

INTERNATIONAL PARENTAL CHILD ABDUCTION

U.S. Department of State • Bureau of Consular Affairs



Report on Compliance with the Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction

April 2014

WEB: travel.state.gov

FACEBOOK: facebook.com/travelgov

TWITTER: [childrensissues](https://twitter.com/childrensissues)

Scan to access
travel.state.gov



INTERNATIONAL PARENTAL CHILD ABDUCTION

U.S. Department of State • Bureau of Consular Affairs

Report to Congress on Compliance with the Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction

The U.S. Department of State (Department), Office of Children's Issues, U.S. Central Authority (USCA) under the 1980 Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction (Convention), hereby submits, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 11611, this report on Convention compliance, covering the period from January 1, 2013 through December 31, 2013. The USCA is submitting this report to the House Appropriations Committee; the Senate Appropriations Committee; the House Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations and Related Programs; the Senate Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations and Related Programs; the House Foreign Affairs Committee; and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

More detailed information on international parental child abduction (IPCA) appears at our Convention compliance webpage, travel.state.gov. The webpage includes reporting methodology, IPCA statistics, and other compliance-related information.

Not Compliant with the Convention

| COUNTRY | ASSESSMENT |
|--------------------------|--|
| <p>Costa Rica</p> | <p>Costa Rica demonstrated non-compliance with the Hague Convention in the areas of judicial and central authority performance. The U.S. Central Authority (USCA) and the Costa Rican Central Authority (CRCA) maintain a cordial relationship, and communication improved slightly in 2013. However, the CRCA continues to fail to expedite abduction cases, compounding already systemic case delays within the Costa Rican judiciary.</p> <p>First and second instance courts generally deliver verdicts that are consistent with Hague principles. However, once those cases reach Costa Rica’s Supreme Court, they are reversed based on interpretations of Costa Rican law and international treaty standards, creating decisions that are inconsistent with Hague principles. The USCA remains concerned regarding a precedent-setting September 2011 decision by the Constitutional Court, a division of the country’s Supreme Court, which ruled that courts should consider “the best interests of the child” rather than habitual residence when deciding Hague Convention cases and reversed a return order. In June 2013, that court reversed another return order based on similar rationale, citing the September 2011 decision, international treaties, and Costa Rican law.</p> |
| <p>Guatemala</p> | <p>Guatemala demonstrated non-compliance with the Hague Convention in the areas of judicial and central authority performance. The U.S. Central Authority (USCA) continues to be concerned about the performance of the Guatemalan Central Authority (GCA) and Guatemalan courts in their handling of Hague Convention cases. The USCA observes considerable delays within the GCA in the processing of cases, both in failing to respond to USCA requests for information and delays in the GCA’s submission of Hague applications to courts. Frequent turnover in personnel and limited coordination mar the relationship between the main GCA office in Guatemala City and its regional offices, causing delays in case processing. Guatemalan courts also process cases very slowly, causing significant delays in all active cases. In addition to delays and a failure to set court hearings, courts have not provided copies of decisions and the GCA has been unable to obtain them.</p> |
| <p>Honduras</p> | <p>Honduras demonstrated non-compliance with the Hague Convention in judicial, law enforcement, and central authority performance. Although Honduras improved its performance under the Hague Convention since being last cited in the 2011 Compliance Report, the U.S. Central Authority (USCA) observed markedly deteriorating compliance in 2013. The Honduran Central Authority (HCA) demonstrated delays in the processing of cases and slow response times to USCA inquiries. Information relayed to the USCA was sometimes incomplete and often failed to demonstrate serious engagement on cases.</p> <p>Poor judicial and law enforcement compliance hinder the country’s ability to comply with Hague Convention obligations. As a result, all three active U.S. return cases filed with the HCA have been pending for more than 18 months. The Honduran judiciary continues to treat Hague cases as custody matters, and significant delays in the processing of appeals by taking parents also inhibit case resolution. Furthermore, the HCA reports that efforts to locate children in Honduras are hampered by the underfunding of the HCA and its inability to elicit the assistance of law enforcement.</p> |

Patterns of Non-Compliance with the Convention

| COUNTRY | ASSESSMENT |
|---------------------------|--|
| <p>The Bahamas</p> | <p>The Bahamas demonstrated patterns of non-compliance with the Hague Convention in the area of judicial performance. Although the U.S. Central Authority has a strong working relationship with the Bahamian Central Authority and communication between the two has improved significantly this year, significant delays in the Bahamian courts remain a serious issue, as does the courts' treatment of Hague Convention cases as custody cases.</p> <p>Bahamian courts require apostilles for documents supporting Hague Convention applications, which is inconsistent with Article 30 of the Convention. In addition, Bahamian courts tend to treat Hague Convention cases as custody cases, in part by regularly requiring home studies of both left-behind parents (LBPs) and taking parents before rendering a Hague decision. Significant delays also result from the Supreme Court requesting specific conditions outside the scope of the Convention to be met before a court will execute a return order. Such conditions often include significant economic burdens to LBPs and long delays to the resolution of Hague Convention cases.</p> |
| <p>Brazil</p> | <p>Brazil demonstrated patterns of non-compliance with the Hague Convention in the areas of judicial and law enforcement performance. The U.S. Central Authority is encouraged by initiatives taken by the Brazilian Central Authority (BCA) and the Office of Attorney General that demonstrate a commitment to improve compliance, and we have noted improvements in administrative case processing. However, significant delays for relief under the Hague Convention in Brazilian federal courts and difficulties in locating children remain a serious issue. The significant delays are the result of lengthy reviews conducted by Brazilian federal judges, which are typically followed by numerous appeals filed by taking parents. Court cases, especially in the appellate stage, can take years to resolve; the oldest return case was filed with the BCA in November 2006 and filed with the Brazilian federal court in January 2008. When the Department raised these concerns, the BCA responded by meeting with judges in individual cases and by examining overall case processing to reduce delays. Failure on the part of Brazilian law enforcement officials to locate children also posed problems in 2013. In one case, the court ordered the return of the child in April 2013, but the taking parent subsequently absconded with the child and Brazilian law enforcement has yet to locate them.</p> |

Efforts to Encourage Other Countries to Become Party to the Convention

In addition to Convention cases, the U.S. Central Authority (USCA) handles international parental child abduction cases that involve abductions to countries not yet party to the Convention. Since the Convention provides the most effective way to facilitate the prompt return of abducted children to their country of habitual residence and to help deter abduction, encouraging countries to join the Convention is a high priority.

During this reporting period, Assistant Secretary for Consular Affairs Janice L. Jacobs, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Overseas Citizens Services James D. Pettit, Special Advisor for Children's Issues Susan S. Jacobs, and a variety of other Department personnel at all levels have actively engaged foreign government officials around the world to become party to the Convention. Special Advisor Jacobs held bilateral discussions with government officials in China, India, Egypt, Kazakhstan, Japan, the Republic of Korea, Tunisia, Ghana, Philippines, and Vietnam, urging them to join the Convention.

Special Advisor Jacobs promoted becoming party to the Convention in a number of her public speeches both in the United States and abroad, including several May 2013 events to mark National Missing Children's Day. Special Advisor Jacobs met in Washington with official delegations from a variety of countries to promote becoming party to the Convention. She testified before Congress and briefed many Congressional staffers on countries' progress toward ratification of the Convention.

The USCA continues to communicate with the governments of Japan, Russia, Jamaica, Nicaragua, Georgia, Thailand, the Republic of Korea, Kazakhstan, and Andorra, which are in varying stages of ratifying, acceding to, or implementing the Convention. USCA officials met with foreign officials from Egypt, Ghana, India, Japan, Nicaragua, Russia, the Republic of Korea, and Tunisia to discuss IPCA and progress towards becoming party to the Convention. USCA officials regularly meet with officials from the European Union, Canada, and Australia to help coordinate multilateral efforts to encourage countries to become party to the Convention.

The Department instructs its diplomatic missions in non-Convention countries to approach host governments to encourage them to become party to the Convention. Embassy and consulate public affairs and consular sections promote the Convention through public diplomacy and outreach activities. Senior Department officials traveling to countries not yet party to the Convention often raise the convention and encourage government officials to become party to the

Convention. In Washington, U.S. government officials raise the Convention in their discussions with senior officials from non-member Convention countries.

Efforts to Encourage Convention Parties to Facilitate Work of Nongovernmental Organizations

The USCA continues to collaborate with States party to the Convention to facilitate the work of nongovernmental organizations that can assist in the return of children to their country of habitual residence under the Convention.

Countries with Enforcement Concerns

Below is a list of countries that are parties to the Convention in which left-behind parents in the United States have not been able to secure prompt enforcement of a court’s final return or access order during the reporting period because of the absence of effective enforcement mechanisms.

| COUNTRY | ENFORCEMENT CONCERN |
|----------------|--------------------------------------|
| Brazil | Convention return order not enforced |
| Mexico | Convention return order not enforced |
| Romania | Convention return order not enforced |
| Ukraine | Convention return order not enforced |

Unresolved Return Applications

As of December 31, 2013, the U.S. Central Authority (USCA) had 111 applications for return that remained open and active for more than 18 months after the date of filing with the relevant foreign central authority in the countries listed below. The following section describes each unresolved case and the actions taken by the USCA to resolve. The actions taken by other authorities are also stated below, as reported to the USCA by the relevant entity.

