



*Permanent Mission of Brazil to the United Nations Office in Geneva
Chemin Camille-Vidart, 15 – 1202 - Genève*

Nº **161** /2026

The Permanent Mission of Brazil to the United Nations Office and other International Organizations in Geneva presents its compliments to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and has the honour to refer to the joint communication of Special Procedures mandate holders, reference AL BRA 1/2026, dated 29 January 2026, concerning allegations related to the events known as the “Crimes of May”.

In response, the Permanent Mission has the honour to transmit the reply of the Brazilian State.

The Permanent Mission of Brazil in Geneva avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights the assurances of its highest consideration.



Geneva, March 26th 2026.

To: ohchr-registry@un.org



FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF BRAZIL

**SPECIAL PROCEDURES OF THE HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL
OFFICE OF THE UNITED NATIONS HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR HUMAN RIGHTS
OHCHR. AL BRA 1/2026**

March 2026

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I – INTRODUCTION	2
II – THE STATE’S RESPONSE	3
II.1 – Regarding any pending litigation.....	3
II.2 – Information on investigations and legal proceedings.....	4
II.3 – Information on investigations, legal proceedings, and accountability measures.....	7
II.4 – Information on the applicability of statutes of limitations to the “May Crimes”.....	14
II.5 – Measures taken to search for missing persons.....	15
II.6 – Reparations granted to the families of the victims of the “May Crimes”.....	16
III – FINAL CONSIDERATIONS	19

I – INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this report is to provide information regarding Letter AL BRA 1/2026, dated January 29, 2026, issued by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), by the Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism; by the Working Group of Experts on People of African Descent; by the Working Group on Enforced or Involuntary Disappearances; by the Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial, summary, and arbitrary executions; and by the Special Rapporteur on the promotion of truth, justice, reparation, and guarantees of non-repetition.

According to the allegations received, operations conducted by security forces allegedly resulted in summary executions and enforced disappearances, with a high number of victims, mostly young Black people from outlying areas. The communication notes that the investigations conducted at the time were reportedly marked by serious flaws, such as the failure to preserve evidence, a lack of forensic investigations, and an improper focus of the inquiries on the victims' conduct, which reportedly contributed to the dismissal of most cases and the resulting impunity. Furthermore, the report highlights the lack of adequate reparations for the families and the persistence of legal obstacles, such as the application of the statute of limitations, in contrast to the understanding that these are serious human rights violations that demand an effective state response.

Thus, the rapporteurs express deep concern regarding the alleged failure to investigate, prosecute, and provide reparations in relation to the events known as the "May Crimes," which occurred in May 2006 in the State of São Paulo and allegedly involved the excessive and lethal use of force by police officers, resulting in mass executions and enforced disappearances. Concern is also noted regarding the apparent absence of prompt, effective, independent, impartial, and thorough investigations, as well as the lack of accountability of state agents in the face of allegations of police violence.

In this regard, the communication requests that the Brazilian State provide additional information and comments on the following points:

1. Any additional information and/or comments regarding the aforementioned allegations.
2. Updated information on the investigations, legal proceedings, and accountability measures adopted by the Brazilian government regarding the "May Crimes," particularly since 2018.
3. Detailed information on the measures adopted to ensure that investigations are prompt, thorough, independent, impartial, and transparent, as well as

explanations regarding how they have met the requirements established in the United Nations Minnesota Protocol on the Investigation of Potentially Unlawful Deaths (2016), including with respect to the preservation of evidence, forensic examinations, chain of custody, witness interviews, family participation, and the pursuit of accountability and reparations.

4. The Brazilian Government's position regarding the applicability of statutes of limitations to the "May Crimes" and clarification on how such limitations can be reconciled with Brazil's obligations to investigate, prosecute, and provide effective reparations for serious human rights violations, including extrajudicial executions and enforced disappearances.

5. Information on the measures adopted to search for persons forcibly disappeared in the context of the "May Crimes," establish their fate and whereabouts, and, in the event of death, locate, treat with respect, identify, and return their remains to their families.

6. Explain whether reparations, including restitution, compensation, rehabilitation, satisfaction, and guarantees of non-repetition, have been granted to the families of the victims of the "May Crimes," including members of the "Mothers of May" movement.

On this occasion, the Brazilian State respectfully submits the following information.

II – RESPONSE FROM THE STATE

II.1 – Regarding Possible *Lis pendens*

First, it should be noted that the Brazilian State is already monitoring the events that occurred in the context of the so-called "May Crimes" in other complaints submitted to the Inter-American Human Rights System.

In this regard, we note the existence of Merits Report No. 101/23, dated July 19, 2023, of the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (IACHR), arising from a complaint filed by the organization Conectas in the context of the so-called "May Crimes" of 2006, specifically regarding the massacre that took place in Bristol Park, in the southern part of the city of São Paulo. The case concerns the alleged extrajudicial executions [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] as well as the alleged failures in the investigations of the events. On January 12, 2025, the Inter-American Court of Human Rights (IACHR), in compliance with the provisions set forth in Articles 39.1.b and 39.1.d of its Rules of Procedure, notified the

submission of the case [REDACTED] by the IACHR against Brazil. Currently, the aforementioned case is pending before the IACHR.

