been and continues to be committed in the context of various widespread or systematic attacks carried out in Mexico, that is, as a crime against humanity.

V. Decision of the Committee

122. Pursuant to article 34 of the Convention, the Committee decides to urgently bring the situation regarding enforced disappearances in Mexico to the attention of the United Nations General Assembly. To this end, the Committee requests the Secretary-General to transmit the present decision, the relevant reports and observations and the information received from civil society organizations to the General Assembly so that it can consider adopting measures to support the State Party’s efforts to prevent, investigate, punish and eradicate enforced disappearance in Mexico.

123. The Committee draws the attention of the General Assembly to the need for action aimed at:

(a) Providing such technical cooperation, financial support and specialized assistance as Mexico may require in respect of search operations, forensic analysis and thorough investigation of allegations of enforced disappearance and links between public officials and organized crime;

(b) Establishing an effective mechanism to uncover the truth and provide assistance and protection to families searching for their loved ones and to the organizations and defenders supporting them.

124. The Committee reaffirms its commitment to continue cooperating with Mexico in accordance with the procedures under the Convention, in particular articles 29, 30 and 31, and to maintain an ongoing dialogue with the authorities and civil society.

125. The Committee recalls that article 34 forms part of the procedures set forth in the Convention to promote cooperation and constructive dialogue between States Parties and the Committee. Its application with respect to a particular State Party should in no way be construed as impairing or interfering with other procedures provided for in the Convention and should not undermine, but rather strengthen, cooperation between the Committee and the State Party concerned.

Notes

- ¹ CED/C/1/Rev.3.
- ² *Ibid.*
- ³ CED/C/MEX/CO/1.
- ⁴ *Ibid.*
- ⁵ CED/C/MEX/VR/1 (Findings), párr. 40.
- ⁶ CED/C/30/2.
- ⁷ CED/C/28/3, párr. 69.
- ⁸ CED/C/27/2, párr. 48; y CED/C/28/3, párr. 70.
- ⁹ CED/C/27/2, párr. 88.
- ¹⁰ Véase los informes del Comité sobre las peticiones de acción urgente del 11° periodo de sesiones (CED/C/11/3) al 30° periodo de sesiones (CED/C/30/2).
- ¹¹ CED/C/28/3, párrs. 72, 93 y 94.
- ¹² CED/C/27/2, párr. 84.
- ¹³ CED/C/MEX/VR/1 (Findings), párrs. 28 y 29; CED/C/MEX/VR/1 (Recommendations), párrs. 57–71; y CED/C/MEX/OAI/2, párrs. 47 y 48.
- ¹⁴ CED/C/27/2, párr. 84.
- ¹⁵ CED/C/28/3, párr. 70.
- ¹⁶ CED/C/27/2, párr. 84.
- ¹⁷ CED/C/26/2, párr. 34–35; y CED/C/28/3, párr. 75.
- ¹⁸ CED/C/27/2, párr. 87.
- ¹⁹ *Ibid.*, párr. 88.
- ²⁰ *Berrospe Medina c. México* (CED/C/24/D/4/2021) y *Ramírez Barrios y Ramírez Barrios c. México* (CED/C/28/D/5/2021).
- ²¹ CED/C/MEX/A.34/RI/1.
- ²² FIDH, “Documento presentado al Comité contra la Desaparición Forzada respecto a la situación en México”, 11 de febrero de 2025.
- ²³ *Ibid.*; y FIDH, IDHEAS, “México: Estructura criminal en la Fiscalía General del estado de Nayarit y crímenes de lesa humanidad”, junio de 2021, disponible en https://www.fidh.org/IMG/pdf/fidh-idheas_-_informe_nayarit_espanol_.pdf.
- ²⁴ FIDH, “Documento presentado al Comité contra la Desaparición Forzada sobre la situación en México”, 11 de febrero de 2025; y FIDH, Comisión Mexicana de Defensa y Promoción de Derechos Humanos y Comisión Ciudadana de Derechos Humanos del Noroeste, “Comunicación de acuerdo con el artículo 15 del Estatuto de Roma de la Corte Penal Internacional sobre la presunta comisión de crímenes de lesa humanidad, en México entre 2006 y 2012”, disponible en [informe_mexico_cpi.pdf](#).
- ²⁵ FIDH, “Remisión de México en virtud del art. 34 de la Convención: información que indica el carácter sistemático de los casos recientes”, 22 de abril de 2025.
- ²⁶ Véase CED/C/MEX/VR/1 (Findings), párrs. 28 y 29, CED/C/MEX/VR/1 (Recommendations), párrs. 57 a 71. El Comité destacó que, según la información disponible, 52.000 personas fallecidas sin identificar yacían en fosas comunes, instalaciones de los servicios forenses, universidades y centros

