REPORT ON COMPLIANCE WITH THE CONVENTION AGAINST TORTURE AND OTHER CRUEL, INHUMAN OR DEGRADING PUNISHMENT IN RELATION TO THE HUMAN RIGHTS OF MIGRANT PERSONS IN THE FRAMEWORK OF THE PRESENTATION OF THE FIFTH AND SIXTH PERIODIC REPORT BY ARGENTINA BEFORE THE COMMITTEE AGAINST TORTURE

6OTH PERIOD OF SESSIONS

Esteemed Committee Experts:

We address you on behalf of Abogados y Abogadas del Noroeste Argentino en Derechos Humanos y Estudios Sociales (ANDHES); el Centro de Estudios Legales y Sociales (CELS); el Colectivo para La Diversidad (COPADI); la Comisión Argentina para Refugiados y Migrantes (CAREF); El Instituto Argentino para la Igualdad, Diversidad e Integración (IARPIDI); el Centro de Justicia y Derechos Humanos de la Universidad Nacional de Lanús; la Red de Migrantes y Refugiadxs in Argentina; and Todo en Sepia - Asociación de Mujeres Afrodescendientes en la Argentina, to submit information on the situation of migrants' rights in the context of the fifth and sixth periodic report by the Argentine State on the application of the Convention against Torture and other Cruel, Human or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (hereinafter the Convention or CAT).

I. Preliminary Remarks

Argentina is country with the broadest migration tradition in the Southern Cone. According to the last census in 2010, foreigners make up 4.5% of Argentina's population, amounting to 1,805,957 people.[1] Given this reality, as this Committee knows, since Law 25.871 was enacted in 2003, it has been internationally recognized[2] for regulating migration through an approach that focus on guaranteeing the human rights of migrant persons.

Migration Law 25.871 and its Regulatory Decree 616/2010 instituted a broad policy of rights around the core concepts of understanding migratory regularization as a State obligation, providing access to justice and due process in any deportation proceedings or immigration detention, and eliminating distinctions between Argentines' and foreigners' access to rights.

In detriment to this right-respectful policy, the Executive Power issued a Necessity and Urgency Decree (also known as DNU 70/2017) on January 30, 2017, repealing a substantial part of the Migration Law – passed by the Argentine Congress – and introduced a normative framework that

[1]Paraguayans are among the most represented communities at 30.5%; Bolivians at 19.1%; Chileans at 10.6%; Peruvians 8.7%; Italians 8.2% and Spaniards 5.2%. A mere 0.2% of the population is from Africa and Oceania and 0.5% from China.

[2]The adoption of Law 25.871 and it regulatory decree was celebrated by different human rights bodies from the universal and regional systems. The Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, for its part, celebrated the normative change on different occasions. The United Nations Committees, including the Committee for the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD), the Committee on Migratory Workers and the Committee against Torture, also celebrated its adoption and supported the challenges posed to its implementation in its final observations on Argentina's evaluations. The CERD even, in its latest periodic evaluation on December 9, 2016, called for the government to abstain from adopting any measure that would pose a setback with regard to the normative framework in place at that time. The committee also underlined "the lack of fluid and regular dialogue with migrant associations."

steps back in guaranteeing the rights of the migrant population. **The modifications introduced under this decree are regressive and violate the guarantees of due process and access to justice in the context of deportation and immigration detention – these situations fall under the specific concern of this Committee according to paragraphs 11, 15, and 17 of the list of issues related to Articles 2 and 3 of the Convention**.

In this sense, the normative changes put in place in January 2017 relate to issues falling within the mandate of the Committee, such as the principle of non-refoulement. Specifically, the DNU (a.) violates due process and access to justice by migrant persons as it creates a **procedure for summary deportation** for certain migrant categories; (b.) **violates the exceptional nature of immigration detention** by expanding the conditions for ordering pre-trial detentions and expanding the time limits and conditions for detention; (c.) **criminalizes migrant persons**. In other words, with limited possibilities of defense, the vast majority of migrant persons will have summary deportation procedures in which detention for migration-related reasons is authorized with few restrictions. These setbacks, in addition to worrying practices of immigration authorities identified in 2016, will be described in more detail in Section II of this document.

This new normative framework also **intensifies discriminatory and violent actions by security forces**, a problemthat will be developed in Section III.