| COUNTRY | ABDUCTED/ RETAINED | APPLICATION FILED | CHILD(REN) LOCATED | SUMMARY OF CASE |
|------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|--|
| ARGENTINA | 1-2009 | 4-2009 | Yes | In November 2009, the court ordered the return of the child. In May 2010, the appellate court denied the taking parent's (TP) appeal and upheld the return order. In August 2010, the TP filed an "extraordinary appeal" with the Argentine Supreme Court. In December 2010, the Supreme Court upheld the First Instance and Court of Appeals decisions and ordered the First Instance court to execute the return order. However, this court continues to delay the execution of the return order until the left-behind parent meets a series of conditions set by the TP related to immigration and financial support for the TP. In an effort to satisfy the TP's conditions, the Argentine government granted the TP an allowance for travel to the United States for a custody hearing and related legal fees. In 2011, the U.S. Embassy in Buenos Aires issued the TP a visa to attend custody hearings. The TP filed multiple requests for asylum in Argentina for the child in a separate administrative court system; one asylum request is still pending. The U.S. Central Authority and U.S. Embassy Buenos Aires have regularly requested updates from the Argentine Central Authority on court proceedings. |

| COUNTRY | ABDUCTED/ RETAINED | APPLICATION FILED | CHILD(REN) LOCATED | SUMMARY OF CASE |
|------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|---|
| ARGENTINA | 7-2010 | 12-2010 | Yes | <p>After the Hague case was assigned to a court, the case was suspended pending resolution of criminal proceedings filed by the taking parent (TP) against the left-behind parent (LBP). In June 2013, the Court of Appeals overturned the suspension of the Hague case. The TP then filed a motion to recuse the judge hearing the return case. The case was transferred to a different court, which will not render a decision until the Court of Appeals can determine whether to accept or reject the motion to recuse the judge. In October 2013, the Criminal Court of Appeals acquitted the LBP of the criminal charges. The U.S. Central Authority and U.S. Embassy Buenos Aires have regularly requested updates from the Argentine Central Authority on the Hague court proceedings.</p> |
| ARGENTINA | 9-2010 | 2-2011 | Yes | <p>In March 2011, a public defender submitted the left-behind parent's (LBP) Hague application to a district court in the Buenos Aires province. In August 2011, the LBP requested that the Argentine Central Authority (ACA) provide a new public defender after the taking parent (TP) relocated with the children to a different jurisdiction. In September 2011, the TP received notification of the Hague application and filed a motion to dismiss for lack of jurisdiction. For over a year, the Pilar and San Isidro courts disputed what district had jurisdiction over the case. After the Court of Appeals decided Pilar Family Court had jurisdiction over the case, the Pilar Family Court rejected the petition for return in December 2012. In June 2013, the Court of Appeals reversed the family court and ordered the return of the children. In July 2013, the TP filed an "extraordinary appeal" with the Argentine Supreme Court for the Province of Buenos Aires, and in December 2013, the court upheld the June 2013. However, litigation remains ongoing. The U.S. Central Authority and U.S. Embassy Buenos Aires have regularly requested updates from the ACA on court proceedings.</p> |

| COUNTRY | ABDUCTED/ RETAINED | APPLICATION FILED | CHILD(REN) LOCATED | SUMMARY OF CASE |
|--------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|---|
| THE BAHAMAS | 1-2009 | 8-2009 | Yes | <p>In June 2010, the Office of the Attorney General (OAG) requested that the Department of Social Services in the Bahamas conduct a home study of the taking parent. The OAG did not receive the report until December 2010. The OAG requested that the left-behind parent (LBP) provide apostilles for Hague application documents, which caused further delays. The U.S. Central Authority (USCA) forwarded the LBP's apostilled documents to the Bahamian Central Authority (BCA) in January 2011, and the case was presented to the court in April 2011. The first hearing was scheduled for October 2011, but it and subsequent hearings have been repeatedly rescheduled for various reasons, including the misplacement of the case files by the court. The August 2012 hearing was adjourned because the court required that the LBP be present. Subsequent hearing dates were rescheduled due to conflict in both parent's schedules. In October 2013, the OAG filed new proposed hearing dates agreed by counsels with the court. As of the close of the reporting period, a hearing date was not scheduled. The USCA and U.S. Embassy Nassau have regularly requested updates from the BCA on court proceedings.</p> |

| COUNTRY | ABDUCTED/ RETAINED | APPLICATION FILED | CHILD(REN) LOCATED | SUMMARY OF CASE |
|--------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|---|
| THE BAHAMAS | 3-2010 | 5-2010 | Yes | <p>The Bahamian Central Authority (BCA) acknowledged receipt of the Hague application only in October 2010, and the Office the Attorney General (OAG) filed it with the First Instance Court in May 2011. The First Instance Court adjourned the July 2011 hearing until it received a home study report of the taking parent (TP). In a September 2011 hearing, the judge recused himself because he personally knew the TP. The OAG sent numerous requests to the court to request a new hearing date, but in January 2012, the court informed the OAG that the case file had been misplaced. After the file was found in June 2012, the OAG continued to submit new proposed dates to the court. In December 2013, the left-behind parent (LBP) sent a request to withdraw the Hague application. The BCA and OAG asked the U.S. Central Authority (USCA) to contact the LBP for clarification. As of the end of the reporting period, the USCA awaited a response from the LBP.</p> |
| THE BAHAMAS | 6-2011 | 8-2011 | Yes | <p>The court's requirements of apostilled documents and home studies of both parents caused initial delays. In June 2012, the Supreme Court ordered the return of the child to the United States and the taking parent filed an appeal. In August 2012, the President of the Court of Appeal dismissed the appeal. The Office of the Attorney General then requested that the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court enforce the return order but to date, the court has not done so. The current order also requires the left-behind parent vacate the marital home and abide by the terms of a vacated June 2010 U.S. domestic violence protection order. The U.S. Central Authority and U.S. Embassy Nassau have regularly requested updates from the Bahamian Central Authority on court proceedings.</p> |

| COUNTRY | ABDUCTED/ RETAINED | APPLICATION FILED | CHILD(REN) LOCATED | SUMMARY OF CASE |
|----------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|--|
| BELGIUM | 6-2010 | 6-2012 | Yes | <p>In July 2012, the Belgian Central Authority (BCA) requested clarification from the U.S. Central Authority (USCA) that the case should be considered a wrongful retention pursuant to Article 3 of the Convention. In August 2012, the BCA sent additional questions to the left-behind parent (LBP) clarifying the wrongful retention date. The LBP provided evidence to the BCA on August 7, 2012; however, the BCA informed the USCA that it was unable to move forward with the application until it received French translations of the Convention application and supporting documents. In December 2013, the USCA informed the BCA that the LBP confirmed he would proceed with his application for the return of his children to the United States rather than pursue access. The case has not yet appeared before a Hague Convention court in Belgium.</p> |
| BRAZIL | 2-2009 | 3-2009 | Yes | <p>In September 2010, the federal court ordered the return of the child. The taking parent (TP) appealed the decision before the Regional Federal Tribunal – Fourth Region, and in December 2011, that court upheld the decision of the first instance court for the return of the child to the United States. In March 2012, the Brazilian Central Authority (BCA) indicated that the TP filed appeals before the Superior Tribunal of Justice (STJ) and Supreme Court. In March 2013, the courts rejected the appeals. The TP appealed the STJ decision and in September 2013, the STJ dismissed the appeal. That same month, the TP filed another appeal of that decision. In November 2013, the STJ declined to accept the TP’s latest appeal. The TP then filed a “motion to clarify”; the Office of Attorney General filed an objection to this motion and requested that the first instance federal court issue an enforcement order without waiting on the settlement of the TP’s outstanding or future appeals or motions. The U.S. Central Authority and U.S. Embassy Brasilia have regularly requested updates from the BCA on court proceedings.</p> |

| COUNTRY | ABDUCTED/ RETAINED | APPLICATION FILED | CHILD(REN) LOCATED | SUMMARY OF CASE |
|---------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|--|
| BRAZIL | 7-2009 | 12-2009 | Yes | <p>The Office of Attorney General (OAG) filed the Hague Convention case in a federal court in August 2010. During a September 2011 mediation hearing, the court ordered a psychological evaluation of the child and granted the taking parent's (TP) motion to hear testimony from character witnesses for the TP and left-behind parent. In March 2013, the psychological evaluation took place but results were annulled as the court did not notify the OAG which was therefore unable to send their own psychologist to the interview. Another evaluation took place in October 2013, but as of the close of the reporting period, the case has not moved forward. The U.S. Central Authority and U.S. Embassy Brasilia have regularly requested updates from the Brazilian Central Authority on the court proceedings.</p> |
| BRAZIL | 7-2009 | 12-2009 | Yes | <p>In April 2010, a federal court ordered the child returned. The taking parent appealed, and the Superior Court of Justice suspended the lower court's ruling. In May 2011, the Office of the Attorney General (OAG) appealed the suspension order. In November 2011, the Brazilian Central Authority (BCA) indicated that the appeal was before Brazil's Regional Federal Tribunal – First Region. In June 2012, this tribunal suggested that both parties review a proposed mediation agreement drafted by the judge, but the left-behind parent rejected the proposal. In June 2013, the OAG met with the judge to discuss the case but as of the close of the reporting period, there have been no developments. The U.S. Central Authority and U.S. Embassy Brasilia have regularly requested updates from the BCA on the court proceedings.</p> |

| COUNTRY | ABDUCTED/ RETAINED | APPLICATION FILED | CHILD(REN) LOCATED | SUMMARY OF CASE |
|---------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|---|
| BRAZIL | 8-2009 | 6-2010 | Yes | <p>In January 2012, the first level court ordered the return of the child to the United States. However, in February 2012, the left-behind parent (LBP) expressed interest in entering into mediation with the taking parent (TP). Since April 2012, the LBP and TP have negotiated a proposed mediation agreement. The TP recently signed the agreement and, in turn, the U.S. Central Authority forwarded the LBP's signed and notarized copy of the agreement to the Brazilian Central Authority in November 2013. The Office of the Attorney General states that it will submit the agreement to court.</p> |
| BRAZIL | 9-2009 | 2-2010 | Yes | <p>In October 2011, the left-behind parent informed the U.S. Central Authority (USCA) that a state court in Rio de Janeiro awarded the taking parent (TP) temporary custody of the child. The USCA informed the Brazilian Central Authority (BCA) of a possible conflict under Article 16 of the Convention. The BCA and Office of the Attorney General (OAG) addressed the issue with the state court, which declined to suspend custody action in the case. In December 2011, a federal court ordered the return of the child to the United States. In January 2012, the TP filed an appeal of the return order. In October 2012, the BCA stated that the appeals court denied the return of the child and the OAG filed an appeal in November 2012. In June 2013, the court accepted the appeal and upheld the return of the child, but the TP and child went missing. Per the BCA, Interpol and Brazilian law enforcement are actively searching for the TP and child but, as of the close of the reporting period, they have not been located. The USCA and U.S. Embassy Brasilia have regularly requested updates from the BCA on location efforts.</p> |