- de resguardo forense a la fecha de la visita, y que dicha cifra, a pesar de su magnitud, no incluía a los cuerpos todavía no localizados ni a los miles de fragmentos de restos humanos que las familias y comisiones de búsqueda recogen semanalmente en las fosas clandestinas.
- 27 Disponibles en el sitio web del Comité:
tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/SessionDetails1.aspx?SessionID=2852&Lang=en.
- 28 Centro PRODH, “Aportes en torno al procedimiento previsto en el artículo 34 de la Convención con respecto de México”, 18 de septiembre de 2025; Amnistía Internacional, “Activación del artículo 34 de la Convención Internacional para la Protección de Todas las Personas contra las Desapariciones Forzadas”, septiembre de 2025; colectivos y organizaciones de la sociedad civil: “Desapariciones forzadas generalizadas y/o sistemáticas cometidas en México. Informe presentado al Comité contra la Desaparición Forzada conforme al artículo 34 de la Convención: Una oportunidad para proteger a todas las personas contra las desapariciones forzadas en México”, 12 de agosto de 2025; Global Rights Advocacy y Seattle University School of Law, “México y la desaparición forzada como crimen de lesa humanidad: el costo humano del corredor minero”, 29 de octubre de 2025. Todas ellas pueden consultarse en
https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/TreatyBodyExternal/countries.aspx?CountryCode=MEX&Lang=SP.
- 29 “Desapariciones forzadas generalizadas y/o sistemáticas cometidas en México”, 12 de agosto de 2025, págs. 18 a 32. Disponible en
tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=INT%2FCED%2FNGO%2FMEX%2F68126&Lang=en.
- 30 Respuestas de México a la solicitud de información con arreglo al artículo 34 de la Convención, 18 de septiembre de 2025.
- 31 CED/C/10/Rev.1.
- 32 Véase <https://www.ohchr.org/es/publications/policy-and-methodological-publications/commissions-inquiry-and-fact-finding-missions>.
- 33 CED/C/MEX/VR/1 (Findings), párrs. 40 y 41.
- 34 Respuestas de México a la solicitud de información con arreglo al artículo 34 de la Convención, 18 de septiembre de 2025, párr. 59.
- 35 *Ibid*, párr. 62.
- 36 A/HRC/13/31.
- 37 Véase el artículo 7, párrafo 1, del Estatuto de Roma. Y, entre otros, los siguientes fallos: Corte Penal Internacional, situación en la República Democrática del Congo, *Le Procureur c. Germain Katanga*, Sala de Primera Instancia II, fallo dictado con arreglo al artículo 74 del Estatuto, 7 de marzo de 2014, ICC-01/04-01/07; Sala de Apelaciones, situación en la República Democrática del Congo, *The Prosecutor v. Bosco Ntaganda*, fallo sobre las apelaciones, 30 de marzo de 2021, ICC-01/04-02/06 A A2; Sala de Primera Instancia IX, situación en la República Centroafricana, *The Prosecutor v. Dominic Ongwen*, fallo de 4 de febrero de 2021, ICC-02/04-01/15-1762-Red; Sala de Primera Instancia X, situación en Mali, *The Prosecutor v. Al Hassan Ag Abdoul Aziz Ag Mohamed Ag Mahmoud*, fallo, 26 de junio de 2024, ICC-01/12-01/18-2594-Red; Sala de Primera Instancia V, situación en la República Centroafricana II, *The Prosecutor v. Alfred Yekatom and Patrice-Edouard Ngaïssona*, fallo de 24 de julio de 2025, ICC-01/14-01/18; y Sala de Primera Instancia I, situación en Darfur (Sudán), *The Prosecutor v. Ali Muhammad Ali Abd-Al-Rahman (“Ali Kushayb”)*, fallo de 6 de octubre de 2025, ICC-02/05-01/20. Véase también Tribunal Penal Internacional para la ex-Yugoslavia, Sala de Apelaciones, *The Prosecutor v. Dragoljub Kunarac et al.*, fallo de 12 de junio de 2002, IT-96-23/1-A; y Sala de Apelaciones, *The Prosecutor v. Milan Martić*, fallo de 8 de octubre de 2008, causa IT-95-11.
- 38 Respuestas de México a la solicitud de información con arreglo al artículo 34 de la Convención, 18 de septiembre de 2025, párr. 64.
- 39 *Ibid*.
- 40 CED/C/MEX/VR/1 (Findings), párr. 11.
- 41 *Ibid.*, párr. 13. Véase también el párr. 21.
- 42 FIDH, “Documento presentado al Comité contra la Desaparición Forzada respecto a la situación en México”, 11 de febrero de 2025, págs. 2, 5 a 8; “Remisión de México en virtud del art. 34 de la Convención: información que indica el carácter sistemático de los casos recientes”, pág. 5; Amnistía Internacional, “Activación del artículo 34 de la Convención Internacional para la Protección de Todas las Personas contra las Desapariciones Forzadas”, págs. 4 y 5; y organizaciones de la sociedad civil y colectivos: “Desapariciones forzadas generalizadas y/o sistemáticas cometidas en México”, 12 de agosto de 2025, págs. 11 a 40.
- 43 FIDH, “Remisión de México en virtud del art. 34 de la Convención: información que indica el carácter sistemático de los casos recientes”, pág. 2. Disponible en
https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=INT%2FCED%2FRIS%2FMEX%2F68123&Lang=en.
- 44 Amnistía Internacional, “Activación del artículo 34 de la Convención”, pág. 4.