I. **Dismantling of a normative framework that aimed to guarantee the rights of migrant persons. A new regressive regulation –** ARTICLES 2 AND 3 of the Convention: paragraphs 11, 15 and 17 on the list of issues.

Due process and access to justice in deportation procedures

The DNU creates a new summary mechanism for deporting migrant persons and alters the rules guiding migration procedures in general. At the same time, it changes the system of administrative appeals and the system of notification, limits judicial review and the right to defense in the event of a deportation order; it especially limits the application of the right to family unity or reunification and the right to free legal assistance.

In summary, under the DNU, a migrant person is left with one sole instance of administrative appeal – the previous law provided for three instances – and **the period for filing an administrative appeal will now be three days** – while the law originally provided 15 days – **and three days to contest it in court**, thus shortening the 30 days ordinarily recognized.

The DNU 70/2017 thus introduced an illusive and ineffective system of judicial oversight of public authorities. The reduction of the time periods for appeals at the administrative and judicial level in circumstances as serious as deportation impacts the effective capacity to carry out a proper defense within that timeframe. Equal access to justice for migrant persons affected by this summary migration procedure is summarily compromised.

The DNU also repeals one of the remedies designed by the Legislature to review decisions made by migration authorities. The remedy repealed constituted a significant tool of protection that authorized the review of decisions made by administrative authorities when there could have existed an “error, omission or manifest arbitrariness, violations of due process, or when new facts of sufficient significance justify said measure.”

Likewise, DNU 70/2017 introduced changes to the **system of administrative notifications** and free legal assistance in all migration procedures. This impacts the real possibilities of migrant persons to exercise their minimum rights to due process and effective legal remedy, especially in the framework of the special summary procedure with such limited timeframes.

The DNU established that the migration authority shall consider notifications not made in the person's domicile to be valid (i.e. those made in full force and effect at the migration authority reception desk). This means that migrant persons must come to the migration office to comply with said requirements, a requirement that is plainly difficult to fulfill and has a serious impact given the short timeframes provided under the summary procedure.

Moreover, under the criteria of the previous law, if a person subject to deportation procedures needed **free legal assistance**, the State was obligated to provide that through the National Public Defenders' Office and the procedural deadlines were suspended until an attorney took on the defense. Under the DNU, migrant persons must themselves request free legal assistance and prove they lack financial means to the migration authority. The wording of the DNU does not, however, provide any indication as to how to prove lack of financial means. In other words, if the migrant person does not request access to free legal assistance or does not faithfully prove their lack of financial means, the procedure – which, in the case of deportation generally includes detention – goes forward without any type of legal assistance from the State.

Another situation that the DNU modifies is the protection of the right to family unity in a migratory context,[3] which is an expression of the general right to the protection of the family.[4] **The DNU restricts and eliminates the possibility of alleging matters of "family unity" or "family reunification" in the majority of cases that may lead to deportation** and, moreover, in the few circumstances that allow for this allegation, it requires proof before the administrative authority that the family is cohabitating, excluding any member who may be emotionally or economically estranged. In other words, the exercise of the right to reunification or family unity is up to the discretion of the administrative authorities, and it is even graver that the DNU has also restricted judicial review of the decisions made by the administrative authority. This means that in the event of a judicial position regarding an administrative decision on deportation, the judge may not evaluate how the criteria of family unity or ties were applied.

One hard set of data that shows the change in Argentinian migration policy is the number of deportations. **In 2016, there was an exponential increase in the figures of deportation orders**, which suggest a more systematic activation of this mechanism by the administrative authority, even before the adoption of the DNU. In 2014, there were 1,760 deportation rulings; in 2015 there were 1,908 and as of September 2016 that number had reached 3,258, an increase of 70% compared to the previous year.[5] This increase can find two explanations. On one hand, as the DNU

[3]Law 25.871 recognizes the relevance of right to family reunification. And its Article 10 provides that: "The State shall guarantee the right to family reunification of immigrants with their parents, spouses, single minor children or older children with disabilities." It further establishes the objective of "guaranteeing the exercise of the right to family reunification."

[4]This right has been recognized under Article 14a of the Argentine Constitution; Article 9 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child; Articles 11.2 and 17 of the American Convention on Human Rights and, more specifically, in Article 44 of the United Nations International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of their Families.