| COUNTRY | ABDUCTED/ RETAINED | APPLICATION FILED | CHILD(REN) LOCATED | SUMMARY OF CASE |
|---------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|--|
| BRAZIL | 6-2011 | 11-2011 | No | The case has not moved forward since it was sent to the Brazilian Central Authority (BCA) in November 2011 because the taking parent (TP) and child have not been located. The BCA stated that they have frequently requested the assistance of Interpol and Brazilian law enforcement in locating the TP and child, without success. The U.S. Central Authority and U.S. Embassy Brasilia have regularly requested updates from the BCA on location efforts. |
| BRAZIL | 7-2011 | 01-2012 | No | In April 2013, a federal court ordered the child returned but, hours later, when the court officer went to pick up the child to hand over to the left-behind parent, the taking parent (TP) had absconded with the child. U.S. Consulate Sao Paulo has been working with local law enforcement to locate the TP and child but, as of the close of the reporting period, they are still missing. The U.S. Central Authority and U.S. Embassy Brasilia have regularly requested updates from the Brazilian Central Authority on location efforts. |
| BRAZIL | 9-2011 | 12-2011 | Yes | The left-behind parent filed the Hague application directly in Brazilian federal court without going through the respective central authorities. In December 2011, the court ordered the child returned and the taking parent (TP) appealed the decision. In September 2013 the Office of Attorney General (OAG) agreed to assist in the Hague case. The TP and child were missing until December 2013 and, at this time, the Brazilian Central Authority (BCA) requested that the OAG file a motion for the enforcement of the original return order. The U.S. Central Authority and U.S. Embassy Brasilia have regularly requested updates from the BCA. |

| COUNTRY | ABDUCTED/ RETAINED | APPLICATION FILED | CHILD(REN) LOCATED | SUMMARY OF CASE |
|---------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|--|
| BRAZIL | 1-2012 | 1-2012 | Yes | In May 2012, the Brazilian Central Authority (BCA) informed the U.S. Central Authority (USCA) that, due to abuse allegations made by the taking parent, the case would be sent to the Secretariat of Women's Policies for further review. Not until September 2013, and a leadership change within the BCA, was the case forwarded to the Office of Attorney General (OAG). In November 2013, the BCA reported that the OAG had accepted the case but as of the end of the reporting period, it had not yet been forwarded to court. The USCA and U.S. Embassy Brasilia have regularly requested updates from the BCA. |
| CANADA | 11-2007 | 11-2010 | Yes | In November 2010, the U.S. Central Authority forwarded the case to the Canadian Central Authority. The left-behind parent (LBP) was working with his Canadian attorney to locate the taking parent and the child, and in June 2011, location was confirmed. In June 2011, a Hague hearing was postponed because the Canadian Office of the Children's Lawyer intervened and requested a further investigation of the LBP related to the well-being of the child. Since that time, the court has ordered interim access to the child for the LBP but has declined to rule on the underlying Hague matter instead urging the parties to reach a settlement. After lengthy delays, a hearing has been set for March 2014. |
| CANADA | 12-2010 | 10-2011 | Yes | In October 2011, the U.S. Central Authority (USCA) forwarded the case to the Canadian Central Authority (CCA). After several months, the left-behind parent retained Canadian counsel and began working with taking parent's attorney to negotiate a mutual agreement. These negotiations went on until November 2013, when the CCA informed the USCA that an agreement was not finalized and the Hague case would proceed to court. The USCA is working with the CCA to confirm a date for the Hague hearing. |

| COUNTRY | ABDUCTED/ RETAINED | APPLICATION FILED | CHILD(REN) LOCATED | SUMMARY OF CASE |
|-------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|--|
| COLOMBIA | 7-2010 | 9-2011 | No | <p>The children have not yet been located. In September and October 2011, the Colombian Central Authority (CCA) requested specific contact information for the children and taking parent (TP) in addition to the city name, photos, and other details provided by the left-behind parent (LBP). In April 2012, the U.S. Central Authority (USCA) passed the CCA additional information to assist in locating the children. In October 2013, the LBP contacted the USCA with photos and other information regarding the children and the USCA passed them to the CCA. In December 2013, the CCA reported they would close the case as the LBP did not provide more specific address information for the TP and the children and the USCA has objected to this decision. The USCA and U.S. Embassy Bogota have regularly requested updates from the CCA on the status of this case.</p> |
| COSTA RICA | 7-2011 | 6-2012 | Yes | <p>A court hearing was held in February 2013. In March 2013, the first instance court denied the child's return. In July 2013 the appeals court upheld the lower court ruling. The left-behind parent (LBP) then filed an appeal with the Costa Rican Supreme Court. In November 2013, the LBP informed us that the Supreme Court denied the LBP's appeal but at the end of the reporting period the U.S. Central Authority (USCA) had not received a copy of the court's decision. The USCA and U.S. Embassy San Jose have regularly requested updates, and a copy of the appellate ruling, from the Costa Rican Central Authority.</p> |

| COUNTRY | ABDUCTED/ RETAINED | APPLICATION FILED | CHILD(REN) LOCATED | SUMMARY OF CASE |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|--|
| COSTA RICA | 03-2012 | 06-2012 | Yes | <p>In April 2013, the Costa Rican Central Authority (CRCA) informed the U.S. Central Authority (USCA) that the children had been located. In May 2013, a CRCA representative warned the USCA that a Costa Rican constitutional provision, which prohibits Costa Ricans from leaving the country against their will, would likely be a factor in any decision regarding the children's return, since the children are U.S.-Costa Rican nationals. During a hearing in August 2013, an individual from the CRCA's parent agency highlighted the same constitutional provision and stated that it was in the children's best interests to stay in Costa Rica with their mother. In August 2013, the first instance court ruled against the children's return, finding them well-settled under Article 12 of the Hague Abduction Convention, although only three months had passed between the abduction and filing dates. At the end of the reporting period, the left-behind parent stated he intended to appeal the ruling.</p> |
| CROATIA | 8-2011 | 11-2011 | Yes | <p>In March 2012, the first instance court denied the child's return on the basis of Article 13(b) of the Hague Convention. The left-behind parent (LBP) appealed the decision, and in August 2012 the appellate court returned the case to the lower court. In November 2013, the Croatian Central Authority informed the U.S. Central Authority that at the LBP's request, the Croatian court appointed a new judge to hear the case and that a decision in the case is pending.</p> |
| DOMINICAN REPUBLIC | 4-2009 | 7-2008 | Yes | <p>In May 2010, the court denied the return of the child and the appellate court upheld that decision. In September 2012, the left-behind parent filed an appeal with the Supreme Court of the Dominican Republic. No date has been scheduled for the hearing. The U.S. Central Authority and U.S. Embassy Santo Domingo have regularly requested updates from the Dominican Central Authority on court proceedings and discuss cases during monthly conference calls.</p> |

| COUNTRY | ABDUCTED/ RETAINED | APPLICATION FILED | CHILD(REN) LOCATED | SUMMARY OF CASE |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|--|
| DOMINICAN REPUBLIC | 1-2011 | 4-2011 | Yes | In October 2011, the court denied the return of the children. The appeals court upheld the decision in 2012. In December 2012, the left-behind parent filed an appeal with the Supreme Court of the Dominican Republic without the assistance of the Dominican Central Authority (DCA), as the DCA stated that an appeal would not be permissible under Dominican law. No hearing date has been scheduled. The U.S Central Authority and the U.S. Embassy Santo Domingo have regularly requested updates from the DCA on court proceedings. |
| GUATEMALA | 6-2010 | 2-2011 | Yes | In March 2012, the Guatemalan Central Authority (GCA) obtained information on the children's possible location and requested that the court secure the children in protective custody and schedule an expedited Hague hearing. In April 2012, the court clerk and the police searched for, but failed to locate the children. In July 2012, the U.S. Central Authority (USCA) was informed by the GCA that the taking parent fled with the children to Mexico and that they would transfer the case to the Mexican Central Authority. In May 2013, the left-behind parent (LBP) informed the USCA that a Hague hearing was held in April 2013 and the judge denied the Hague return because the LBP did not have a representative at the court. The USCA requested a copy of the order, but the GCA has not provided a copy. |
| GUATEMALA | 9-2011 | 3-2012 | Yes | In April 2012, the Guatemalan Central Authority (GCA) confirmed receipt of the Hague application, but stated it would be unable to forward the case to court until the child was located. In September 2012, the GCA notified the U.S. Central Authority (USCA) that the Hague case was sent to the court, and in October 2012, the hearing was held and the judge ordered a return. The taking parent immediately appealed the decision and according to the GCA, the return order was reversed by the appellate court. The USCA requested a copy of the appellate court order and the date of the ruling but the GCA has not provided a copy of the order or further information. |

| COUNTRY | ABDUCTED/ RETAINED | APPLICATION FILED | CHILD(REN) LOCATED | SUMMARY OF CASE |
|-----------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|--|
| HONDURAS | 12-2007 | 2-2012 | Yes | <p>In February 2012, the Honduran Central Authority (HCA) requested that the left-behind parent (LBP) undergo a home study. In May 2012, after the U.S. Central Authority (USCA) forwarded the home study on the LBP's behalf, the HCA requested that the study be authenticated with by apostille. The USCA objected that such requests are inconsistent with Convention obligations; however, the LBP had the document apostilled in July 2012. After several postponements, a hearing took place in November 2012. In May 2013, the HCA reported that the child was ordered returned under the Convention. The USCA requested, but did not receive, a copy of the ruling from the HCA. After receiving the ruling from the LBP's lawyer, the USCA learned that it denies the child's return but states that the child is at "social risk" with the taking parent. In December 2013, the USCA requested clarification of the ruling but the HCA had not responded as of the end of the reporting period. The USCA and U.S. Embassy Tegucigalpa have regularly requested updates from the HCA seeking clarity on the case status.</p> |
| HONDURAS | 7-2010 | 3-2011 | No | <p>The child has not yet been located. In August 2011 and August 2012, the Honduran Central Authority (HCA) requested the taking parent's address to locate the child. In August 2012, the U.S. Central Authority (USCA) passed the HCA information regarding the possible location of the child. In September 2012, the HCA informed U.S. Embassy Tegucigalpa that it needed a specific address. In September 2013, the USCA passed additional information to the HCA. The HCA stated that it would perform a search. In October 2013, the USCA's primary HCA point of contact left her post. Since that time, the HCA has not provided any updates on the status of the search. The USCA and U.S. Embassy Tegucigalpa have regularly requested updates from the HCA on the status of this case.</p> |

