



Inter-Parliamentary Union
For democracy. For everyone.

Peru

Decision adopted by the Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians at its 179th session (Geneva, 2 to 18 February 2026)



© Twitter @MargotPalaciosH

PER-44 – Margot Palacios Huamán

Alleged human rights violations

- ✓ Violation of freedom of opinion and expression
- ✓ Violation of freedom of assembly and association
- ✓ Other acts obstructing the exercise of the parliamentary mandate

A. Summary of the case

According to the complainant, Ms. Palacios has allegedly been the victim of threats, acts of intimidation, restrictions on freedom of opinion and expression, and restrictions on freedom of assembly and association as a consequence of her actions as an opposition parliamentarian.

The complainant reports that Ms. Palacios travelled to Europe from 6 to 15 February 2023. During the trip, she met with members of the Peruvian community abroad and with representatives of various international organizations. As a result of her criticism of the Government's actions, expressed publicly during her trip, she has allegedly been the victim of harassment, acts of intimidation and bullying by other members of Congress belonging to the governing party, the national media and other actors in Peruvian political life. The complainant considers that the

Case PER-44

Peru: Parliament affiliated to the IPU

Victim: A female opposition member of parliament

Qualified complainant(s): Section I.1(a) of the Committee Procedure (Annex I)

Submission of complaint: February 2023; June 2024

Recent IPU decision: October 2023

IPU mission(s): - - -

Recent Committee hearing: - - -

Recent follow-up:

- Communication(s) from the authorities: Letter from the Secretary General of Parliament (December 2025)
- Communication from the complainant: September 2025
- Communication to the authorities: Letter to the President of the Congress of the Republic (November 2025)
- Communication to the complainant: January 2026

systematic media presence of this multitude of actors, including on social media, is creating a hostile environment for Ms. Palacios, thus putting her safety at risk.

The complainant included in the documentation sent to the IPU a number of press reports and social media posts in which various members of Congress belonging to the governing party accuse member of Congress Palacios of “generating rejection of the country abroad”, “spreading hatred”, and “distorting the reality of the country” among other accusations, and call for sanctions against her. The complainant asserts that Ms. Palacios did not file a complaint in Peru for the alleged human rights violations described in the complaint.

According to information contained in the complaint, the acts of harassment also took the form of specific acts of intimidation, such as filing a formal complaint against Ms. Palacios concerning her trip to Europe in official letter no. 823-2022-2023-PRCV/CR presented to the Ethics Committee of the Congress of the Republic. Another complaint against her and 48 other opposition members of parliament is reportedly being processed by the Subcommittee on Constitutional Accusations of the Congress of the Republic for alleged acts of “constitutional and criminal offences for failure to fulfil their duties of political oversight and to provide ongoing support to the President of the Republic, ministers of State and other senior officials”.

In a letter dated 25 April 2023 to the IPU Secretary General and signed by the Secretary General of Parliament, it was stated that the complaint filed against member of parliament Palacios with the Ethics Committee had been declared inadmissible and dismissed on 28 March 2023. However, the complaint against her and 48 other parliamentarians was "pending classification" by the Congress Subcommittee on Constitutional Accusations.

At the hearing held at the 147th IPU Assembly, the Peruvian delegation stated that, on 6 October 2023, the Subcommittee on Constitutional Accusations had approved by a majority the qualifying report declaring inadmissible the complaint filed against 49 members of parliament, including Ms. Palacios. The delegation provided copies of this subcommittee report confirming this statement.

In June 2024, the complainant reported that Ms. Palacios had been subjected to ongoing harassment due to her role as an opposition parliamentarian. Her resignation from the *Perú Libre* party and parliamentary group in May 2024, submitted on grounds of conscience, subsequently resulted in arbitrary actions and restrictions on the exercise of her parliamentary mandate, including the refusal to accept her resignation, her removal from committee assignments, and her expulsion from the party. The complainant argues that these measures impede her ability to join or form a new parliamentary group, thereby preventing her from engaging effectively in parliamentary proceedings, in contravention of constitutional and jurisprudential standards prohibiting the imperative mandate. The complainant also highlights delays and insufficient reasoning by the Board of Directors of Parliament and reports that Ms. Palacios has initiated a constitutional *amparo* action, which is still pending before the Constitutional Court.

In December 2025, the parliamentary authorities provided updated information on the proceedings followed in Parliament confirming that, on 7 April 2025, the Board of Directors had ultimately rejected Ms. Palacios's request to reconsider the ratification of her expulsion from the *Perú Libre* parliamentary group. The original expulsion decision was therefore left in effect, although her subsequent request for a pronouncement on that decision remained pending.

B. Decision

The Committee on the Human Rights of Parliamentarians

1. *Recalls* that, in October 2023, the initial complaint concerning the situation of Ms. Palacios was declared inadmissible by the Committee under its Procedure for the examination and treatment of complaints, considering that the parliamentary procedures initiated appeared to have worked well, consequently guaranteeing the protection of Ms. Palacios's rights;
2. *Notes*, however, that recent and updated information was duly submitted by a qualified complainant under section I.1(a) of the Procedure; *notes also* that the new complaint concerns Ms. Palacios, a member of the Peruvian Parliament at the time of the alleged events; *notes further* that the new complaint relates to allegations of violations of freedom of opinion and expression, freedom of assembly and association, and other acts obstructing the exercise of

the parliamentary mandate, which fall within the Committee's mandate and appear to constitute a continuation of the allegations contained in the initial complaint;

3. *Considers*, therefore, that the new complaint is admissible under the provisions of section IV of the Procedure for the examination and treatment of complaints; *decides* to reopen the case under the provisions of section IX, paragraph 26, of the Procedure; and *declares* itself competent to examine it;
4. *Thanks* the Peruvian Parliament for the information provided in writing and for its continued cooperation with the Committee; and *notes with interest* that, in application of the relevant internal procedures, the Parliament has afforded Ms. Palacios the opportunity to present her defence in the context of the ongoing proceedings;
5. *Notes with concern*, however, that more than a year and a half after Ms. Palacios's expulsion from her political party, the exercise of her parliamentary functions remains subject to certain limitations, and that her requests for the protection of her rights before Congress have not yet been definitively resolved; *considers* in this regard that proceedings affecting the exercise of the parliamentary mandate must be resolved without undue delay, in order to safeguard the effective exercise of the mandate and the proper functioning of parliamentary democracy; *expresses the hope* that the parliamentary proceedings will advance expeditiously and in conformity with the applicable national legal framework, including the relevant constitutional provisions and national jurisprudence concerning the prohibition of the imperative mandate; and *wishes* to receive information on all measures taken by the Parliament in this respect;
6. *Requests* the Secretary General to convey this decision to the President of the Congress of the Republic of Peru and the complainant;
7. *Decides* to continue examining this case.