- ⁴⁵ CED/C/MEX/VR/1 (Findings), párr. 50. Del mismo modo, en su informe de visita de 2011, el Grupo de Trabajo sobre las Desapariciones Forzadas o Involuntarias recordó que “solo mediante una investigación independiente, imparcial y completa se puede descartar una potencial desaparición forzada. Por ende, el número de casos de desaparición forzada no puede ser establecido a cabalidad sin la debida investigación” (A/HRC/19/58/Add.2, párr. 21).
- ⁴⁶ Corte Penal Internacional, Sala de Primera Instancia VI, *The Prosecutor v. Ntaganda*, fallo de 8 de julio de 2019, párr. 662; *The Prosecutor v. Yekatom y Ngaïssona*, fallo de 24 de julio de 2025, párr. 3770; y *The Prosecutor v. Ali Kushayb*, fallo de 6 de octubre de 2025, párr. 692.
- ⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, *Le Procureur c. Katanga*, fallo de 7 de marzo de 2014, párr. 1108; y Sala de Primera Instancia VI, *The Prosecutor v. Ntaganda*, fallo de 8 de julio de 2019, párr. 662.
- ⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, *Le Procureur c. Katanga*, fallo de 7 de marzo de 2014, párr. 1116; *The Prosecutor v. Yekatom y Ngaïssona*, fallo de 24 de julio de 2025, párr. 3775; y Sala de Primera Instancia VI, *The Prosecutor v. Ntaganda*, fallo de 8 de julio de 2019, párr. 673.
- ⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, *Le Procureur c. Katanga*, fallo de 7 de marzo de 2014, párr. 1119; y *The Prosecutor v. Yekatom y Ngaïssona*, fallo de 24 de julio de 2025, párr. 3774.
- ⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, Sala de Primera Instancia VI, *The Prosecutor v. Ntaganda*, fallo de 8 de julio de 2019, párr. 662; y *The Prosecutor v. Yekatom y Ngaïssona*, fallo de 24 de julio de 2025, párr. 3773.
- ⁵¹ *Ibid.*, Sala de Primera Instancia VI, *The Prosecutor v. Ntaganda*, fallo de 8 de julio de 2019, párr. 662; *The Prosecutor v. Ongwen*, fallo de 4 de febrero de 2021, párr. 2689; Sala de Primera Instancia VIII, *The Prosecutor v. Ahmad Al Faqi Al Mahdi*, fallo de 27 de septiembre de 2016, párrs. 18 y 49; y *The Prosecutor v. Yekatom y Ngaïssona*, fallo de 24 de julio de 2025, párr. 3780. Véase también Tribunal Penal Internacional para la ex-Yugoslavia, *The Prosecutor v. Kunarac et al.*, fallo de apelación de 12 de junio de 2002, párr. 57.
- ⁵² Corte Penal Internacional, *The Prosecutor v. Ongwen*, fallo de 4 de febrero de 2021, párr. 2679; *The Prosecutor v. Yekatom y Ngaïssona*, fallo de 24 de julio de 2025, párr. 3776; *The Prosecutor v. Ali Kushayb*, párr. 699.
- ⁵³ *The Prosecutor v. Ongwen*, fallo de 4 de febrero de 2021, párr. 2679; *The Prosecutor v. Yekatom y Ngaïssona*, fallo de 24 de julio de 2025, párr. 3776; y *The Prosecutor v. Ali Kushayb*, fallo de 6 de octubre de 2025, párr. 699.