| COUNTRY | ABDUCTED/ RETAINED | APPLICATION FILED | CHILD(REN) LOCATED | SUMMARY OF CASE |
|-----------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|--|
| HONDURAS | 1-2011 | 12-2011 | Yes | The Honduran Central Authority (HCA) did not provide updates on this case until August 2012, when it reported that per a judge's request, apostilles were required on the application and all supporting documents. The U.S. Central Authority has expressed that this requirement appears to be inconsistent with Hague Abduction Convention to both the HCA and Honduran Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The HCA maintains that the case will not move forward without the fulfillment of the judge's request, and the left-behind parent has not yet apostilled the documents. |
| ISRAEL | 5-2011 | 7-2011 | Yes | In October 2011, the left-behind parent (LBP) reported he was unable to afford an attorney. The U.S. Central Authority (USCA) provided the LBP with information about legal aid in the United States and in Israel. The Israeli Central Authority informed the USCA, that the case will not progress until the LBP applies for legal aid or retains an attorney at his own expense. The USCA has informed the LBP and is in regular communication about the case. |
| ITALY | 6-2012 | 6-2012 | Yes | In September 2012, the Juvenile Court in Florence ordered the child's return to the United States. The Juvenile Court subsequently stayed the return order, and the taking parent (TP) appealed the decision. In March 2013, the appeal was assigned to the Court of Cassation in Rome in January 2013. In April 2013, the Italian Central Authority (ICA) confirmed that no appeal hearing date had been set. In October 2013, the Court of Cassation heard the TP's appeal, and the public prosecutor recommended the child's return. In December 2013, the ICA confirmed that the final written decision remains pending. The U.S. Central Authority is in frequent communication with the ICA. |

| COUNTRY | ABDUCTED/ RETAINED | APPLICATION FILED | CHILD(REN) LOCATED | SUMMARY OF CASE |
|---------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|---|
| MEXICO | 3-2002 | 7-2002 | No | In January 2003, the court issued an order to secure the children, but the children were not located. The children's whereabouts remain unknown. Interpol is searching for the children. The U.S. Central Authority and the U.S. Mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the Mexican Central Authority on efforts to locate the children. |
| MEXICO | 9-2005 | 2-2006 | Yes | In April 2006, the court held a hearing on the Hague application, but the taking parent (TP) did not appear. In December 2006, the court requested psychological evaluations of the parents and child. The left-behind parent (LBP) also requested that the judge recuse himself from the case, but the judge declined. In January 2012, the judge ordered the child's return, but the TP appealed. In May 2012, the appellate court overturned the return order and remanded the case to the lower court. The LBP filed an <i>amparo</i> , which was denied in November 2012. In December 2012, the LBP requested a judicial review of the <i>amparo</i> resolution, which is still pending. The U.S. Central Authority and the U.S. Mission in Mexico have regular communication with the Mexican Central Authority on court proceedings. |
| MEXICO | 11-2005 | 4-2011 | No | In November 2011, the court scheduled a hearing but the child had not been located. The Mexican Central Authority (MCA) requested the assistance of Interpol to locate the child; however, the child's whereabouts remain unknown. The MCA has requested information from several Mexican institutions but found no records for the child. The U.S. Central Authority and the U.S. Mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on efforts to locate the child. |

| COUNTRY | ABDUCTED/ RETAINED | APPLICATION FILED | CHILD(REN) LOCATED | SUMMARY OF CASE |
|---------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|---|
| MEXICO | 3-2006 | 5-2006 | No | In May 2008, the court denied the Hague application, and the left-behind parent (LBP) appealed. The appellate court affirmed the lower court's decision in October 2008, and the LBP filed an <i>amparo</i> . In November 2009, the court granted the <i>amparo</i> and ordered the return of the child. The <i>Agencia Federal de Investigación</i> searched for the taking parent and child, but could not locate them. In October 2013, the Mexican Central Authority (MCA) referred the case to Interpol to search for the child. The U.S. Central Authority and the U.S. Mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on efforts to locate the child. |
| MEXICO | 9-2006 | 6-2008 | No | The California Attorney General filed the Hague application with the Mexican Central Authority (MCA). The MCA referred the case to law enforcement for assistance in locating the children; however, the children's whereabouts remain unknown. The U.S. Central Authority and the U.S. Mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on efforts to locate the children. |
| MEXICO | 9-2006 | 9-2008 | No | In June 2009, the court held a hearing on the Hague application, but the taking parent (TP) and child did not appear. In January 2012, law enforcement attempted to secure the child but was not successful. In August 2012, the TP filed an <i>amparo</i> . The child's whereabouts remain unknown and court proceedings remain stalled. The U.S. Central Authority and the U.S. Mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the Mexican Central Authority on efforts to locate the child. |

| COUNTRY | ABDUCTED/ RETAINED | APPLICATION FILED | CHILD(REN) LOCATED | SUMMARY OF CASE |
|---------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|---|
| MEXICO | 12-2006 | 6-2007 | No | The California Attorney General's Office filed the Hague application with the Mexican Central Authority (MCA) on behalf of a social services agency. The court postponed a hearing on the Hague application in April 2010 because the authorities were unable to locate the taking parent and children. The court returned the case to the MCA. The children have not been located. In 2013, the MCA requested the assistance of Interpol in locating the children. The U.S. Central Authority and the U.S. Mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on efforts to locate the children. |
| MEXICO | 3-2007 | 10-2007 | No | In April 2009, the court ordered the return of the child, even though the child had not yet been located. The Office of the District Attorney for Orange County (California) had supplied several leads on the whereabouts of the child, which the U.S. Central Authority (USCA) passed to the Mexican Central Authority (MCA), which in turn passed on to the <i>Agencia Federal de Investigación</i> . In July 2012, the MCA reported that the return order had been overturned, and the court would hold new hearings when Interpol located the child. In July 2013, the left-behind parent provided more information on the child's location. The MCA and a nongovernmental organization are working on location efforts. The USCA and the U.S. Mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on efforts to locate the child. |

| COUNTRY | ABDUCTED/ RETAINED | APPLICATION FILED | CHILD(REN) LOCATED | SUMMARY OF CASE |
|---------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|---|
| MEXICO | 3-2007 | 1-2008 | No | The child was in the custody of a social services agency when he was abducted by his maternal grandmother. In March 2009, the court scheduled a hearing on the Hague application. The grandmother and child failed to appear. The mother was released from jail and is believed to have joined the grandmother and child in Mexico. The Mexican Central Authority (MCA) and the court requested the <i>Agencia Federal de Investigación</i> 's assistance in locating the child. The MCA has requested information from several Mexican institutions but found no records for the child. Court proceedings remain stalled because the child has not been located. The U.S. Central Authority and the U.S. Mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on efforts to locate the child. |
| MEXICO | 3-2007 | 8-2009 | No | In March 2010, the Mexican Central Authority (MCA) confirmed that the case had been referred to Interpol for assistance in locating the child, thus far without success. The U.S. Central Authority and the U.S. Mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on efforts to locate the child. |
| MEXICO | 6-2007 | 10-2007 | No | The court scheduled a hearing on the Hague application in November 2008, but when the court notified the taking parent (TP), he disappeared with the child. In November 2009, the Mexican Central Authority (MCA) requested the assistance of the <i>Agencia Federal de Investigación</i> in finding the TP and the child. Court proceedings meanwhile remain stalled. In October 2013, the MCA referred the case to Interpol to search for the child. In November 2013, the U.S. Central Authority (USCA) shared an updated age progression photo with the MCA. The USCA and the U.S. Mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on efforts to locate the child. |

| COUNTRY | ABDUCTED/ RETAINED | APPLICATION FILED | CHILD(REN) LOCATED | SUMMARY OF CASE |
|---------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|---|
| MEXICO | 8-2007 | 10-2007 | Yes | In September 2008, the court ordered the return of the child, but the taking parent (TP) appealed. In December 2008, the appellate court overturned the decision to return the child. In January 2009, the left-behind parent (LBP) filed an <i>amparo</i> against this decision. In May 2009, the <i>amparo</i> court returned the case to the original court and ordered that it reconsider its decision after reviewing psychological examinations of the TP and child, but did not order a psychological examination of the LBP. In May 2010, the court denied the return, finding that the child was well-settled in Mexico; the LBP appealed. In October 2010, the appellate court returned the case to the lower court, ordering it to have a psychological evaluation of the LBP prepared and considered in its decision. In December 2010, the LBP traveled to Mexico for psychological testing. In September 2012, the court denied the return and the LBP appealed the decision, which was denied in December 2012. The LBP filed another <i>amparo</i> , which remains pending. The U.S. Central Authority and the U.S. Mission in Mexico have regular communication with the Mexican Central Authority on court proceedings. |
| MEXICO | 9-2007 | 12-2007 | No | In December 2007, the Mexican Central Authority (MCA) forwarded the Hague application to the court, but the child has not yet been located. In November 2007, the U.S. Embassy conducted a welfare and whereabouts visit and reported that the child was living with his maternal grandparents. This information was provided to the MCA but the <i>Agencia Federal de Investigación</i> has been unsuccessful in locating the child. The MCA has requested school information from Mexican institutions but has found no record of the child. Court proceedings meanwhile remain stalled. In October 2013, the U.S. Central Authority provided updated information to the MCA. |

