



OVERLOOKED,

UNDER-PROTECTED

MEXICO'S DEADLY *REFOULEMENT* OF CENTRAL AMERICANS SEEKING ASYLUM

I WELCOME

AMNESTY
INTERNATIONAL



Amnesty International is a global movement of more than 7 million people who campaign for a world where human rights are enjoyed by all.

Our vision is for every person to enjoy all the rights enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other international human rights standards.

We are independent of any government, political ideology, economic interest or religion and are funded mainly by our membership and public donations.

© Amnesty International 2018

Except where otherwise noted, content in this document is licensed under a Creative Commons (attribution, non-commercial, no derivatives, international 4.0) licence.

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/legalcode>

For more information please visit the permissions page on our website: www.amnesty.org

Where material is attributed to a copyright owner other than Amnesty International this material is not subject to the Creative Commons licence.

First published in 2018 by Amnesty International Ltd
Peter Benenson House, 1 Easton Street, London WC1X 0DW, UK



Cover photo:

Illustration by Joaquín Castro Caceres for Amnistía Internacional

© Amnesty International / Joaquín Castro Caceres

Index: AMR 41/7602/2018

Original language: English

amnesty.org

CONTENTS

GLOSSARY	4
1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	5
1.1 Methodology	6
2. FALLING THROUGH THE CRACKS: FAILURES IN SCREENING PROCESSES	8
2.1 First stage of screening by INM field agents	10
2.2 Falling through the cracks: Second stage of screening in detention centres	11
3. LEGAL LIMBO AND HASTY RETURNS	14
3.1 Voluntary return papers	14
3.2 The failure to fully inform individuals about their casefile	16
3.3 Failures of INM information systems	16
4. ILL-TREATMENT OF MIGRANTS AS PART OF THE DEPORTIONS MACHINE	18
4.1 Arbitrary detention of asylum seekers and its impact on <i>refoulement</i>	20
5. RECOMMENDATIONS	22

GLOSSARY

TERM	DESCRIPTION
REFUGEE	A refugee is a person who has fled from their own country because they have a well-founded fear of persecution and their government cannot or will not protect them. Asylum procedures are designed to determine whether someone meets the legal definition of a refugee. When a country recognizes someone as a refugee, it gives them international protection as a substitute for the protection of their home country.
ASYLUM-SEEKER	An asylum-seeker is someone who has left their country seeking protection but has yet to be recognized as a refugee. During the time that their asylum claim is being examined, the asylum-seeker must not be forced to return to their country of origin. Under international law, being a refugee is a fact-based status, and arises before the official, legal grant of asylum.
MIGRANT	A migrant is a person who moves from one country to another to live and usually to work, either temporarily or permanently, or to be reunited with family members. Regular migrants are foreign nationals who, under domestic law, are entitled to stay in the country. Irregular migrants are foreign nationals whose migration status does not comply with the requirements of domestic immigration legislation and rules. They are also called “undocumented migrants”. The term “irregular” refers only to a person’s entry or stay. Amnesty International does not use the term “illegal migrant.”
UN REFUGEE CONVENTION AND PROTOCOL	The 1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees is the core binding international treaty that serves as the basis for international refugee law. The 1967 Protocol relating to the Status of Refugees retakes the entire content of the 1951 Convention and simply adds an extension on its application to all refugees, not just those arising from specific time bound conflicts in the 1940s and 50s. Mexico has ratified both the Convention and the Protocol while the USA has ratified the Protocol, which gives it identical obligations. This treaty, along with the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights of 1966, ratified by both USA and Mexico, provide a series of fundamental rights to be enjoyed by all humans.
REFOULEMENT	<i>Refoulement</i> is the forcible return of an individual to a country where they would be at real risk of serious human rights violations (the terms “persecution” and “serious harm” are alternatively used). Individuals in this situation are entitled to international protection; it is prohibited by international law to return refugees and asylum-seekers to the country they fled – this is known as the principle of non- <i>refoulement</i> . The principle also applies to other people (including irregular migrants) who risk serious human rights violations such as torture, even if they do not meet the legal definition of a refugee. Indirect <i>refoulement</i> occurs when one country forcibly sends them to a place where they at risk of onwards <i>refoulement</i> ; this is also prohibited under international law.
MARAS	Colloquial name commonly given to organized groups from the Northern Triangle of Central America that are characterized by violent criminal activities and generally associated with territorial control.

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Mexico is witnessing a hidden refugee crisis on its doorstep. For a number of years, citizens from nearby countries who formerly passed through Mexico in search of economic opportunities have been leaving their countries due to fear for their lives and personal liberty. This briefing analyses the results of a survey carried out by Amnesty International with 500 responses from migrants and people seeking asylum travelling through Mexico. The information presented demonstrates that the Mexican government is routinely failing in its obligations under international law to protect those who are in need of international protection, as well as repeatedly violating the *non-refoulement* principle¹, a binding pillar of international law that prohibits the return of people to a real risk of persecution or other serious human rights violations. These failures by the Mexican government in many cases can cost the lives of those returned to the country from which they fled.

The so-called “Northern Triangle” countries of Guatemala, El Salvador and Honduras continue to experience generalized violence, with homicide rates four to eight times higher than what the World Health Organization considers “epidemic” homicide levels.² Nearly all of the respondents to Amnesty International’s survey came from these three Central American countries.³ Of those detained by Mexican authorities, 84% (263 out of 310 that answered the question) did not desire to be returned to their country. Of these, 54% (167 out of 310) identified violence and fear as a principal reason for not wanting to go back to their country, and 35% (108 out of 310) identified direct personal threats to their life back home as the reason for not wanting to return.