- ⁵⁴ Corte Penal Internacional, *Le Procureur c. Katanga*, fallo de 7 de marzo de 2014: el “ataque” tuvo lugar el 24 de febrero de 2003 en el pueblo de Bogoro (provincia de Ituri), perpetrado por un grupo armado, durante el cual se estima que más de 200 civiles murieron. En la causa *The Prosecutor v. Ntaganda*, Sala de Primera Instancia VI, fallo de 8 de julio de 2019: el “ataque” tuvo lugar entre agosto de 2002 y diciembre de 2003 en la provincia de Ituri, a través de dos “operaciones” principales que involucraron múltiples crímenes y víctimas. Véanse también, entre otros, Tribunal Penal Internacional para la ex-Yugoslavia, Sala de Primera Instancia I, *The Prosecutor v. Stanislav Galić*, fallo de 4 de diciembre de 2003, IT-89-29-T: el ataque tuvo lugar durante el mando del acusado (septiembre de 1992 a agosto de 1994), en el contexto del asedio de Sarajevo, mediante una campaña prolongada de francotiradores y bombardeos contra civiles en Sarajevo; y Tribunal Penal Internacional para la ex-Yugoslavia, Sala de Primera Instancia I, *The Prosecutor v. Ante Gotovina et al.*, fallo de 15 de abril de 2011, IT-06-90-T: el ataque tuvo lugar entre agosto y septiembre de 1995 en Krajina (Croacia) durante la llamada “Operación Tormenta”, mediante una campaña de deportación y traslado forzoso de la población civil serbia de Krajina.
- ⁵⁵ Corte Penal Internacional, *Le Procureur c. Katanga*, 7 de marzo de 2014, párr. 1122.
- ⁵⁶ En el caso de Kenya, por ejemplo, la Corte Penal Internacional determinó que los denominados Mungiki operaban como una estructura jerárquica amplia y compleja, caracterizada por diversos niveles de mando y una clara división de funciones en la estructura de mando. La obediencia a las normas internas de los Mungiki se logra mediante estrictas medidas disciplinarias. También se demostró que los Mungiki tenían control sobre actividades sociales fundamentales en muchas de las zonas residenciales pobres, especialmente en Nairobi, y recaudaban impuestos informales para financiar dichas actividades. Corte Penal Internacional, Sala de Costas II, situación en la República de Kenya, en la causa *The prosecutor v. Francis Kirimi Muthaura, Uhuru Muigai Kenyatta and Mohammed Hussein Ali*, 8 de marzo de 2011 (ICC-01/09-02/11), párr. 22. Véase también Open Society Justice Initiative, *Atrocidades innegables: confrontando crímenes de lesa humanidad en México* (2016), págs. 87 a 95. Véase también Carsten Stahn, “A critical introduction to international law”, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press (2019), pág. 57.
- ⁵⁷ Open Society Justice Initiative, *Atrocidades innegables: confrontando crímenes de lesa humanidad en México* (2016), págs. 87 a 95. Véase también Carsten Stahn, “A critical introduction to international law”, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press (2019), pág. 57.
- ⁵⁸ “Desapariciones forzadas generalizadas y/o sistemáticas cometidas en México”, informe del 12 de agosto de 2025, pág. 24. Disponible en https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/TreatyBodyExternal/countries.aspx?CountryCode=MEX&Lang=SP.
- ⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, pág. 29.
- ⁶⁰ CED/C/MEX/VR/1 (Findings), párrs. 11 y 44 a 48; y A/HRC/19/58/Add.2, párr. 90.