| COUNTRY | ABDUCTED/ RETAINED | APPLICATION FILED | CHILD(REN) LOCATED | SUMMARY OF CASE |
|---------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|---|
| MEXICO | 12-2007 | 7-2008 | Yes | The California Attorney General filed the Hague application with the Mexican Central Authority (MCA). In September 2008, the court ordered the child's return under the Convention. The taking parent (TP) then filed an <i>amparo</i> , which was denied. Subsequently, the TP requested a judicial review. In November 2011, the reviewing court upheld the denial of the <i>amparo</i> . The left-behind parent (LBP) and TP attempted to reach an agreement but failed. The LBP filed a motion with the original court for a final return order on the Hague application. The U.S. Central Authority and the U.S. Mission in Mexico have regular communication with the MCA on court proceedings. |
| MEXICO | 12-2007 | 10-2008 | No | The California Attorney General filed the Hague application with the Mexican Central Authority (MCA). The whereabouts of the child are unknown; therefore, the MCA reports that jurisdiction cannot be determined. In August 2011, the U.S. Central Authority (USCA) provided an address in Zacatecas (provided by the left-behind parent) where the child may be residing. Integral Family Development (DIF) Monterrey visited that address at the U.S. Consulate's request in June 2012, to conduct a welfare and whereabouts visit. DIF spoke with the maternal grandmother, who reported that the child and taking parent had relocated to Aguascalientes. DIF Aguascalientes found school records for the child and visited the house, but it was abandoned. In December 2013, the USCA sent a copy of DIF's report from Aguascalientes to the MCA. Interpol is now searching for the child. The USCA and the U.S. Mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on efforts to locate the child. |

| COUNTRY | ABDUCTED/ RETAINED | APPLICATION FILED | CHILD(REN) LOCATED | SUMMARY OF CASE |
|---------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|--|
| MEXICO | 2-2008 | 6-2008 | No | In November 2008, the Mexican Central Authority (MCA) sent the case to the <i>Agencia Federal de Investigación</i> for assistance in locating the children. The case was not forwarded to a court, as jurisdiction could not be determined. In 2011, the U.S. Central Authority (USCA) shared an updated age progression photo with the MCA to help with the search. In 2013, the MCA requested the assistance of Interpol in locating the children. The USCA and the U.S. Mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on efforts to locate the children. |
| MEXICO | 3-2008 | 5-2008 | No | In June 2009, the Mexican Central Authority (MCA) referred the case to the <i>Agencia Federal de Investigación</i> (AFI) for assistance. The left-behind parent provided information and a picture of the child directly to AFI. The MCA reports that the case has not been forwarded to a court as jurisdiction cannot be determined. In October 2013, the MCA referred the case to Interpol to search for the child. In December 2013, the U.S. Central Authority (USCA) shared an updated age progression photo with the MCA. The USCA and the U.S. Mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on efforts to locate the child. |
| MEXICO | 5-2008 | 3-2009 | No | An August 2010 hearing on the Hague application was postponed because the taking parent did not appear. In September 2011, the <i>Agencia Federal de Investigación</i> discovered that the children had been moved to an unknown location in a different state in Mexico. The Mexican Central Authority (MCA) then requested the assistance of Interpol to locate the children. One child is now 16 years of age and is no longer eligible for return under the Convention. The U.S. Central Authority and the U.S. Mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on efforts to locate the younger child. |

| COUNTRY | ABDUCTED/ RETAINED | APPLICATION FILED | CHILD(REN) LOCATED | SUMMARY OF CASE |
|---------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|--|
| MEXICO | 6-2008 | 8-2008 | Yes | In April 2009, the court denied the Hague application. The left-behind parent (LBP) appealed. In July 2009, the Supreme Court of Guanajuato overturned the decision and ordered the return of the child. However, the taking parent (TP) appealed that decision before the return order could be enforced. Since that time, the TP has filed several appeals and <i>amparos</i> . In September 2010, the state appeals court's ruling on the TP's <i>amparo</i> determined that there was a mistrial in the original proceeding. It ordered the case returned to the court of first instance. In December 2010, the TP filed another <i>amparo</i> . The LBP has also filed <i>amparos</i> in the case. In August 2012, the court in Guanajuato denied the child's return to the United States because the court found the child to be well settled and the judge also took into consideration the five-year-old child's wish to remain in Mexico. The LBP filed an <i>amparo</i> in January 2013, which is still pending. The U.S. Central Authority and the U.S. Mission in Mexico have regular communication with the Mexican Central Authority on court proceedings. |
| MEXICO | 7-2008 | 9-2008 | No | The Mexican Central Authority (MCA) forwarded the Hague application to the court, but the children have not been located. In April 2010, the MCA referred the case to the <i>Agencia Federal de Investigación</i> for assistance in finding the children. The MCA has requested information from several Mexican institutions but has found no records for the children. Interpol continues searching for the children. The U.S. Central Authority and the U.S. Mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on efforts to locate the children. |

| COUNTRY | ABDUCTED/ RETAINED | APPLICATION FILED | CHILD(REN) LOCATED | SUMMARY OF CASE |
|---------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|--|
| MEXICO | 9-2008 | 5-2009 | Yes | The California Attorney General filed the Hague application with the Mexican Central Authority (MCA). The court did not provide updates for more than a year. In December 2009, after further inquiries from the MCA, the court reported that the taking parent had appeared at an earlier court hearing but refused to return the child voluntarily. In May 2012, the MCA notified the U.S. Central Authority (USCA) that the court had denied the return of the child at a hearing in April 2012. The USCA sent a letter to the MCA expressing concern about the apparent failure of the court to properly notify in a timely fashion the MCA or the left-behind parent (LBP) about the hearing or the court decision. The LBP appealed this decision and, in November 2013, the appeal was denied. The LBP plans to further appeal this case to a higher court. The USCA and the U.S. Mission in Mexico have regular communication with the MCA on court proceedings. |
| MEXICO | 9-2008 | 6-2009 | No | In October 2010, the Mexican Central Authority (MCA) requested the assistance of the <i>Agencia Federal de Investigación</i> in locating the children. In 2013, Interpol took the lead on the search. The MCA has reached out to various entities following leads provided throughout the year by the left-behind parent. None have yielded conclusive results. The U.S. Central Authority and the U.S. Mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on efforts to locate the children. |
| MEXICO | 11-2008 | 4-2009 | Yes | In March 2010, the court asked for assistance in locating the child. However, the taking parent (TP) filed an <i>amparo</i> , seeking to halt the Convention proceedings. In October 2013, Interpol located the child. The TP again filed an <i>amparo</i> and the Mexican Central Authority (MCA) recommended that the left-behind parent retain an attorney to respond. The U.S. Central Authority and the U.S. Mission in Mexico have regular communication with the MCA on court proceedings. |

| COUNTRY | ABDUCTED/ RETAINED | APPLICATION FILED | CHILD(REN) LOCATED | SUMMARY OF CASE |
|---------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|---|
| MEXICO | 11-2008 | 9-2009 | Yes | In May 2010, the court denied the Hague application for return after determining that the left-behind parent (LBP) had consented to the removal of the child to Mexico and that the child was now well settled. Soon after, the LBP filed an appeal and in November 2011, the appellate court upheld the lower court's denial of return. The LBP filed an <i>amparo</i> against the decision of the appellate court. In May 2012, the LBP won the <i>amparo</i> , and the <i>amparo</i> court remanded the case to the lower court. In December 2013, the court denied the return of the child. The LBP intends to appeal the court's decision. The U.S. Central Authority and the U.S. Mission in Mexico have regular communication with the Mexican Central Authority on court proceedings. |
| MEXICO | 12-2008 | 12-2009 | Yes | In April 2010, the court scheduled a hearing, but the child had not yet been located. The court referred the case to law enforcement for assistance. In September 2012, Interpol located the child and the court held a hearing in which the return of the child was denied. The left-behind parent filed an <i>amparo</i> and is awaiting a decision. The U.S. Central Authority and the U.S. Mission in Mexico have regular communication with the Mexican Central Authority. |
| MEXICO | 12-2008 | 3-2010 | Yes | In December 2010, the left-behind parent (LBP) and taking parent (TP) entered into an agreement, ratified by the court, for the child's return. The TP did not comply and filed an appeal and later an <i>amparo</i> . The TP lost both legal recourses and requested a judicial review. The court was ordered to restart the Convention process. In December 2013, the judge denied the child's return but ordered visitation. The LBP intends to appeal the decision to deny return. The U.S. Central Authority has regular communication with the Mexican Central Authority. |

| COUNTRY | ABDUCTED/ RETAINED | APPLICATION FILED | CHILD(REN) LOCATED | SUMMARY OF CASE |
|---------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|--|
| MEXICO | 12-2008 | 4-2011 | No | The California Attorney General filed the Hague application with the Mexican Central Authority (MCA) on behalf of a social services agency. A court hearing was scheduled in October 2011, but the taking parent and child did not show up. The case was referred to Interpol which is searching for the child. The MCA has requested school records for the child. The U.S. Central Authority and the U.S. Mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on efforts to locate the child. |
| MEXICO | 1-2009 | 5-2009 | No | The California Attorney General filed the Hague application with the Mexican Central Authority (MCA). In May 2010, the MCA confirmed that the <i>Agencia Federal de Investigación</i> was searching for the child. The U.S. Central Authority (USCA) has provided updated information about the possible location of the child to the MCA. The MCA has requested information from several Mexican institutions but has found no records for the child. Interpol continues searching for the child. The USCA and the U.S. Mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on efforts to locate the child. |
| MEXICO | 1-2009 | 6-2011 | Yes | The Hague application was filed in March 2011, but it was returned by the Mexican Central Authority (MCA) because the child's names did not match the birth certificate due to an amendment of the birth record. The Hague application was resubmitted in June 2011. In June 2013, the court denied the return of the child. In August 2013, the left-behind parent (LBP) filed an appeal which was denied. In October 2013, the LBP filed an <i>amparo</i> , which remains pending. The U.S. Central Authority and the U.S. Mission in Mexico have regular communication with the MCA on court proceedings. |