Violations by Mexican authorities of the *non-refoulement* principle directly affect human lives and deny protection to those most at need. One man who came to Mexico seeking asylum after fleeing death threats in Honduras told Amnesty International he wept in desperation to try to stop his deportation, yet officials did not listen to him or inform him of his right to lodge an asylum claim, and simply deported him back to his country. This testimony echoes dozens collected by Amnesty International and contrasts with the official responses received from Mexican authorities, who informed Amnesty International that *refoulement* cases were rare.

Amnesty International analysed the 500 responses received and found 120 testimonies that gave solid indications that a *refoulement* had occurred, which is 24% of the total set of responses, and equates to 40% of the responses provided by those individuals who had been detained by the National Institute of Migration (INM). These testimonies involved people explicitly seeking asylum or expressing fear for their lives in their country of origin, yet nevertheless being ignored by the INM and deported to their country.

In addition, Amnesty International found that 75% of those people detained by the INM were not informed of their right to seek asylum in Mexico, despite the fact that Mexican law expressly requires this and public officials assured Amnesty International that the requirement is complied with. Amnesty International also found evidence of a number of procedural violations of the rights that people seeking asylum should be afforded in line with international human rights law. These violations effectively deny them the possibility to challenge their deportation and to obtain protection in Mexico.

1. Article 33 of the 1951 UN Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees provides that states must not return persons to territories where their “life or freedom” would be threatened. The *non-refoulement* principle is also considered a binding principle of international customary law.

2. The World Health Organization (WHO) considers a murder rate of more than 10 per 100,000 inhabitants to be an epidemic level. However, in 2016, the murder rate in El Salvador was recorded as 81.2 per 100,000 inhabitants (National Civil Police), in Honduras 58.9 per 100,000 (SEPOL) and in Guatemala 27.3 per 100,000 (National Civil Police). 2017 figures from these same sources noted 60 per 100,000 for El Salvador, 42.8 per 100,000 for Honduras, and 26.1 per 100,000 for Guatemala.

3. Of the 385 people interviewed, 208 people were from Honduras, 97 from El Salvador, 59 from Guatemala, and a series of other countries represented less than five cases each

1.1 METHODOLOGY

Between May and September 2017 Amnesty International carried out a survey of irregular migrants and asylum seekers with the aim of understanding how Mexican authorities are implementing their obligations to ensure the effective enjoyment of the right to seek asylum in Mexico. Surveys were carried out in queues for government offices, lawyers and UN offices, as well as in migrant shelters, in the southern states of Chiapas, Tabasco and the northern state of Coahuila. Surveys were also carried out in a reception centre for deportees in Guatemala. Three hundred and eighty-five people were surveyed in individual interviews responding to a standardized questionnaire that was read out to them.⁴ Many of these people detailed multiple experiences of entering Mexico, giving a total of 500 responses to the questionnaire based on 500 discrete episodes of leaving one's country. Many migrants and people seeking asylum cross by land into Mexico more than once, which means that the data set for this survey was based on each separate experience of crossing into Mexico. At times, one interviewee filled out a number of survey responses, based on separate journeys they had made over the years.

Eighty-two per cent of the interviewees were men, 17% were women, 1% did not wish to specify their gender and 2 cases identified as transgender. The over-representation of males is reflected in the migratory flow as noted by official statistics, with females accounting for approximately a quarter of the apprehensions of irregular migrants carried out in 2017.⁵ Nevertheless, this official data does not take into account other routes that may be more precarious or clandestine that women may be forced to make and precise assessments of women-led migration routes are not readily available.


Of the 500 survey responses collected by Amnesty International, 297 pertained to migrants or people seeking asylum that had been at one point apprehended by the INM. The rest had either never been apprehended by Mexican officials, or had been apprehended by police (116 responses) the Army (11 responses) or the Navy (4 responses). Further detail on the role of the police in apprehending migrants (mostly illegally), will be outlined briefly below, however the focus of this briefing is the role of migration authorities. Survey responses were anonymous and participants were offered no benefit in their individual cases in return. The data set gathered is not a randomized sample of the estimated 500,000 irregular migrants that cross Mexico's southern border annually.⁶ As such, the percentages presented here in graphs, while an indication of wider trends, are not a statistical sample of the hundreds of thousands of people that pass through Mexico each year. Nevertheless, the data obtained from the survey provides important information on the common practices of Mexican authorities in order to inform Amnesty International's recommendations.

4. Of the 385 people surveyed, 208 people were from Honduras, 97 from El Salvador, 59 from Guatemala, and a series of other countries represented less than five cases each.

5. From January to November 2017, females accounted for 29% of irregular migrants apprehended by the INM: See: Unit for Migratory Policy, Ministry of the Interior, Unidad de Política Migratoria, Secretaría de Gobernación, Extranjeros Presentados y Devueltos, 2017 Cuadro 3.1.3: Eventos de extranjeros presentados ante la autoridad migratoria, según grupos de edad, condición de viaje y sexo, available at: http://www.politicamigratoria.gob.mx/es_mx/SEGOB/Extranjeros_presentados_y_devueltos. Last accessed XX January 2018

6. United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, "Factsheet – Mexico" February 2017 - Available at: <http://reporting.unhcr.org/sites/default/files/Mexico%20Fact%20Sheet%20-%20Februrary%202017.pdf>

THE HUMAN EXPERIENCE OF REFOULEMENT



1. You flee threats to your life and grave danger.
2. You enter Mexico without documents.
3. Tired and hungry, you travel by foot or bus.
4. Migration agents (INM) detain you without explaining anything to you.
5. They lock you up without explaining your right to seek protection in Mexico.
6. They pressure you to sign a deportation paper.
7. They deport you by bus to your possible death back in your country.