- ⁶¹ CED/C/MEX/VR/1 (Findings), párrs. 44 a 47.
- ⁶² Respuestas de México a la solicitud de información con arreglo al artículo 34 de la Convención, 18 de septiembre de 2025, párrs. 37 a 43.
- ⁶³ *Ibid.*, párr. 106.
- ⁶⁴ Tribunal Penal Internacional para la ex-Yugoslavia, Sala de Primera Instancia I, *The Prosecutor v. Tihomir Blaškić*, fallo de 3 de marzo de 2000, IT-95-14-T, párr. 205.
- ⁶⁵ Corte Penal Internacional, *Le Procureur c. Katanga*, fallo de 7 de marzo de 2014, párr. 1123.
- ⁶⁶ *Ibid.*
- ⁶⁷ En la causa *Katanga*, la Sala de Primera Instancia de la Corte Penal Internacional consideró que el ataque a la aldea de Bogoro por parte de un grupo armado, durante el cual se estima que murieron más de 200 civiles, podía considerarse en sí mismo un ataque “sistemático”, tal y como se desprendía del escenario del ataque y, más concretamente, de la forma en que las tropas se desplegaron, atacaron la aldea y cometieron los crímenes (*Katanga*, párrs. 1157 a 1162). En la causa *Ntaganda*, la Sala de Primera Instancia determinó que el ataque liderado por un grupo armado en Ituri entre el asalto a Bunia en agosto de 2002 y el asalto a la misma ciudad en mayo de 2003 fue tanto generalizado como sistemático (fallo de juicio *Ntaganda*, 8 de julio de 2019, párrs. 691 a 695).
- ⁶⁸ CED/C/MEX/VR/1 (Findings), párr. 24.
- ⁶⁹ “Desapariciones forzadas generalizadas y/o sistemáticas cometidas en México”, 12 de agosto de 2025, págs. 31 y 32.
- ⁷⁰ Las fiscalías estatales reportaron un total de 5.532 fosas clandestinas entre 2006 y 2024, mientras que la Fiscalía General de la República informó únicamente de 630 fosas en el mismo periodo. Véase <https://plataformaciudadanadefosas.org/assets/diagnostico-forense.pdf>, págs. 8 y 9.
- ⁷¹ CED/C/MEX/VR/1 (Findings), párrs. 28 a 29.
- ⁷² Véase <https://plataformaciudadanadefosas.org/assets/diagnostico-forense.pdf>, pág. 9.
- ⁷³ FIDH, “Documento presentado al Comité contra la Desaparición Forzada respecto a la situación en México”, 11 de febrero de 2025, pág. 4.
- ⁷⁴ FIDH, “Remisión de México en virtud del art. 34 de la Convención: información que indica el carácter sistemático de los casos recientes”. Disponible en https://tbinternet.ohchr.org/_layouts/15/treatybodyexternal/Download.aspx?symbolno=INT%2FCED%2FRIS%2FMEX%2F68123&Lang=en.
- ⁷⁵ “Desapariciones forzadas generalizadas y/o sistemáticas cometidas en México”, 12 de agosto de 2025, pág. 18. Véase la descripción de situaciones específicas en varios estados, págs. 14 a 33.
- ⁷⁶ Corte Penal Internacional, *Le Procureur c. Katanga*, fallo de 7 de marzo de 2014, párr. 1104.
- ⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, párr. 1105.
- ⁷⁸ *Ibid.*
- ⁷⁹ *Ibid.*; y Tribunal Penal Internacional para la ex-Yugoslavia, *The Prosecutor v. Milan Martić*, párr. 297.
- ⁸⁰ Corte Penal Internacional, *The Prosecutor v. Al Hassan Ag Abdoul Aziz Ag Mohamed Ag Mahmoud*, fallo de 26 de junio de 2024, párr. 1106.
- ⁸¹ *Ibid.*, *The Prosecutor v. Ntaganda*, fallo de 30 de marzo de 2021, párr. 424.
- ⁸² FIDH, “Documento presentado al Comité contra la Desaparición Forzada respecto a la situación en México”, 11 de febrero de 2025.
- ⁸³ “Desapariciones forzadas generalizadas y/o sistemáticas cometidas en México”, 12 de agosto de 2025, pág. 22.
- ⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, págs. 25 a 29.
- ⁸⁵ *Ibid.* pág. 5.
- ⁸⁶ Corte Penal Internacional, *Le Procureur c. Katanga*, fallo de 7 de marzo de 2014, párr. 1125.
- ⁸⁷ Tribunal Penal Internacional para la ex-Yugoslavia, Sala de Primera Instancia I, *The Prosecutor v. Tihomir Blaškić*, fallo de 3 de marzo de 2000, párr. 205.