[5] These numbers were presented by the National Migration Office itself in response to a request for reports from the National University of Lanús in September 2016.

now seems to authorize, the National Migration Office was already carrying out accelerated deportation procedures. On the other, those numbers could likewise reflect cases rejected under the previous administration that had been decided otherwise. In either case, the contents of the DNU confirm that there are substantial changes to migration policy priorities when it comes to deciding administrative cases.

Immigration Detention

According to the logic behind the reduction in judicial and procedural guarantees, DNU 70/2017 introduced modifications that have a concrete impact on the freedom of movement of migrant persons subject to deportation proceedings. It authorizes new circumstances for detention for migration-related reasons, for longer periods of time and under more lax parameters and procedures for administrative authorities.

While the original Article 70 of law 25.871 only authorized detention under final, consensual deportation orders and allowed for detention only in exceptional cases to ensure compliance with a court-ordered detention order, final or not. **The text of the DNU authorizes deprivation of liberty as of the commencement of the summary procedure, without any "exceptionality" requirement and when the court has not even issued the deportation order.**. Therefore, the Summary Trial Procedure may potentially be put to constant use and abuse by authorities. It is essential that, to the extent that this law allows requesting deprivation of liberty, it provide the parameters under which this would be justifiable in keeping with the criteria of legality, necessity, purpose and exceptional nature of the measure.

Furthermore, **judicial oversight of detention is severely compromised**. The DNU does not require the migration authority to provide any element for the judge to be able to evaluate the detention request nor does it specify the judge's authority to reject the request. According to the detention regulation introduced under DNU 70/2017, judicial action in the case of detention requests seems to be reduced to a procedural formality.

Another modification has to do with the cases in which the administrative authority submits a request to extend deprivation of liberty: the new regulation does not require authorities to give the reasons for such an extension or why an alternative measure is not warranted, thus leading to increased detention times. Moreover, if the migrant person files administrative or judicial actions to challenge any decision, **detention is extended indefinitely as long as those proceedings go on**; this poses a dilemma of coercion that is impossible to sustain under national and international legal framework.

Adding to the DNU's impact on freedom of movement, and the creation of new grounds for detaining persons, using this measure systematically rather than as an exception or last resort, further limits the exercise of minimum guarantees of due process and access to justice. This is even more so when the person is behind bars. One must wonder how that person is to gather evidence regarding their actual situation in Argentina and challenge the arguments brought against them by migration authorities, or investigate the conditions linked to their previous migration procedures, among other situations that could be needed to prepare an appropriate legal defense.

In this sense, it should be further underscored that in August 2016, the national government placed a notice on the National Migration Office web site stating that it would build and authorize

a **migrant detention center**, as a tool for "combatting migratory irregularity." In light of the reaction from social actors, this message was modified on three occasions. The third version, which was ultimately taken down from the web site, said that a detention center would be built to hold: "foreigners with criminal records or illegal entry into the country (…) and who have final deportation orders and are in "detention" according to a reasoned court decision". The DNM signed an agreement with the city of Buenos Aires, which provided a property to establish the center. Currently, the renovations are being done for its inauguration, which is expected to happenin the coming months.

One of the reasons the current administration has given for the creation of the migrant detention center is that some migrants are being held in police stations or penitentiaries; however they say so without explaining which specific situations they mean. These places are, of course, unsuitable for holding persons under detention orders. However, the existence of the detention center in addition to the expansion of causes for deportation and detention, the limits on guarantees of due process and the right to defense and the reduction of judicial oversight and access to justice by migrant persons, provide evidence that immigration detention will become more frequent and systematic.

Effects of the normative changes. Case examples.

Throughout 2016 we have received concrete cases that exemplify the consequences of the changes introduced by the DNU. Notably, detentions carried out both before deportation orders are issued and in conjunction with them, and summary deportation processes that fail to guarantee due process or access to justice for migrant persons and ignore ties in the country and family unity. These practices were denounced as contrary to the Migration Law, but are now being legalized according to the new regulations introduced by the DNU, even if they still fail to comply with the broader normative framework in Argentina as well as international treaties and jurisprudence.

As an example, CELS, UNla and Caref submitted an amicus curiae brief in the Case of *Town of Rafaela, Santa Fe Province*, where three Chinese citizens were detained for over 150 days because they had entered the country at an unauthorized border crossing, ane were thus unable to regularize their migratory status under any circumstances (Article 29 of the Migration Law). For this reason, a deportation order was issued almost at the same time that the detention request was submitted to the federal judge. They were held in a facility of the gendarmerie, without access to consular assistance or an interpreter and under a deportation order that was neither definitive nor consensual. In accordance with the previous normative framework, these persons were released after a bail was paid and they continue to await the execution of their deportation order.