OVERLOOKED, UNDER-PROTECTED

MEXICO'S DEADLY REFOULEMENT OF CENTRAL AMERICANS SEEKING ASYLUM
Amnesty International

2. FALLING THROUGH THE CRACKS: FAILURES IN SCREENING PROCESSES

“Here we are not interested in your lives. Our job is to deport you.”

Mexican INM agent in response to a 27 year old Honduran man who expressed fear of returning to his country.⁷


The National Institute of Migration (INM) is the federal government body responsible for regulating borders, travel and residence documents and the flow of regular and irregular migration throughout the country. The INM is also responsible for apprehending and deporting irregular migrants. It pertains to the Interior Ministry and has a staff of close to 6,000.⁸ The officials of the INM that have direct contact with people seeking asylum generally fall into two categories: INM field agents who carry out a first stage of interception and apprehensions in field activities such as highways or checkpoints; and INM officials assigned to migration detention centres, of which the INM has 54 throughout the country.

Amnesty International analysed the 500 survey responses received and found 120 testimonies that gave solid indications that a *refoulement* had occurred, which is 24% of the total set of responses, and equates to 40% of the responses provided by those individuals that had specifically been detained by the INM. These testimonies involved people seeking asylum more specifically expressing fear for their lives in their country of origin, yet despite this being ignored by the INM and deported to their country of origin.

These failures are more than simply negligent practices, and each case of *refoulement* is a human rights violation that risks costing the lives of people seeking asylum. The practical experience of an illegal deportation or *refoulement* involves the return of a person seeking asylum by land to Guatemala, Honduras and El Salvador. In the case of El Salvador and Honduras, these countries comprise limited amounts of territory where *maras* networks stretch across nearly all regions. Deportation centres and highway drop-off points for deportees are easily trackable places for these powerful and violent networks to operate and persecute deportees from different parts of the country.

7. Anonymous survey response from a 27 year old Honduran man interviewed by Amnesty International in the city of Saltillo on 18 September 2017

8. According to the Federal Budget of 2017 (*Presupuesto de Egresos de la Federación*, 2017), the INM had a staff of 5,809 employees.



Amnesty International interviewed Saúl just days before he was murdered. [An asterisk next to his name* indicates Amnesty International has changed the name in order to protect his identity.]
©Amnesty International/Encarni Pindado

SAÚL*: MURDERED THREE WEEKS AFTER BEING ILLEGALLY DEPORTED BACK TO HONDURAS BY THE INM

Saúl worked in the transport industry as a bus driver in Honduras. The transport industry has been specifically outlined by the UNHCR as one of five specific categories of at-risk profiles within the context of widespread violence in Honduras, given the grip that *maras* have through demanding bus drivers extortions or “war taxes.” In November 2015 Saúl suffered an armed attack in which two of his sons were seriously wounded. Fearing for his life, Saúl fled to Mexico and applied for asylum. The COMAR denied him asylum arguing that he had options for security in his country, and the INM subsequently violated the *non-refoulement* principle by deporting him within the 15 day legal window in which he had the right to appeal his claim. Amnesty International researchers interviewed Saúl in Honduras in July 2016, three weeks after he had been deported. He expressed an acute fear for his life and had already suffered an attack in his house on arriving home. A few days later, Saul was murdered.

Officials of the INM are required by domestic law to “detect foreigners that, based on their expressions to the authority, or indeed based on their personal condition, can be presumed to be possible asylum seekers, informing them of their right to request asylum.”⁹ They are also required to channel those people that express their intention to seek asylum to Mexico’s refugee agency, the *Comisión Mexicana de Ayuda a Refugiados* (COMAR).¹⁰ The law and regulations do not distinguish between different categories of INM officials in relation to this obligation, as all are required to comply with these requirements, whether they are field agents or officials in detention centres. A representative of the INM informed Amnesty International that regardless of whether INM officials carry out activities related to interception and apprehensions in field operations, or whether they are in migration detention centres, they are all given uniform training on human rights and international refugee law.¹¹ Indeed, authorities should be capable of screening for protection needs in a variety of settings.¹²

9. Article 16 of the Reglamento de la Ley sobre Refugiados y Protección Complementaria, available at: http://www.diputados.gob.mx/LeyesBiblio/regley/Reg_LRPC.pdf

10. Article 21 of Mexico’s Refugee Law (*Ley de Refugiados y Protección Complementaria*) outlines that: “Any authority that becomes aware of the intention of a foreigner to seek refugee status, must immediately advise in writing to the Ministry of the Interior [to which the COMAR pertains.] The failure to comply with the requirement will be sanctioned in line with the legal stipulations on responsibility of public servants. [Own translation].

11. Amnesty International interview with INM delegation in Chiapas, southern Mexico, 16 August 2017

12. The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) outlines that “Screening and referral can be conducted at border or coastal entry points, in group reception facilities or in places where detention takes place (including detention centres). See: United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, “The 10-point action plan: Mechanisms for Screening and Referral”, available at: <http://www.refworld.org/pdfid/5804e0f44.pdf>, page 119.

2.1. FIRST STAGE OF SCREENING BY INM FIELD AGENTS

“The INM agent said to me: now that you've been detained, you're screwed and you're gonna get deported to your country.”

Comments from a Honduran man¹³ who had fled death threats, describing the response he received from an INM field agent when he expressed his fear of returning.

The field agents of the INM are often the very first point of contact with Mexican authorities for a number of migrants and people seeking asylum. Yet, they do not have their names on their official uniforms, and in many cases function as a faceless force dedicated to apprehending migrants and asylum seekers and turning them over to migration detention centres without an individualized assessment of each detainee's personal circumstances and protection needs.