Annex

[Spanish only]

Cronología de la cooperación entre el Comité y el Estado Parte y actuación del Comité en los diferentes procedimientos de su mandato

<i>Fecha</i>	<i>Acción</i>	<i>Marco jurídico</i>	<i>Documentos/decisiones finales</i>
Febrero de 2007	Ratificación de la Convención por el Estado Parte		
	1. Revisión del informe inicial y de la información complementaria presentados por el Estado Parte y aprobación de las observaciones finales del Comité	Art. 29, párrs. 1, 3 y 4, de la Convención	
Marzo de 2014	Presentación del informe inicial presentado por el Estado Parte		CED/C/MEX/1 y CED/C/MEX/1/Corr.1
Febrero de 2015	Diálogo constructivo sobre el informe inicial Aprobación de las observaciones finales por el Comité sobre el informe presentado por el Estado Parte		CED/C/MEX/CO/1
Febrero de 2016	Presentación de la información del Estado Parte sobre el seguimiento de las observaciones del Comité		CED/C/MEX/CO/1/Add.1
Octubre de 2016	Aprobación del informe sobre el seguimiento de las observaciones finales del Comité		CED/C/11/2
Febrero de 2018	Presentación de información por el Estado Parte sobre la implementación de las observaciones finales		CED/C/MEX/CO/1/Add.2
Noviembre de 2018	Diálogo constructivo sobre la información complementaria Aprobación de las observaciones finales II del Comité		CED/C/MEX/OAI/1

<i>Fecha</i>	<i>Acción</i>	<i>Marco jurídico</i>	<i>Documentos/decisiones finales</i>
Enero de 2022	Presentación de información complementaria por el Estado Parte		CED/C/MEX/AI/2
Septiembre de 2023	Diálogo constructivo sobre la información complementaria presentada por el Estado Parte y el informe de la visita del Comité (CED/C/MEX/VR/1 (Findings) y CED/C/MEX/VR/1 (Recommendations)) Aprobación de las observaciones finales del Comité sobre la información complementaria presentada por el Estado Parte		CED/C/MEX/OAI/2
Septiembre de 2026	Plazo de entrega de la información complementaria por el Estado Parte		
2.	Peticiones de acción urgente	Art. 30 de la Convención	
2012	Registro de la primera petición de acción urgente por el Comité en relación con hechos ocurridos en México		
Junio de 2025	Registro total de peticiones de acción urgente relacionadas con México al 18 de junio 2025: 757 (de 2.064 casos registrados), de los cuales: se cerraron 78 tras la localización de la persona desaparecida y siguen activos 679		
3.	Comunicaciones individuales	Art. 31 de la Convención	
Octubre de 2020	Aceptación del procedimiento por el Estado Parte		