In fact, in 2016 practices such as these were rejected by the justice system. In a decision by Criminal Appeals Court 4,[6] the court ruled in favor of four Chinese citizens in a similar case, arguing that the protection of the rights of migrants detained for administrative reasons must be ensured through proper, timely and effective judicial channels and that the exceptional nature of the detention must be duly substantiated based on the specific case.

[6] Link to Federal Criminal Appeals Court No. 4 FRO 27459/2016/CFC1 N° 1065/16.4 at: http://www.cij.gov.ar/nota-22930-Casaci-n-federal-hizo-lugar-a-un-planteo-contra-el-rechazo-de-habeas-corpus-a-favor-de-extranjeros-retenidos-por-inmigraci-n-irregular-hace-90-d-as.html

Rigoberto Bernal Case[7]

On June 28, 2016 the Gendarmerie detained Bernal, a Paraguayan resident of Villa 21 in the Retiro area of the city of Buenos Aires, and deported him that same day to Ciudad del Este, Paraguay. Bernal is the father of a 4-year-old daughter and his spouse was pregnant at the time of his deportation. Four days later, she reported his disappearance at the Territorial Agencies for Access to Justice (ATAJO) in Villa 31, the same day Bernal called her from Ciudad del Este to let her know he had been deported.

The National Migration Office (DNM) justified Bernal's deportation based on the fact that he had a criminal record. The legal strategies developed by ATAJO and the National Public Defenders' Office led to the suspension of the deportation decision. Federal Contentious-Administrative Court 11 ordered migration authorities to allow him to re-enter the country; however, that order was not honored several times: Bernal made unsuccessfully attempts to re-enter, none of which were recorded in the rejection books at the border. Finally, on October 26, Examining Court 29 issued a resolution ordering the National Migrations director to "immediately annul the prohibition on entering the country," whereby Bernal was able to re-enter in November, after having spent months grappling with a state decision that infringed his rights.

H.J. Case[8]

Mr. H. J. was arbitrarily arrested and deported from Argentina by the DNM on January 20, 2017 to his native country of Peru. The deportation was based on a criminal conviction against Mr. H. J. from February 19, 2004, in which he was found guilty of the crime of narcotics possession with intent to sell. The sentence for said conviction expired on January 8, 2006, the statute of limitations on that record lapsing until January 8, 2016. In other words, for this particular case, the criminal record ceased to exist 10 years after fulfillment of the sentence. Therefore, the deportation order issued for Mr. H. J. was carried out despite the inexistence of a criminal record at the time of his detention and subsequent deportation. At the same time, the decision also ignored the fact that his family members are permanent residents of Argentina.

In light of this situation, his attorney filed a petition for habeas corpus and constitutional protection (amparo), requesting that the DNM cease their actions and basing his arguments on the criteria of family unity and reunification provided under Law 25.871.

[7] This case became public knowledge. See https://www.pagina12.com.ar/diario/sociedad/3-314037-2016-11-12.html y https://www.pagina12.com.ar/diario/sociedad/3-313130-2016-11-01.html

[8] This case made it to the Immigrant and Refugee Rights Clinic, jointly coordinated by CELS, CAREF and the University of Buenos Aires (UBA) Law School since 2002. The Clinic advises and sponsors an average 300 cases annually for migrant and/or refugee persons.

The courts of first and second instance rejected those petitions. The Appeals Chamber, however, considered that the fact that Mr. H. J. had children should be taken into account, thus ordering the DNM to suspend the deportation. Nevertheless, because the deportation had already been carried out by that time, the Appeals ruling was rendered abstract. The court ordered the DNM to explain whether it taken Mr. H. J.'s family situation into consideration; the DNM alleged that it had but that it does not oblige the immigration office to waive the deportation order. The writ of habeas corpus was ultimately rejected.

Criminalization of migrant persons

DNU 70/2017 was passed in the context of a political decision by the national government to link migration to crime. In fact, the government announced this reform as part of its security policy. As can be seen on the National Migration Office's web site, on January 17, 2017, President Mauricio Macri asserted that, "We cannot allow delinquency to continue choosing Argentina as a place to commit crime."[9] In this sense, the reasons to adopt the DNU are linked to an alleged urgency of "public security."