Amnesty International analysed the conduct of INM field agents and found that this first stage of screening during interception and apprehension of migrants displays overt failures to detect people seeking asylum and act accordingly. Amnesty International noted just 10 cases out of 297 people apprehended by the INM where field agents responded according to the law, by explaining asylum seekers their right to seek protection in Mexico and informing them of the procedure they could undergo in the COMAR. While these are promising practices from public officials, the fact that this was the minority of cases is extremely concerning and points to grave and systemic failures by the INM to comply with law and international human rights obligations. The vast majority of cases involved INM field agents ignoring or at times humiliating people seeking asylum in response to their expressions of fear of return to their country.

Amnesty International found that 69% of those that had been apprehended by INM noted that the field agent never asked them their reasons for having left their country. This is despite the fact that in the Latin American Regional Guidelines for the preliminary identification and referral mechanisms for Migrant Populations,¹⁴ one of the preliminary questions that should be asked to irregular migrants is why the person left their country. While this is one of a series of questions that can be asked during the first stages of identification of asylum-seekers and refugees, and Amnesty International recommends more precise questions,¹⁵ the fact that field agents did not pose even such entry-level questions reveals a lack of adequate attention to their legal obligations to screen for people seeking asylum. Many responses to Amnesty International's questionnaire noted that INM field agents did not allow migrants and people seeking asylum to speak and simply shouted orders at them and loaded them into vans.

A number of survey responses pointed to the indifference of INM field agents to the comments from people seeking asylum as to their fear of returning to their country; comments that by law should detonate a response from the agent that informs asylum authorities of the intention of the person to seek asylum.¹⁶ A number of responses to Amnesty International's survey outlined a rude or teasing attitude from INM agents. INM field agents routinely ignored asylum seekers' concerns, and told asylum seekers they could not do anything and that they should talk to their colleagues once they arrived at the migration detention centre. This response, as will be seen below, is inadequate, given the fact that the processes in the migration detention centres also routinely fail to detect people seeking asylum.

13. Interview response to survey carried out with Honduran man in Tapachula, Chiapas state, 14 August 2017

14. These guidelines were agreed upon in an IOM and UNHCR sanctioned process that produced this document in 2013: <http://rosanjose.iom.int/site/sites/default/files/LINEAMIENTOS%20ingles.pdf> Page 19.


15. See Amnesty International discussion of screening procedures in Italy: *Hotspot Italy: How EU's flagship approach leads to violations of refugee and migrant rights*, 3 November 2016, Index number: EUR 30/5004/2016, p34ff.

16. Op Cit. See footnote 9.

One person seeking asylum told Amnesty International “I asked [the INM field agents] for asylum, and they told me that it didn’t exist, and that in Mexico they didn’t like Hondurans because we commit mischief.” Another migrant told Amnesty International “the field agents know that you don’t know your rights. They say whatever they want.”

WHAT WAS THE INM FIELD AGENT’S ATTITUDE WHEN YOU EXPRESSED YOUR REASONS FOR NOT WANTING TO RETURN TO YOUR COUNTRY?

(171 responses to this question)



2.2 FALLING THROUGH THE CRACKS: SECOND STAGE OF SCREENING IN DETENTION CENTRES

Mexico has 54 migration detention centres, many of which are highly securitized and controlled facilities resembling prison-style conditions.¹⁷ These detention centres are the second stage of processing for irregular migrants and asylum seekers and are run by a different category of INM officials that interview detainees, prepare a casefile for each, and determine whether they are to be deported, which in the case of Central Americans, involves loading them onto buses that leave from the migration detention centres on Mexico’s southern border. In the case of people seeking asylum, the law requires that these persons are channelled to COMAR without delay and are shielded from deportation.¹⁸

The INM informed Amnesty International that each migrant or asylum seeker that enters a detention centre is given at least an hour individually where they are interviewed and explained their rights.¹⁹ Nevertheless, only 203 of 297 (68%) of responses from people that passed through detention centres indicated to Amnesty International they were given an interview when they entered. Of those that said they were given an interview, 57% said that it lasted less than ten minutes. Thirty-five percent said their interview lasted less than 30 minutes, and only 8% noted that it lasted more than half an hour. The UNHCR notes that the recommended time for screening interviews is between 30 minutes and a few hours per person.²⁰

17. The UN Special Rapporteur on Torture and other cruel, inhuman and degrading punishment noted having received reports of beatings, threats, humiliation and insults experienced by migrants in Mexico’s migration detention centres in his visit to Mexico in 2014.

18. Op. cit. see footnote 9.


19. Representative of the General Directorate for Control and Verification of the INM in an Interview with Amnesty International, Mexico City, 2 May 2017.

20. United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, December 2016: “The 10-point action plan: Mechanisms for Screening and Referral”, available at: <http://www.refworld.org/pdfid/5804e0f44.pdf>, page 119

The data collected by Amnesty International demonstrates a systematic failure to properly inform detained migrants and people seeking asylum of their rights. This is a violation of the law by the INM, which aims to ensure proper protection for asylum seekers and guard against illegal *refoulement* of people whose lives are at risk. It is extremely concerning that 75% of responses from people who passed through detention centres noted that they were not informed of their right to seek asylum in Mexico.


WERE YOU INFORMED OF YOUR RIGHT TO SEEK ASYLUM?

(297 responses of people that passed through migration detention centres)



DURATION OF THE INTERVIEW IN THE MIGRATION DETENTION CENTRE

(297 responses of people that passed through a migration center)



“The INM has not improved in informing people about asylum. People get the information by word of mouth.”