| COUNTRY | ABDUCTED/ RETAINED | APPLICATION FILED | CHILD(REN) LOCATED | SUMMARY OF CASE |
|---------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|--|
| MEXICO | 2-2009 | 10-2009 | Yes | The California Attorney General filed the Hague return application with the Mexican Central Authority (MCA). In October 2010, the case was denied by a family court in Tampico. In November 2010, the left-behind parent (LBP) appealed the case to the Superior Tribunal in Tamaulipas. In October 2011, the appellate court upheld the denial of return. In January 2012, the LBP filed another appeal, which was denied in May 2012. In June 2012, the LBP filed an <i>amparo</i> with the federal court. In April 2013, the <i>amparo</i> court remanded the case to the family court for new proceeding. The USCA and the U.S. Mission in Mexico have regular communication with the MCA. |
| MEXICO | 3-2009 | 3-2010 | Yes | The child was located and a hearing was scheduled in June 2011, but the taking parent (TP) was not notified and did not attend the hearing. The court then closed the case. The left-behind parent (LBP) contested the decision and the court reopened the case in July 2011. At a hearing in November 2012, the court denied the return of the child and the LBP filed an appeal. The appellate court overturned the denial and remanded the case to the lower court. A new hearing was scheduled for December 2013. The TP did not attend the hearing and it was postponed to January 2014. The U.S. Central Authority and the U.S. Mission in Mexico have regular communication with the Mexican Central Authority on court proceedings. |
| MEXICO | 6-2009 | 10-2009 | No | The taking parent (TP) attempted to file for custody in Mexico, but in December 2009, the Mexican Central Authority (MCA) advised the custody court to suspend proceedings due to the pending Hague application. The first court hearing on the Hague application was held in January 2010. In April 2010, the court ordered the return of the child under the Hague Convention. The TP appealed the decision. The TP also filed a succession of <i>amparos</i> , which were resolved in September 2011. Several hearings on the TP's appeal have taken place but the appeal remains pending and the child has not been located. The U.S. Central Authority and the U.S. Mission in Mexico have regular communication with the MCA on court proceedings. |

| COUNTRY | ABDUCTED/ RETAINED | APPLICATION FILED | CHILD(REN) LOCATED | SUMMARY OF CASE |
|---------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|---|
| MEXICO | 7-2009 | 11-2009 | Yes | In June 2010, the court denied the return of the children, as the two older children objected to returning to the United States. The left-behind parent (LBP) filed an appeal, and the appellate court overturned the denial and remanded the case to the lower court. In October 2012, the court again denied the Hague return application. The LBP intends to file an <i>amparo</i> . The U.S. Central Authority and the U.S. Mission in Mexico have regular communication with the Mexican Central Authority on court proceedings. |
| MEXICO | 9-2009 | 11-2010 | No | In April 2010, one of the children was reported kidnapped from the taking parent (TP) by a criminal group in Mexico. The U.S. Embassy was informed of the kidnapping. The child was later reported recovered by the TP. A court hearing on the Hague application took place in April 2012. The Mexican Central Authority (MCA) requested the <i>Agencia Federal de Investigación</i> 's assistance to locate the children, believed to be living with the TP. The eldest child, living with other relatives in Mexico, had provided location information of the siblings to the left-behind parent), which the U.S. Central Authority (USCA) relayed to the MCA in October 2013. The USCA and the U.S. Mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on efforts to locate the children. |
| MEXICO | 11-2009 | 6-2010 | Yes | The Mexican Central Authority (MCA) sent the case to the court in September 2010. In October 2011, the MCA informed the U.S. Central Authority (USCA) that the child was not located so the case was sent to the <i>Agencia Federal de Investigación</i> . In January 2012, the USCA sent a possible location for the child to the MCA. In October 2013, the child was located and the court ordered return. The taking parent filed an <i>amparo</i> and the child remains in Integral Family Development custody. The USCA and the U.S. Mission in Mexico have regular communication with the MCA on court proceedings. |

| COUNTRY | ABDUCTED/ RETAINED | APPLICATION FILED | CHILD(REN) LOCATED | SUMMARY OF CASE |
|---------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|--|
| MEXICO | 2-2010 | 1-2012 | Yes | The court ordered the children's return in April 2012. The taking parent (TP) filed an appeal and an <i>amparo</i> at the same time. The <i>amparo</i> was accepted and the return order was invalidated. The case was remanded to the lower court which again ordered the return in August 2013. The TP then filed another <i>amparo</i> which remains pending. The U.S. Central Authority and the U.S. Mission in Mexico have regular communication with the Mexican Central Authority on court proceedings. |
| MEXICO | 3-2010 | 4-2011 | No | The Mexican Central Authority (MCA) requested the assistance of law enforcement to locate the child and, in October 2012, the child was located. The court held several hearings in October and November 2012. In December 2012, while the child remained in the custody of Integral Family Development (DIF) and the court had not issued a final order, the child was abducted from the DIF shelter by the taking parent and a relative. The child's whereabouts are unknown and court proceedings remain stalled. The U.S. Central Authority and the U.S. Mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on efforts to locate the child. |
| MEXICO | 7-2010 | 10-2011 | No | The California Attorney General's Office filed the Hague application with the Mexican Central Authority (MCA). The court scheduled a hearing for January 2012; however, the children did not appear. The taking parent (TP) has filed a series of <i>amparos</i> since August 2012, which the court denied. In December 2013, the TP filed a request for a judicial review of the denial. The children have not been located. In 2013, the MCA requested the assistance of Interpol in locating the children. The U.S. Central Authority and the U.S. Mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on efforts to locate the children. |

| COUNTRY | ABDUCTED/ RETAINED | APPLICATION FILED | CHILD(REN) LOCATED | SUMMARY OF CASE |
|---------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|---|
| MEXICO | 7-2010 | 4-2012 | Yes | In September 2012, the court denied the children's return. The left-behind parent (LBP) filed an <i>amparo</i> challenging the decision, which the court denied. The LBP then filed a request for a judicial review of the denial. The court's final decision on the review is pending. The U.S. Central Authority and the U.S. Mission in Mexico have regular communication with the Mexican Central Authority on court proceedings. |
| MEXICO | 8-2010 | 8-2010 | Yes | The California Attorney General filed the Hague return application with the Mexican Central Authority (MCA). In March 2012, the MCA informed the U.S. Central Authority (USCA) that it would send a request to transfer the case to a different court, since the taking parent (TP) was thought to have personal connections with courts and police in the jurisdiction. In November 2012, the MCA informed USCA that the TP had filed an <i>amparo</i> which was denied. In August 2013, the court denied the child's return. The left-behind parent (LBP) appealed this decision; however, the appellate court upheld the ruling in September 2013. In October 2013, the LBP filed an <i>amparo</i> , which is still pending. The USCA and the U.S. Mission in Mexico have regular communication with the MCA on court proceedings. |
| MEXICO | 8-2010 | 12-2010 | No | In January 2011, the Mexican Central Authority (MCA) requested Interpol's assistance in locating the child. Since that time, efforts to locate the child have been unsuccessful. The MCA reported that the case was not forwarded to a court as jurisdiction could not be determined. The U.S. Central Authority (USCA) has provided updates to the MCA on behalf of the left-behind parent. The MCA has requested information from several Mexican institutions but found no record of the child. The USCA and the U.S. Mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on efforts to locate the child. |

| COUNTRY | ABDUCTED/ RETAINED | APPLICATION FILED | CHILD(REN) LOCATED | SUMMARY OF CASE |
|---------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|--|
| MEXICO | 8-2010 | 1-2011 | Yes | A hearing was scheduled for July 2011, but the children had not yet been located. In August 2011, the taking parent (TP) filed an <i>amparo</i> . In March 2012, the TP lost the <i>amparo</i> , and the case was remanded to the original court for a final order on the Hague application. In June 2013, the left-behind parent (LBP), TP, and children attended a hearing and the judge denied the children's return. Subsequently, the LBP filed an appeal. The U.S. Central Authority and the U.S. Mission in Mexico have regular communication with the Mexican Central Authority on court proceedings. |
| MEXICO | 9-2010 | 5-2011 | No | A Hague hearing took place in December 2011, but the court could not locate the child. In May 2012, the Mexican Central Authority (MCA) requested the <i>Agencia Federal de Investigación's</i> assistance to locate the child. In June 2012, the MCA informed the U.S. Central Authority (USCA) that the case was sent to Interpol and requested photos of the child, which the USCA forwarded. The MCA reports that they have requested information from several Mexican institutions but found no records for the child. The USCA and the U.S. Mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on efforts to locate the child. |
| MEXICO | 10-2010 | 4-2011 | No | In September 2011, the Mexican Central Authority (MCA) requested Interpol's assistance in locating the child. Since that time, efforts to locate the child have been unsuccessful. The MCA reports that the case was not forwarded to a court as jurisdiction could not be determined. The U.S. Central Authority (USCA) has provided updated information about the possible location of the child to the MCA. The MCA has requested information from several Mexican institutions but found no record of the child. Interpol continues searching for the child. The USCA and the U.S. Mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on efforts to locate the child. |

| COUNTRY | ABDUCTED/ RETAINED | APPLICATION FILED | CHILD(REN) LOCATED | SUMMARY OF CASE |
|---------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|--|
| MEXICO | 10-2010 | 4-2011 | No | The Mexican Central Authority (MCA) requested the assistance of Interpol to locate the child; however, the child's whereabouts remain unknown. The U.S. Central Authority and the U.S. Mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on efforts to locate the child. |
| MEXICO | 11-2010 | 3-2012 | Yes | In April 2012, the case was sent to a Durango Court. In May and June 2012, hearings were held. The taking parent filed an <i>amparo</i> which was denied. The court denied the return in September 2013, and the left-behind parent filed an appeal which is still pending in Durango. The U.S. Central Authority and the U.S. Mission in Mexico have regular communication with the Mexican Central Authority on court proceedings. |
| MEXICO | 12-2010 | 3-2011 | Yes | In October 2011, the court ordered the return of the children. In December 2011, the Mexican Central Authority (MCA) requested law enforcement assistance to execute the order. The children were located in June 2013, and the taking parent filed an appeal, which remains pending. The U.S. Central Authority and the U.S. Mission in Mexico have regular communication with the MCA on court proceedings. |
| MEXICO | 12-2010 | 8-2011 | Yes | The court denied the return of the child in December 2013, as the seven-year-old child objected to returning to the United States. The left-behind parent intends to appeal the decision. The U.S. Central Authority and the U.S. Mission in Mexico have regular communication with the Mexican Central Authority on court proceedings. |
| MEXICO | 12-2010 | 1-2012 | No | The Mexican Central Authority (MCA) requested the assistance of law enforcement to locate the child. However, the child's whereabouts remain unknown and court proceedings remain stalled. The U.S. Central Authority and the U.S. Mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on efforts to locate the child. |