Nevertheless, the original wording of Law 25.871 already established the mechanisms for deporting anyone with a definitive court conviction for serious crimes, while the reform introduced under the DNU, as we explained in detail, involves procedural changes that go beyond the issue of migrants who have committed crimes. It is thus clear that security policy is not what is really at stake. This reform by decree is aimed at expanding and toughening oversight of the migrant population in this country.

As such, the DNU expands the grounds for impeding entry and permanency in the country and for canceling the regular residence of migrants that have criminal records. For starters, these impediments can now be applied to any migrant who has committed a crime that could warrant detention, while Law 25.871 established that only criminal sentences exceeding three years of imprisonment could lead to cancel permanency in Argentina. At the same time, the DNU requires that judicial officials notify the National Migration Office of the existence of criminal cases in which this is identified, thus initiating the deportation procedure or review of residencies already issued. In the case of final proceedings for any crime with a prison sentence, a migrant may be deported by an express procedure, with few possibilities of defense, as exposed previously. This expansion of causes for deportation infringes the presumption of innocence of migrant persons, submitting them to the discretion of the security forces, who can now bring unsubstantiated cases against them and deport them based on only those grounds. This new legal power will mean that migrants will be subject to institutional violence, particularly those who work on the streets or who are under pre-trial custody.

This expansion of the impediments to entry, permanency, and the cancelation of residency status for migrants with criminal records, regardless of the severity of the crime, is further aggravated by the fact that the summary procedure is also applied to migrants who have committed administrative infractions. This includes the failure to inform migration authorities about the existence of records of "security force requirements" or "entry at an unauthorized point." Another

[9] See in this respect: http://www.migraciones.gov.ar/accesible/indexP.php?mostrar_novedad=3377

added impediment refers to cases of "institutional severity", a concept that the DNU does not define, clarify or explain.

In other words, the procedure for exceptional deportation will be applied in the majority of cases subject to deportation. For any crime punishable by deprivation of liberty as well as for administrative infractions, migrant persons will be submitted to the same summary deportation process, a process that, in and of itself, violates the guarantees of due process, access to justice and their right to family unity, as we pointed out previously.

Suggested Questions for the State

1. What measures is the State taking to effectively guarantee due process and access to justice in deportation procedures, in particular with regard to the enactment of Necessity and Urgency Decree No. 70/2017?
2. What measures are being taken to ensure that immigration detention is only a measure of last resort, in order to guarantee by law and in practice alternatives to detention and ensure that any exceptional detentions comply with all principles and standards?
3. What measures are being adopted to guarantee the presumption of innocence of migrant persons under criminal proceedings?

Recommendations for the State

1. Annul the normative changes instituted in the summary migration procedure for the deportation of migrant persons.
2. Develop the necessary measures to effectively guarantee free legal counsel in migratory detention and deportation procedures.
3. Ensure that migration-related legislation includes the principle of using detention in migration cases only as a measure of last resort, as well as other measures as an alternative to detention – and their effective application – ensure full and effective legal protection in cases in which detention is initiated as an exceptional measure, and prohibit absolutely the detention of children and families.
4. Ensure the absolute guarantee of compliance with the principle of non-refoulement, particularly in the framework of the Special Summary Migratory Procedures.

II. Raids and ill treatment of migrant persons by security forces – ARTICLE 16 of the Convention: paragraph 39 on the list of issues

In the context of the criminalization and stigmatization of migrant persons due to the change in Argentina's migration policy, is it important to take stock of the use of racial profiling and practices of persecution marked by episodes of ill treatment at the hands of the police against migrants of African descent and other Latin Americans, which are becoming increasingly common.

In the case of Senegalese people, the most common way of survival is street vending, because they cannot find work in other sectors of the economy. In general terms, they are persecuted, harassed and humiliated on a daily basis by police. Court statistics show the systematic and selective nature of persecution against these persons when they try to resell their wares on the

street.[10] The police write them up for "street vending without a permit," citations that are frequently dismissed in court for lack of merit.