Lawyer working on asylum and migration cases in Chiapas in the south of Mexico

Also of concern is the fact that in numerous cases, INM officers told people seeking asylum that their consul was the person in charge of explaining to them their rights to asylum in Mexico, thereby indirectly pushing them to contact their consular authorities. International practice tends to shield asylum-seekers from contact with their consular authorities, as a form of protection against the risk of identification, retaliation and human rights violations at the hands of state agents.²¹

GIVEN THE RUN-AROUND IN THREE MIGRATION DETENTION CENTERS:

"The people in the migration detention centre did not advise or direct me well. They told me that it would be better to return to my country, ...They gave me lots of pretexts, "buts". They said there was no COMAR office in the state I was in, so it was going to take months for my claim, so it was better to go back to my country. At first I was in the migration detention centre [in a northern state of the country]. From that place, and from the very first moment, I said I wanted asylum. They told me they couldn't do anything. On arrival at the next migration detention centre in Mexico City, the official said to me: "I can't do anything, you are already on the list to be returned to your country." It was not until Tapachula, after speaking to my consul, that I was able to speak to the COMAR!"

Comments from an El Salvadorian woman interviewed by Amnesty International who passed through three different detention centres: One in a state of northern Mexico [location has been omitted to protect the identity of the interviewee], then Mexico City and then Tapachula, Chiapas, on the southern border. In none of these did the INM properly inform her and it was only by chance that her consul informed her of the asylum procedure.

21. Article 21 of Mexico's Refugee Law (*Ley de Refugiados y Protección Complementaria*) outlines that consuls must not be informed of their citizens' asylum claim, only unless the person gives express consent.

3. LEGAL LIMBO AND HASTY RETURNS

“I can't do anything for you – you are already on the list for the deportation bus.”

Comments by an INM official to a 25-year-old man from El Salvador who expressed fear for his life if he was returned to his country. He told Amnesty International that INM officials did not let him read his return papers, and simply loaded him onto the bus to be deported.²²

The detention and return of an irregular migrant or asylum seeker to their country of origin is the default response that the INM takes in relation to Central Americans arriving in Mexico. The INM opens a casefile for each person detained, taking the form of an administrative legal procedure, in which the person detained has 15 days to present arguments in their favour and seek legal counsel.²³ Once all of these stages are completed, or once the person signs papers withdrawing their intention to present arguments within the 15 day window, the INM prepares a resolution concluding the casefile and places the irregular migrant on a list to board a bus headed for their country of origin. The names on this list are checked off by the consul of the country of origin who verifies the nationality of each person.

3.1 VOLUNTARY RETURN PAPERS

An alarming aspect of the way the administrative migratory procedure is implemented in practice is that one of the very first steps in putting together a casefile involves detainees signing a number of papers, accepting their “voluntary return”²⁴ to their country and waiving their rights to present legal arguments in their favour within the stipulated 15-day procedural window. This is the default process that is carried out in the first interview or “declaration” (*comparacencia*) of the migrant or asylum-seeker before an INM official in the detention centre. This *comparecencia* takes place within the first 24 hours of a migrant or asylum-seeker entering the detention centre, and it is at this time that the INM official is by law required to comprehensively explain to them their right to asylum, among other rights. In practice, this process often involves the INM official asking the detainee to sign a number of papers, often without explaining their contents. It is extremely concerning that the signing of return papers and the waiving of very important procedural rights are the default steps in this process. Rather than being informed in detail of the different avenues available to them, including seeking asylum, thereby allowing an informed decision by each person, migrants are routinely asked to sign “voluntary return”

22. Anonymous survey responses from an interview carried out with an El Salvadoran man seeking asylum in Mexico, interviewed in Tapachula, Chiapas state, 8 August 2017

23. Article 56 of the Federal Law on Administrative Procedures (*Ley Federal de Procedimiento Administrativo*) outlines that each party in an administrative legal process must be formally notified with the lodging of a deed as to the opening of the period for arguments and responses. Nevertheless, this does not occur in relation to the Migratory Administrative Process [Procedimiento Administrativo Migratorio].

24. “Voluntary return” refers to deportations which do not imply administrative sanctions on re-entry in Mexico, as opposed to official deportations, which have punitive implications upon re-entry.

papers, which effectively allow for their deportation. Since the signing of the “voluntary return” paper is a default step on arriving at a migration detention centre, in order not to be returned to their country detainees must actively desist from this return, and only then will it be reversed. Reasons for desisting on “voluntary return” papers may include the decision to request asylum, or the decision to open a judicial proceeding to stop one’s deportation. However, many irregular migrants and asylum seekers are also asked to sign a paper waiving their rights to present legal arguments in their favour within the stipulated 15 day procedural window.

“The INM official in the detention centre said ‘if you don’t sign here [my voluntary return paper], we won’t give you food, you won’t be able to have a shower. We will treat you like you don’t exist.’ ”

Comments from a 23 year old Honduran man²⁵ to Amnesty International regarding his experience in the detention centre in Acayucan, Veracruz, in 2017.

According to the testimonies collected by Amnesty International, people seeking asylum whose lives are at risk in Central America are very frequently pressured into signing “voluntary return” deportation papers. Amnesty International received numerous testimonies of people in detention centres being hastily asked to sign voluntary return papers without being explained what they were, as well as a number of cases where people desired to seek asylum yet were ignored and told to sign their return papers. In some cases, INM officials in immigration detention centres were verbally forceful with asylum seekers or even pressured them into signing papers through coercive tactics. These overt displays of illegality on the part of INM officials are demonstrative of an institutional culture that enables systematic failures in complying with the *non-refoulement* principle.

“The lady from INM told me ‘I’m not even going to talk with you.’ She got angry with me because I didn’t sign my deportation.”