| COUNTRY | ABDUCTED/ RETAINED | APPLICATION FILED | CHILD(REN) LOCATED | SUMMARY OF CASE |
|---------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|--|
| MEXICO | 1-2011 | 4-2011 | No | The Mexican Central Authority (MCA) requested the assistance of law enforcement to locate the child. In September 2012, the taking parent filed an <i>amparo</i> , which was denied. The child's whereabouts remain unknown and court proceedings remain stalled. The U.S. Central Authority and the U.S. Mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on efforts to locate the child. |
| MEXICO | 2-2011 | 5-2011 | No | In September 2012, the U.S. Central Authority (USCA) sent a new possible address to the Mexican Central Authority (MCA) but law enforcement was unable to locate the child. The child's whereabouts remain unknown and court proceedings remain stalled. The USCA and the U.S. Mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on efforts to locate the child. |
| MEXICO | 3-2011 | 8-2011 | No | The Mexican Central Authority (MCA) forwarded the Hague application to the court, but the court has not located the children. In October 2013, the left-behind parent reported that the children had moved to a different town in Guanajuato. The MCA then requested the assistance of Interpol to locate the children. The U.S. Central Authority and the U.S. Mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on efforts to locate the children. |

| COUNTRY | ABDUCTED/ RETAINED | APPLICATION FILED | CHILD(REN) LOCATED | SUMMARY OF CASE |
|---------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|--|
| MEXICO | 3-2011 | 1-2012 | Yes | The Leon court scheduled a hearing on the Hague application for March 2012, and the children were temporarily taken into Integral Family Development (DIF) custody due to claims that the taking parent (TP) was abusing alcohol. The TP then filed an <i>amparo</i> against DIF in March 2012. In May 2013, more than a year later, a Hague hearing was held. The court requested the left-behind parent's (LBP) criminal records and postponed follow up hearings multiple times until the LBP provided a criminal records check to the U.S. Central Authority, which then forwarded it to the Mexican Central Authority (MCA). The court scheduled another hearing for September 2013, but this was postponed due to the TP filing an <i>amparo</i> before the hearing could be held. As of December 2013, the court had requested a psychological evaluation to be done on the LBP in Mexico. Court proceedings remained stalled while the MCA discussed with the court the difficulty of complying with this request. |
| MEXICO | 3-2011 | 3-2012 | Yes | The Mexican Central Authority (MCA) forwarded the case to the court in April 2012. The court scheduled a hearing for May 2012. A succession of <i>amparos</i> was filed, delaying judicial proceedings on the Hague application. The court ordered the return of the child in April 2013. The taking parent filed an appeal against the April 2013 decision, which is still pending. The U.S. Central Authority and the U.S. Mission in Mexico have regular communication with the MCA on court proceedings. |
| MEXICO | 4-2011 | 12-2011 | No | The Mexican Central Authority (MCA) forwarded the Hague application to the court, but the court has not located the child. In July 2013, the left-behind parent reported that the child had moved to a different state in Mexico and the MCA then requested the assistance of Interpol to locate the child. The U.S. Central Authority and the U.S. Mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on efforts to locate the child. |

| COUNTRY | ABDUCTED/ RETAINED | APPLICATION FILED | CHILD(REN) LOCATED | SUMMARY OF CASE |
|---------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|---|
| MEXICO | 5-2011 | 11-2011 | No | The court located the children in March 2012 and set a hearing for April 2012. In April 2012, the court denied the children's return. The left-behind parent (LBP) filed an <i>amparo</i> and appealed the decision. Both legal proceedings remain ongoing and the LBP is also working with the Mexican legal system to obtain custody. The U.S. Central Authority and the U.S. Mission in Mexico have regular communication with the MCA on court proceedings. |
| MEXICO | 6-2011 | 8-2011 | Yes | In 2013, Interpol located the child in Guanajuato. In July 2013, the taking parent filed an <i>amparo</i> . The court's final decision on the <i>amparo</i> is pending. The U.S. Central Authority and the U.S. Mission in Mexico have regular communication with the Mexican Central Authority on court proceedings. |
| MEXICO | 7-2011 | 8-2011 | No | The California Attorney General's Office filed the Hague application for the child with the Mexican Central Authority (MCA). At a March 2012 hearing, the taking parent (TP) agreed to return the child in April 2012. When the TP failed to appear, the court ordered the child's return. Subsequently, the TP fled with the child and filed a series of <i>amparos</i> . The child has not been located. In 2013, the MCA requested the assistance of Interpol to locate the child. The U.S. Central Authority and the U.S. Mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on efforts to locate the child. |
| MEXICO | 7-2011 | 8-2011 | No | The Mexican Central Authority (MCA) requested the assistance of law enforcement to locate the child. However, the child's whereabouts remain unknown and court proceedings remain stalled. The U.S. Central Authority and the U.S. Mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on efforts to locate the child. |

| COUNTRY | ABDUCTED/ RETAINED | APPLICATION FILED | CHILD(REN) LOCATED | SUMMARY OF CASE |
|---------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|--|
| MEXICO | 8-2011 | 10-2011 | No | The Mexican Central Authority (MCA) requested the assistance of law enforcement to locate the child. The taking parent (TP) filed an <i>amparo</i> , which was denied in January 2013. In October 2013, Interpol attempted to recover the child but the TP and child fled. The child's whereabouts are unknown and court proceedings remain stalled. The U.S. Central Authority and the U.S. Mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on efforts to locate the child. |
| MEXICO | 9-2011 | 2-2012 | No | The court scheduled a hearing for April 2012 but before Mexican officials could secure the child, the taking parent (TP) fled the home with the child. The court ordered the return of the child in July 2012 even though the child was not present. The TP filed an <i>amparo</i> , which the court denied. The TP filed a request for judicial review of the denial. The court's final decision on the review is pending. In 2013, the Mexican Central Authority (MCA) requested the assistance of Interpol in locating the child. The U.S. Central Authority and the U.S. Mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on efforts to locate the child and court proceedings. |
| MEXICO | 11-2011 | 6-2012 | No | The child's whereabouts remain unknown and court proceedings remain stalled. In 2013, the Mexican Central Authority (MCA) requested the assistance of Interpol in locating the child. The U.S. Central Authority and the U.S. Mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on efforts to locate the child. |
| MEXICO | 12-2011 | 5-2012 | No | The California Attorney General filed the Hague application with the Mexican Central Authority (MCA). In February 2013, the left-behind parent's (LBP) representative appeared in the court although the taking parent was not present. The LBP's representative requested a final decision from the court on the Hague application but the court has not yet ruled. The U.S. Central Authority and the U.S. Mission in Mexico have regular communication with the MCA on court proceedings. |

| COUNTRY | ABDUCTED/ RETAINED | APPLICATION FILED | CHILD(REN) LOCATED | SUMMARY OF CASE |
|---------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|---|
| MEXICO | 1-2012 | 6-2012 | No | The California Attorney General's Office filed the Hague return application with the Mexican Central Authority (MCA). The court scheduled a hearing for March 2013; however, the taking parent and child did not appear. In 2013, the MCA requested the assistance of Interpol in locating the child. The U.S. Central Authority and the U.S. Mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on efforts to locate the child. |
| PANAMA | 12-2011 | 4-2012 | Yes | In April 2012, the U.S. Central Authority (USCA) filed the Hague case with the Panamanian Central Authority (PCA). When the Hague hearing was held in October 2012, the left-behind parent testified on his behalf and he also participated in a psychological evaluation consisting of 750 questions. In April 2013, the Panamanian court ordered the child returned to the United States and the taking parent appealed the decision. The USCA is working closely with the PCA. |

| COUNTRY | ABDUCTED/ RETAINED | APPLICATION FILED | CHILD(REN) LOCATED | SUMMARY OF CASE |
|---------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|--|
| PERU | 8-2008 | 1-2009 | Yes | In December 2009, the court denied the return. In May 2010, the appellate judge ordered the taking parent and child to undergo a psychological evaluation. In July 2010, the Superior Court vacated the lower court's denial but did not order the return. The Peruvian Central Authority (PCA) declined to represent the LBP and pledged to provide assistance through the Ministry of Justice. The left-behind parent (LBP) procured a private attorney during the delay and the Ministry of Justice determined the LBP was able to furnish his own attorney. In August 2011, the case was remanded to the Family Court of Lima for a decision. In May 2012, the court ordered new psychological evaluations of the LBP. However, there was lengthy discussion regarding the type of evaluation that would be acceptable to the court. In October 2012, the court determined that a psychological evaluation and home study provided by a U.S. social service provider would be acceptable. In January 2013, the LBP submitted a psychological evaluation to the PCA. The LBP declined to submit a home study evaluation, and no decision has been reached on the appeal. The U.S. Central Authority and U.S. Embassy Lima continue to regularly request updates on court proceedings. |
| PERU | 5-2010 | 6-2010 | Yes | A return order was issued in July 2011. The taking parent appealed the order. The appellate court upheld the return decision in January 2012. The left-behind parent appealed the appellate decision. An evidentiary hearing in this appeal took place in December 2012 and a final hearing was held in November 2013 but a ruling has not yet been issued. The U.S. Central Authority and U.S. Embassy Lima continue to regularly request updates regarding current court proceedings. |