In 2013, the Argentine Attorney General's Office created the Complex Investigation Coordinating Unit, which currently intervenes in investigations of street vending, ordering violent raids on the homes of the Senegalese, confiscating their merchandise and personal belongings, which are never recovered in most cases.[11] This violent, disproportionate action by the Attorney General's Office with the police has provoked reaction by the Senegalese community, who carried out their first march from the National Congress to the City Legislature in protest of the violence and criminalization carried out against them.[12] Such violent actions by the police can be seen in the case of A. D., detailed below. To this report we have attached a photo illustrating the time of the events.[13]

A.D. Case[14]

On Wednesday, March 2, 2017 around 16:45, a city police operation was carried out in Plaza Constitución in the city of Buenos Aires against *manteros* (street peddlers). In an unconventional manner, the procedure adopted by the police was to directly confiscate A. D.'s merchandise, giving him no prior warning or time to remove it himself.

Faced with this situation, A. D. tried to stop the police from removing his merchandise. A police agent then grabbed him and applied a restraint technique, leaving him unconscious on the ground. When A. D. didn't respond, they had to call an ambulance and had him him taken to Argerich Hospital, escorted by two officers. While he awaited examination, he remained in handcuffs with his hands behind his back. Upon his release from the hospital, he was taken in handcuffs to Precinct 30. On the following morning, he was transferred to Precinct 28, where he remained for the rest of the day until his release around 18.30. A. D. was charged with resisting arrest, but the gross actions by police in this case have not been investigated.

There has also been a documented rise in police persecution based on racial profiling in conjunction with trans-phobia.[15] The *Zambrano* case is an example. In the early morning of

[10] There are a disproportionate number of citations written compared to the number of convictions obtained: while the conviction rate for street vending in public is 1.23 convictions for every 100 cases, the average number of convictions for all violations is 2.29 per 100. This disproportion of more than 50% with the overall average indicates that the police are initiating this type of proceeding without legal grounds to a far greater extent than they do for other violations.

[11] See videos on method for street vending raids at:
https://youtu.be/VEJ0nWra9ds
https://youtu.be/qDJ3ygPtNQg
https://youtu.be/XSXCxRdq1KQ

[12] See http://www.abranpasoradio.com.ar/vendedores-ambulantes-de-senegal-marcharon-contra-la-metropolitana/, and a video of the march, made by La Vaca magazine, at https://youtu.be/3pseo94MKbw

[13] See Annex I.

[14] Nengumbi Sukama of the Argentine Institute for Equality, Diversity and Integration (IARPIDI) took action in this case.

[15] See the reports submitted by the Gender Observatory of the Public Defenders' Office for Buenos Aires Province and another by OTRANS.

September 4, 2016, around 25 transgender and transvestite women of Peruvian and Ecuadorian nationality were detained in a police raid touted as an “operation against narco-transvestites.” Nine people were taken to the 9th precinct, four were held for over a week.However only one of them was found to posses narcotics hidden in her undergarments, but even so it amounted to less than 1 gram. On September 12, the Court of La Plata Appeals and Guarantees Chamber declared the police procedure null and void, considering it “utterly degrading.” The decision in this historic case for the community renders account of violent police action that criminalizes and persecutes trans and transvestite migrants and recognizes that their basic human rights are not respected by the police or the justice system.

The merciless treatment of the transvestite and transsexual migrant population has been striking in the city of La Plata. The police carry out these degrading searches of trans women in public, and they are prosecuted for drug dealing based on possession of a small quantity of narcotics. These people are held in police precincts along with men, where they are subjected to abuse and gender violence. They are not provided with medical assistance or basic care. So far in 2017, two trans women, Angie Velazquez Ramirez and Pamela Macedo Panduro, have died under these conditions, according to reports by the OTRANS Argentina organization. The use of these methods against trans migrant persons is of great concern.[16]

Suggested Questions

1. What measures have been adopted to prevent episodes of ill treatment against migrant persons at the hands of security forces?

2. What methods will be adopted to avoid arbitrary detentions, degrading searches and detentions of transsexual migrants in police precincts under humiliating conditions?

Recommendations

1. Adopt the proper administrative and judicial measures to remove police officials implicated in acts of discrimination from continued duty on the force.

2. Adopt the necessary measures to guarantee that security forces, in the framework of other crime prevention duties, do not take on administrative functions related to migration procedures, such as those associated with oversight of residency status.

[16]See lhttp://cosecharoja.org/otra-vez-muere-una-muere-una-trans-en-prision/