Comments from a Guatemalan woman who had asked for asylum but was refused access to the procedure while in immigration detention

25. Anonymous survey interview carried out in Saltillo, Coahuila state, 19 September 2017

3.2 THE FAILURE TO FULLY INFORM INDIVIDUALS ABOUT THEIR CASEFILE

People seeking asylum and migrants are made even more vulnerable by the fact that they are never given a copy of their “voluntary return” paper or the casefile that pertains to them. This undermines their ability to understand the process they are being subjected to or to oppose any of the decisions made about their case. In the case of “voluntary return” papers, a public official co-signs each of these papers alongside the detainee. Denying rights-holders a copy of these papers strips them of any possibility for redress in light of arbitrary or illegal actions by authorities.

A lawyer working on dozens of cases of detained migrants and asylum seekers in the state of Chiapas told Amnesty International it is even very difficult for her to access casefiles. The fact that legal representatives also battle to access such information gravely undermines asylum seekers’ rights to effective legal counsel.²⁶

3.3 FAILURES OF INM INFORMATION SYSTEMS

In addition, internal systems within the INM enable repeated breaches of the *non-refoulement* principle. In an interview with Amnesty International, an INM chief in the southern state of Chiapas²⁷ admitted that the internal INM computer registries do not have a field on each person’s individual file as to whether they are an asylum seeker or not. This is a grave oversight from the INM, the very same body that is able to control a sophisticated system of biodata, travel permissions and entry permits for each passport holder on its computer database. The fact that no unified system exists within INM databases that indicates whether a person is an asylum seeker or not is extremely concerning and leaves open the possibility that these at risk populations fall through the cracks. Amnesty International has received a number of reports of people seeking asylum being deported despite being in a current process of an asylum claim before the COMAR. Amnesty International has also received a number of reports of INM field agents apprehending asylum seekers and then ripping up their official paper from COMAR. This paper specifically calls on the INM to refrain from deporting them and asylum seekers carry it on them with their name and photo.

26. In line with article 8 (1) and (2) of the American Convention of Human Rights, those people before an administrative legal process, as is the case with detained migrants and asylum seekers subject to deportation, have the right to be heard before competent authority; to have access to a legal representative and interpreter at no charge; and the right to appeal the decision that affects them (including deportation or “voluntary return”).

27. Amnesty International interview with INM delegation in Chiapas, southern Mexico, 16 August 2017



Emilia and one of her younger sons
©Amnesty International/Benjamín Alfaro Velázquez

EMILIA* AND FAMILY: FINDING SAFETY AND A NEW LIFE IN MEXICO AFTER FORMERLY BEING DEPORTED

Emilia fled El Salvador and arrived in Mexico in late 2016 with her seven children,²⁸ after two of her other children and her brother had been killed by the *mara* in El Salvador. Her teenage daughter had also been attacked by the *mara* and the family couldn't take it anymore and fled the country. On arrival to Mexico, Emilia's eldest daughter went in to labor and had to be rushed to a hospital on entry into Mexico in order to give birth to Emilia's first grandchild, a baby girl. The family rented a small hotel room in southern Mexico in the days following, and soon afterwards Emilia had to take a bus back to the hospital to carry out paperwork for the vaccinations of the newborn baby. On her way to the regional hospital in Tapachula, Chiapas state, Emilia was stopped at an INM checkpoint alongside her teenage son who was accompanying her. Emilia pleaded with the INM agents not to return her to El Salvador where her life was at risk, and through tears, told them that she was on her way to the hospital for the paperwork for her newborn granddaughter. INM agents ignored her pleas, and detained her and her son in the nearby detention centre where they were separated and deported a few days later. By sheer luck, on arriving in El Salvador, Emilia was able to find her son and a willing citizen lent her some money to quickly return to Mexico. She found the rest of her family on return to Mexico, and remained living in a cramped room on the border, all together, for months on end while they awaited their asylum claim outcome. Emilia and her family were granted international protection in Mexico in April 2017. After a few months, the family organized themselves to move to northern Mexico where they currently live. Emilia's children are now attending school and her baby granddaughter is now walking. Her eldest daughter is working in a local shop and the elder sons have obtained agricultural work. The family told Amnesty International they feel safe and out of harm's way.

28. For the full story of threats and persecution against Emilia and her family, see: Amnesty International Facing Walls: USA and Mexico's Violation of the Rights of Asylum Seekers. June 15, 2017. AMR 01/6426/2017. Available at: <https://www.amnesty.org/es/documents/amr01/6426/2017/en/>

4. ILL-TREATMENT OF MIGRANTS AS PART OF THE DEPORTATION MACHINE

The almost automatic response by federal authorities to irregular migrants is to apprehend them and turn them over to migration detention centres. As outlined above, the INM is the authority responsible for this function, nevertheless Mexico's Migration Law specifically allows for the Federal Police to act in an auxiliary function alongside the INM in migratory verification exercises.²⁹ Notwithstanding this stipulation, the involvement of the Federal Police must respond to an express request by the INM, and police cannot simply pick up migrants in different parts of the country as part of their daily functions.³⁰ Unfortunately, irregular migrants and people seeking asylum are often subjected to arbitrary detentions by federal, state and municipal police.

POLICE VIOLENCE AND ILL-TREATMENT

A total of 68% of those 116 responses that detailed a detention by the police described their treatment as "bad" or "very bad".

Federal and municipal police were most commonly mentioned as being involved in apprehensions that very frequently involved robbery or extortion of migrants by police. On a limited number of occasions police handed migrants over to migration detention centres.