| COUNTRY | ABDUCTED/ RETAINED | APPLICATION FILED | CHILD(REN) LOCATED | SUMMARY OF CASE |
|---------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|---|
| PERU | 10-2010 | 10-2010 | Yes | After extended deliberations in the initial series of hearings due to the continued submission of evidence and counter evidence by both the taking (TP) and left-behind (LBP) parents, the return was denied in September 2012. The LBP appealed the ruling, a subsequent hearing was held in January 2013, and the return was ordered; however, the TP requested an additional judicial review and the return order is being evaluated by a panel of three supreme court judges. The U.S. Central Authority and U.S. Embassy Lima request regular updates on the case and court proceedings. |
| PERU | 10-2010 | 1-2011 | Yes | A return order was issued in June 2011, the taking parent appealed the decision, and a lengthy appeals process remains underway. In May 2012, the appeal was sent to the Superior Court for review, and in June 2012, the Superior Court sent the case to the district attorney's office for review. In August 2012, the case was again sent back to the original appellate court, and a new hearing was held in January 2013. A decision has yet to be reached. The U.S. Central Authority and U.S. Embassy Lima continue to regularly request updates on court proceedings. |
| PERU | 5-2011 | 11-2011 | Yes | A hearing was held in August 2012, and a return order was issued. The taking parent appealed the decision, and a hearing was held in January 2013. No decision has been reached in the appeal. The U.S. Central Authority and U.S. Embassy Lima continue to regularly request updates regarding current court proceedings. |
| PERU | 5-2011 | 4-2012 | Yes | An initial hearing was held in August 2012, and a decision supporting a return was issued in January 2013. In January 2013, the taking parent appealed the decision, and a final appeal hearing is scheduled for January 2014. The U.S. Central Authority and U.S. Embassy Lima continue to regularly request updates regarding current court proceedings. |

| COUNTRY | ABDUCTED/ RETAINED | APPLICATION FILED | CHILD(REN) LOCATED | SUMMARY OF CASE |
|-------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|--|
| PERU | 8-2011 | 9-2011 | Yes | <p>A hearing was held in August 2012, and a decision supporting a return was issued in September 2013 after an extended delay. Initially the taking parent (TP) and left-behind parent considered negotiating a voluntary return agreement; however, they were not able to settle on mutually acceptable terms. In October 2013, the TP appealed the return decision, and no decision has been reached in the appeal case. The U.S. Central Authority and U.S. Embassy Lima continue to regularly request updates regarding current court proceedings.</p> |
| PERU | 12-2011 | 2-2012 | Yes | <p>After a delayed notification process, a hearing was held in January 2012 after initial hearings in December 2012 were cancelled due to a judicial strike. Additional evidence and counterevidence were submitted by both taking parent (TP) and left-behind parent (LBP) after the TP introduced abuse allegations. On November 4, 2013 the return was denied and the LBP's attorney appealed the decision on November 19, 2013. The U.S. Central Authority and U.S. Embassy Lima continue to regularly request updates on court proceedings.</p> |

| COUNTRY | ABDUCTED/ RETAINED | APPLICATION FILED | CHILD(REN) LOCATED | SUMMARY OF CASE |
|---------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|--|
| POLAND | 7-2009 | 12-2009 | Yes | <p>During the first hearing in early 2010, the Polish court ordered a home study of the left-behind parent's (LBP) residence in the United States. In February 2011, the Polish court ordered the child's return to the United States. The taking parent (TP) appealed the ruling. The LBP obtained an enforcement order from the Polish court in April 2011, but the TP went into hiding with the child before Polish law enforcement could execute the order. The Polish appellate court granted the TP's appeal in July 2011 and remanded the case to the court of first instance. The TP resurfaced with the child in Poland soon after this decision. During a hearing in December 2011, the TP claimed a defense under Article 13(b) of the Hague Convention. The court of first instance adjourned without setting a future hearing date in order to allow the parties' adequate time to have their witnesses from the initial case re-deposed. In January 2012, the Polish Central Authority (PCA) requested U.S. Central Authority (USCA) assistance with coordinating a home study in the United States for the LBP, per the Polish court order. Over the next several months, the LBP began working with International Social Services (ISS) in order to arrange the home study. The Polish court held a hearing in October 2012 in which court-appointed psychologists evaluated family members. Since that time, the Polish court has held regular status hearings, and the LBP has continued to work with the Polish court and ISS in order to complete the home study and re-depose all of the witnesses (who live in different countries) from the previous trial. The USCA is in regular contact with the PCA and LBP regarding the progress of the proceedings. The LBP and TP are in contact, and the LBP has traveled to Poland for visitation with his child as the proceedings continue.</p> |

| COUNTRY | ABDUCTED/ RETAINED | APPLICATION FILED | CHILD(REN) LOCATED | SUMMARY OF CASE |
|---------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|---|
| POLAND | 9-2011 | 3-2012 | Yes | <p>The left-behind parent's (LBP) Polish attorney filed the Convention petition directly with the court in March 2012. In April 2012, the Polish court requested the LBP submit a letter from the state of Illinois that the child's removal was wrongful under Article 15 of the Convention. The LBP obtained the Article 15 declaration from a federal court in Illinois in August 2012, and the Polish court scheduled the next Hague Convention hearing for September 17, 2012. In order to allow more time for translation of documents and for the taking parent (TP) to prepare her Article 13(b) defense, the court scheduled and postponed hearings in September 2012, October 2012, and November 2012. After ordering psychological evaluations in December 2012, the Polish court did not hold a substantive hearing until June 2013 because the TP filed a complaint in January 2013 against the judge. The Hague Convention hearing remained in abeyance until the complaint was heard in another court. In June 2013, the first instance court denied the child's return under Article 13(b). The Polish Central Authority (PCA) confirmed the LBP filed an appeal, and the hearing is scheduled for January 2014. The U.S. Central Authority (USCA) has been in regular contact with the PCA and the LBP throughout the case. Although the LBP initially filed directly with the court, the USCA assisted the LBP with sending the Hague application to the PCA in May 2013 so that the PCA could have grounds to actively monitor the case.</p> |

| COUNTRY | ABDUCTED/ RETAINED | APPLICATION FILED | CHILD(REN) LOCATED | SUMMARY OF CASE |
|----------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|--|
| ROMANIA | 8-2008 | 11-2008 | Yes | <p>Convention proceedings stalled when the left-behind parent attempted to recover the child extra-judicially in January 2009. In August 2009, the court denied the child's return on the basis of Article 13(b) of the Convention. In March 2010, the appellate court ordered the child returned; however, Romania has not enforced the return order. In November 2012, the Romanian Central Authority (RCA) reported that its attempt to file charges against a bailiff for refusing to enforce the order had been unsuccessful. Two judges recused themselves, and the trial was postponed several times. In November 2013, the RCA filed an appeal and the Brasov Minors and Families Court ordered the child's return to the United States. The court also stated that its decision is "irrevocable." Embassy Bucharest has raised the case at the highest levels within the RCA and the Ministry of Justice.</p> |

| COUNTRY | ABDUCTED/ RETAINED | APPLICATION FILED | CHILD(REN) LOCATED | SUMMARY OF CASE |
|----------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|--|
| SLOVAKIA | 8-2010 | 10-2010 | Yes | <p>In January 2011, the Slovak court ordered the child's return. The taking parent (TP) filed an appeal, and the appellate court upheld the lower court's decision in April 2011. In the summer of 2011, the Slovak court began fining the TP for not complying with the order. The TP filed an appeal with the Slovak Constitutional Court in July 2011 and alleged that the Slovak judges who presided over the Convention proceedings had violated her human rights. In response, the Constitutional Court stayed the Convention return order in December 2011 pending its review of the case. In August 2012, the Constitutional Court ordered that the case be remanded back to the court of first instance for re-trial. The court of first instance had its first hearing in December 2012 and set the next hearings for January and March 2013. In June 2013, the U.S. Central Authority (USCA) requested, under Article 11 of the Convention, an explanation for the delay in proceedings. In summer 2013, the TP fired her attorney, and the court postponed proceedings in order for the TP to find representation. The next hearing is scheduled for January 2014. The Department sent a Diplomatic Note in August 2013 and has formally raised the case with the Slovak Central Authority (SCA) and the Slovak Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) at senior levels. The MFA informed Embassy Bratislava that the MFA would continue to monitor the case. The USCA has been in regular communication with the SCA and the left-behind parent.</p> |

| COUNTRY | ABDUCTED/ RETAINED | APPLICATION FILED | CHILD(REN) LOCATED | SUMMARY OF CASE |
|---------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|---|
| TURKEY | 5-2010 | 12-2010 | Yes | <p>Hague convention hearings took place in March, May, July, and November 2011. The court scheduled further hearings to allow time to coordinate the testimony of U.S. witnesses and to review replies from each party. The July 2012 Hague Convention hearing was subsequently postponed until November 2012. The U.S. Central Authority (USCA) and the Turkish Central Authority (TCA) coordinated closely in an attempt to expedite the testimony of the U.S. witnesses and to offer judicial assistance if appropriate. In January 2013, the Karsiyaka First Family Court rejected the return, stating the child's habitual residence was not the United States. In March 2013, the left-behind parent (LBP) appealed the First Family Court's decision. In April 2013, the USCA requested that the TCA adhere to Article 16 obligations under the Convention and stay custody proceedings, as the Convention return case continued after the LBP received notification of an upcoming divorce and custody hearing in Izmir. In December 2013, the TCA informed the USCA that the appeal remains pending before the Court of Cassation.</p> |
| TURKEY | 5-2010 | 2-2011 | Yes | <p>In January 2012, the court ordered the child's return under the Convention, and the taking parent filed an appeal. In June 2012, the appellate court overturned the lower court's order to return the child and remanded the case back to the lower court. In February 2013, the lower court denied the return. In April 2013, the public prosecutor filed an appeal of the lower court's decision. In August 2013, the Turkish Central Authority (TCA) reported that the Second Chamber of the Court of Cassation upheld the lower court ruling to deny the return and requested an exceptional review in the relevant chamber of the Court of Cassation. The U.S. Central Authority has formally raised the case with the TCA at senior levels and continues to be in regular contact regarding updates in the case.</p> |

| COUNTRY | ABDUCTED/ RETAINED | APPLICATION FILED | CHILD(REN) LOCATED | SUMMARY OF CASE |
|---------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|--|
| TURKEY | 8-2010 | 10-2010 | Yes | <p>In March 2011, the lower court ordered the children’s return under the Convention, and the taking parent (TP) appealed the decision. In January 2012, the appellate court upheld the children’s return and remanded the case to the lower court. In July 2012, the lower court insisted upon its initial decision, and the TP appealed the case to the Grand Chamber of the Court of Cassation. The USCA reached out to the Turkish Central Authority (TCA) to request an expedited hearing under Article 11 of the Convention. In June 2013, the U.S. Central Authority formally raised the case with the TCA, which stated that the Grand Chamber’s decision remains pending.</p> |