<i>Fecha</i>	<i>Acción</i>	<i>Marco jurídico</i>	<i>Documentos/decisiones finales</i>
Julio de 2021	Registro de la primera comunicación individual relativa a México		
Octubre de 2021	Registro de la segunda comunicación individual relativa a México		
Marzo de 2023	Aprobación del dictamen sobre la comunicación núm. 1 por el Comité		CED/C/24/D/4/2021
Julio de 2024	Registro de la tercera comunicación individual relacionada con México		
Marzo de 2025	Audiencia pública y aprobación del dictamen sobre la comunicación núm. 2 por el Comité		CED/C/28/D/5/2021
4. Country visit		Art. 33 de la Convención	
2012-2013	Recepción de la solicitud de activación del procedimiento con arreglo al artículo 33 de la Convención		
Mayo de 2013	Solicitud de información al Estado Parte sobre la solicitud recibida		
Septiembre de 2013	Reunión con el Estado Parte donde informan que invitarán al Comité		
Enero de 2014	Reiteración de la decisión del Comité de solicitar una visita		
Febrero de 2014 a marzo de 2020	Intercambios en los que México no consintió la visita o la aplazó		
30 August 2021	Aceptación por el Estado Parte de la visita del Comité a México		
15-26 November 2021	Visita del Comité a México		

<i>Fecha</i>	<i>Acción</i>	<i>Marco jurídico</i>	<i>Documentos/decisiones finales</i>
Marzo de 2022	Informe del Comité sobre su visita a México		CED/C/MEX/VR/1 (Findings) CED/C/MEX/VR/1 (Recommendations)
Agosto de 2022	Respuesta del Estado Parte al informe de visita		CED/C/MEX/OVR/1 y anexos
Septiembre de 2023	Diálogo constructivo sobre la información complementaria presentada por el Estado Parte (CED/C/MEX/AI/2) y el informe del Comité sobre su visita a México Aprobación de las observaciones finales del Comité sobre la información complementaria presentada por el Estado Parte		CED/C/MEX/OAI/2
5. Acción basada en indicios de que las desapariciones forzadas se practican de forma generalizada o sistemática		Art. 34 de la Convención	
2019	Primera solicitud de activación del procedimiento, el Comité no adopta ninguna acción		
2021	Cuatro solicitudes de activación del procedimiento El Comité decidió no activar el procedimiento para evitar el solapamiento con el procedimiento de visita		

<i>Fecha</i>	<i>Acción</i>	<i>Marco jurídico</i>	<i>Documentos/decisiones finales</i>
Marzo a octubre de 2025	Recepción de documentación por la que se solicita la activación del artículo 34 de la Convención (Federación Internacional por los Derechos Humanos y otros)		
17 de marzo a 4 de abril de 2025	28ª sesión del Comité: adopción de la decisión de solicitar al Estado Parte toda la información pertinente sobre la situación		
24 June 2025	Presentación de la solicitud al Estado Parte, con plazo de respuesta al 18 de septiembre de 2025		CED/C/MEX/A.34/RI/1
18 September 2025	Respuesta del Estado Parte (mantenida confidencial a solicitud del Estado Parte hasta la publicación de la decisión del Comité)		
18 de septiembre de 2025 a marzo 2026	Recepción de documentación pública sobre la situación		
22 de septiembre a 2 de octubre de 2025; 9 a 19 de marzo 2026	29º y 30º periodos de sesiones del Comité: análisis de la información y adopción de la decisión de llevar la cuestión, con carácter urgente, a la consideración de la Asamblea General de las Naciones Unidas por medio del Secretario General de las Naciones Unidas		CED/C/MEX/A.34/D/1