Some testimonies noted torture or ill-treatment by police: One migrant told Amnesty International:

"They beat me and applied electric shocks to me and they took my money. I told them I had rights, but they tortured me with a pistol that they had on their waist. They gave me electric shocks for 10 minutes" ³¹



The treatment by INM agents in apprehensions did not rate as poorly as the police in the response to Amnesty International's survey. While this is promising to note, the fact that the INM did not present such overwhelmingly poor ratings as police does not mean there is no cause for concern.

29. Mexico's Migration Law (*Ley de Migración*) outlines in its Article 81: The revision of documents of people entering and leaving the country, as well as the inspection of transport lines entering and leaving the country, are considered actions of migratory control. In these actions, the Federal Police will act in an auxiliary function, in coordination with the National Institute of Migration.

30. Mexico's Migration Law (*Ley de Migración*) outlines in its Article 96: Authorities will collaborate with the National Institute of Migration in the exercise of its functions, when the Institute requests it, without this implying that authorities can independently carry out functions of migratory control, verification and revision.

31. Amnesty International has received a number of reports about the use of Tasers against migrants and asylum seekers throughout Mexico. The reports focus on the use of these instruments by federal agents, yet it is not clear in testimonies whether the INM also carries these instruments.

Amnesty International received a number of reports of grave human rights violations committed by INM officials during the moments of apprehension as well as in detention centres. One Honduran man³² told Amnesty International that on entering Mexico in the southern state of Tabasco, he was apprehended by INM agents who tied him up and beat him with a tennis ball wrapped inside a wet sock in order to avoid leaving marks on his body. A number of other migrants and asylum seekers mentioned beatings and forceful treatment during their apprehension by INM agents, as well as racist and humiliating remarks. One young Honduran man told Amnesty International that an INM agent offered to let him go free in return for sexual favours.³³ This chain of ill treatment against people seeking asylum and migrants is replicated during the time in immigration detention. While a number of migrants and asylum seekers told Amnesty International that the treatment in immigration detention centers was “fine”, a number of responses pointed to ill-treatment. In addition, Amnesty International has documented a number of instances of prolonged detentions for months or even up to a year, including the detention of small children and babies in detention centers. A citizen advisory body of the INM recently released a comprehensive report based on site visits and inspections of migration detention centres, which signalled the commonplace use of practices that undermine the physical and mental health of detainees and go against international standards that call for the non-detention of people seeking asylum.³⁴

In addition, Amnesty International has received a number of reports from lawyers and civil society organizations of solitary confinement in “punishment cells” in migration detention centres, where detainees can be kept for weeks on end. In at least three testimonies, Amnesty International was informed by detainees that they had been separated and placed in a small cell with very little light, where they remained all day and were not able to join other detainees during meal times. The reasons for placing detainees in these cells were in two cases in response to a fight or scuffle that guards claimed the detainee had been part of, and in the third case the confinement was a response to a woman who had experienced a psychotic episode while inside the detention centre.

Amnesty International questioned the INM on the existence of these solitary confinement cells. After an initial denial of their existence, officials admitted that their installations did in fact allow for this sort of imposed segregation of certain individuals.³⁵ While there are no doubt security concerns inside migration detention centres that may warrant limited disciplinary measures, the conditions reported in these “punishment cells” appear disproportionate in relation to international standards on the deprivation of liberty and rights of detainees.³⁶ In addition, it is important to emphasize that irregular migrants and asylum seekers have not committed a crime and are not being detained on criminal charges, as would be the case in prisons.

32. Honduran man interviewed in an anonymous survey response in the city of Saltillo, Coahuila state, on 18 September 2017

33. Survey interview - anonymous response from a 20 year old man from Honduras interviewed in Tenosique, Tabasco State, 29 May 2017

34. Citizen Council of the National Institute of Migration, (Consejo Ciudadano del Instituto Nacional de Migración). *Personas en detención migratoria en México: Misión de Monitoreo de Estaciones Migratorias y Estancias Provisionales del Instituto Nacional de Migración*, July 2017

35. Amnesty International interview with INM delegation in Chiapas, southern Mexico, 16 August 2017.

36. The United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners (the Nelson Mandela Rules) prohibits solitary confinement under a variety of circumstances. For more information, see: https://www.unodc.org/documents/justice-and-prison-reform/GA-RESOLUTION/E_ebook.pdf

4.1 ARBITRARY DETENTION OF ASYLUM SEEKERS AND ITS IMPACT ON *REFOULEMENT*

Migrants, asylum seekers and refugees should not suffer any restriction on their liberty or other rights (either detention or so-called alternatives to detention) unless such a restriction is (a) prescribed by law; (b) necessary in the specific circumstances; and (c) proportionate to the legitimate aim pursued. In particular, any measure (either custodial or non-custodial) restricting the right to liberty of migrants, asylum-seekers and refugees must be exceptional



The entry point for men at a migration detention centre in the southern state of Chiapas
©Amnesty International

and based on a case-by-case assessment of the personal situation of the individual concerned, including their age, history, need for identification and risk of absconding, if any. The individual concerned should be provided with a reasoned decision in a language they understand. Children, both those unaccompanied and those who migrate with their family, should never be detained, as detention is never in their best interests.³⁷

In the case of Mexico, the decision to detain an irregular migrant or asylum seeker is almost completely devoid of any individualized assessment. Detention is the automatic response, and all irregular migrants apprehended by INM are detained, even if they express a wish to seek asylum. This flies in the face of international law under Article 9 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) which prohibits arbitrary detention.³⁸ In addition, due to the failures in the screening system discussed above, asylum-seekers end up being unlawfully detained together with the migrants.

Under the UN Refugee Convention and its 1967 Protocol, states are not allowed to apply punitive measures to those seeking asylum.³⁹ The detention of people seeking asylum can be seen as a punitive measure that undermines their intention to seek protection. In Mexico, the prospect of being unlawfully detained often pushes asylum-seekers to return to their country of origin, despite the risks they face upon return.

37. See also: "UNHCR's position regarding the detention of refugee and migrant children in the migration context" (January 2017) clarifying that "children should not be detained for immigration purposes, irrespective of their legal/migratory status or that of their parents, and detention is never in their best interests.: <http://www.refworld.org/docid/503489533b8.html>

38. In addition, The UN Working Group on Arbitrary Detention has explicitly stated that where the detention of unauthorized immigrants is mandatory, regardless of their personal circumstances, it violates the prohibition of arbitrary detention in Article 9 of the UDHR and Article 9 of the ICCPR. See Report of the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention on its visit to the United Kingdom, E/ CN.4/1999/63/Add.3, 18 December 1998, Paragraph 33

39. 1951 UN Convention on Refugees, Article 31. Full text of the Convention available at: <http://www.unhcr.org/3b66c2aa10>

There may be a correlation between periods in migration detention and *refoulement* of asylum seekers from Mexico. Of 49 responses that noted that they wished to return to their country, eight that had been apprehended by INM said that the reason they wanted to return to their country was because they did not want to remain in migration detention. In the case of Emilia* (see Section 3), despite the fact that her life was at grave risk in El Salvador, she told Amnesty International that she could not bear to be locked up and separated from her son in detention, so she decided to risk her life and sign her voluntary return paper that would allow her to get out of detention, yet at the same time risk her life in the hope of being released and reunited with her son and family.

Such examples demonstrate that the failures in screening processes for asylum seekers, coupled with the failures of the migration detention system, end up enabling further violations by Mexico of the *non-refoulement* principle.

A recent promising development from the INM has been the implementation of the Programme of Alternatives to Detention (*Programa de Alternativas a la Detención*) since August 2016, as a result of an agreement between COMAR, INM and the UNCHR. Amnesty has observed that a number of asylum seekers are being released as a result of this programme, yet many failures remain. Before August 2016, asylum seekers making claims from inside a migration detention centre remained in detention for up to 3 months or more. Since late 2016, the majority of asylum seekers in detention centres are now being released within a matter of weeks due to the Programme of Alternatives to Detention that places them in migrant shelters run by civil society organizations.

Nevertheless, it is concerning that this programme is not institutionalized or published officially and thus risks being simply an act of good faith that could disappear at any moment.

In 2016, 24% of asylum claims commenced with COMAR were abandoned by the asylum seeker before the procedure was concluded. The 2017 rate of abandonment of asylum claims had dropped to 16% by August, according to figures published by the COMAR. These figures demonstrate that the fact that asylum seekers are no longer being detained for such prolonged periods could be having an impact on their adherence to the asylum procedure in Mexico and possibilities for obtaining protection rather than being returned to their country.

Street scene near Ciudad Hidalgo, on the Mexico - Guatemala border
© Amnesty International



5. RECOMMENDATIONS

TO THE PRESIDENT:

- Urgently order a review of screening processes implemented by the National Institute of Migration (INM). This review must have the aim of:
 - Ensuring irregular migrants who are apprehended and detained are properly informed of their right to seek asylum in Mexico;
 - Guaranteeing that their access to asylum procedures faces no obstacles; and
 - Curbing illegal practices of *refoulement* and ensuring they are met with administrative sanction.

TO THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF MIGRATION (INM):

- Urgently implement a review of screening processes implemented by the National Institute of Migration (INM). This review must have the aim of:
 - Implementing a pro-active screening system that improves identification of potential asylum seekers within the first moments of contact with the INM;
 - Ensuring irregular migrants who are apprehended and detained are properly informed of their right to seek asylum in Mexico;
 - Guaranteeing their access to asylum procedures faces no obstacles;
 - Curbing illegal practices of *refoulement* and ensure they are met with administrative sanction.
- Improve internal coordination databases and processes to ensure that asylum seekers are clearly identified in official registries to avoid oversights that enable unlawful deportations.
- Publish and institutionalize the Programa de Alternativas a la Detención in the Official Gazette (Diario Oficial de la Federación).
- Provide all detained migrants and asylum seekers, as well as their legal representatives, with a full photocopy of their casefile papers on entry to a detention centre as well as a copy of their voluntary return paper and resolution in their administrative migratory procedure.



**AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL
IS A GLOBAL MOVEMENT
FOR HUMAN RIGHTS.
WHEN INJUSTICE HAPPENS
TO ONE PERSON, IT
MATTERS TO US ALL.**

CONTACT US

 info@amnesty.org

 +44 (0)20 7413 5500

JOIN THE CONVERSATION

 www.facebook.com/AmnestyGlobal

 [@AmnestyOnline](https://twitter.com/AmnestyOnline)

OVERLOOKED, UNDER-PROTECTED

MEXICO'S DEADLY *REFOULEMENT* OF CENTRAL AMERICANS SEEKING ASYLUM

Mexico is witnessing a hidden refugee crisis on its doorstep. Citizens from nearby countries who formerly left Guatemala, Honduras and El Salvador and passed through Mexico in search of economic opportunities have for a number of years been leaving their countries due to fear for their lives and personal liberty. This briefing outlines the results of a questionnaire carried out by Amnesty International with 500 responses from migrants and people seeking asylum travelling through Mexico. The information presented demonstrates that the Mexican government is routinely failing in its treaty obligations under international law to protect those who are in need of international protection, as well as repeatedly violating the *non-refoulement* principle, a binding pillar of international law that prohibits the return of people to life-threatening situations.