Furthermore, it should be noted that, in 2015, the São Paulo State Public Defender's Office filed a complaint with the IACHR on behalf of the families of the victims of the "May Crimes" in the Baixada Santista region. Subsequently, still in the context of the same events, the São Paulo State Public Defender's Office filed a new complaint with the IACHR on May 12, 2021, regarding alleged practices of enforced disappearance [REDACTED]. This petition was admitted by the IACHR in May 2025, and the Brazilian State was granted a six-month period, pursuant to Article 37.2 of its Rules of Procedure, to submit observations on the merits.

Accordingly, the Brazilian State notes that it is already addressing, at the international level, the facts related to the "May Crimes" through multiple procedures to determine international responsibility, both judicial and extrajudicial in nature. In this context, the State considers that coordination among such mechanisms would be beneficial, in order to ensure institutional coherence and avoid the issuance of potentially contradictory decisions.

II.2 – Information on Investigations and Judicial Proceedings

This section focuses on information regarding points 1 and 2 of the communication, namely:

1. Any additional information and/or comments regarding the aforementioned allegations.
2. Updated information on the investigations, legal proceedings, and accountability measures adopted by the Brazilian government regarding the "May Crimes," particularly since 2018.

In order to respond to the questions raised, various institutional bodies were contacted and requested to provide information on police investigations, criminal proceedings, cases dismissed, measures aimed at preventing the statute of limitations from expiring, any investigations into enforced disappearances, and the status of public civil actions related to the events.

With regard to the events that occurred on May 14, 2006, it is noted that the facts were reported via Police Report No. 1,230/2006 (83rd Police Precinct – Parque Bristol), which led to the opening of Police Inquiry No. 1,124/2006. In November 2008, the São Paulo Public

Prosecutor's Office requested that the investigation be closed, basing the request on the fact that, although investigations were conducted, it was not possible to identify the perpetrators of the crime. On November 26, 2008, the Judiciary closed the case at the request of the Public Prosecutor's Office.

At the federal level, on May 13, 2009, Preparatory Proceedings for a Motion to Transfer Jurisdiction PGR-PPIDC-PGR No. 1.00.000.005295/2009-00 were initiated. Once the investigations were concluded, on May 9, 2016, the then Attorney General filed the Motion for Transfer of Jurisdiction No. 9 - SP (2016/0133526-7), arguing for the motion's approval with a view to transferring the investigation, prosecution, and trial to the jurisdiction of the Federal Court, São Paulo Judicial District, regarding the homicides [REDACTED]

On August 10, 2022, Motion No. 9 for Transfer of Jurisdiction was granted by the Superior Court of Justice (STJ):

Having reviewed and deliberated on these case files involving the parties indicated above, the Justices of the Third Section unanimously agree to grant the Motion for Transfer of Jurisdiction to order the transfer and reopening of Police Investigations Nos. 1,124/06 and 2,831/2006, of the DHPP/SP, to the Federal Police, under the supervision and control of the Federal Public Prosecutor's Office and under the jurisdiction, insofar as its intervention is required, of the Federal Court of the Capital of the State of São Paulo, seat of the Judicial Section of São Paulo, in accordance with the vote of the Reporting Justice.

According to information from the Human Rights Advisory Office of the Public Security Secretariat of the Government of the State of São Paulo, the police investigations related to the aforementioned cases and dated May 14, 2006 (Police Report No. 463/2006 DH – Police Inquiry No. 1124/2006 – case file of Case No. 0002082-38.2006.8.26.0052 of the 1st Jury Court of the Capital) and December 3, 2006 (Police Report No. 1037/2006 DH – Police Inquiry No. 2831/2006 – case file of Case No. 0000269-39.2007.8.26.0052 of the 1st Jury Court of the Capital), whose legal classifications are “Triple Premeditated Homicide and Attempted Homicide” and “Intentional Homicide and Traffic Accident,” respectively, were processed and investigated by Specialized Units that comprised the State Department of Homicide and Protection of Persons (DHPP) at the time the events occurred; this department is recognized for its expertise and serves as a national reference for other specialized units across the country.

The Human Rights Advisory Office of the Public Security Secretariat of the Government of the State of São Paulo reported that the police investigations in question were concluded and forwarded to the Judiciary. The Judicial Police proceedings were submitted for review by the Public Prosecutor's Office and the Judiciary from the outset of the investigations, where the criminal cases subsequently followed their regular course until the decisions to dismiss them were issued, concluding that all measures deemed relevant to the cases identified in the report had been taken. He also emphasized that, to date, there are no new facts that would justify reopening the investigations, under the terms of Brazilian law, particularly in accordance with the provisions of Article 18 of the Brazilian Code of Criminal Procedure.

Within the scope of the São Paulo State Public Prosecutor's Office, clarifications were provided regarding the procedures carried out by the Special Action Group for the Suppression of Organized Crime (GAECO):

- a) Civil Inquiry No. 14.0725.0000382/2015-4 evolved into Public Civil Action No. 1025361-76.2019.8.26.0053, pending before the 4th Court of Public Finance of the Capital, which seeks to compel the State of São Paulo to fulfill various obligations aimed at improving public safety policies and addressing police lethality;
- b) Civil Inquiry No. 14.0725.0001580/2014-1 has evolved into Public Civil Action No. 1062551-10.2018.8.26.0053, pending before the 16th Court of Public Finance of the Capital, the purpose of which is to establish the state's civil liability for the events known as the "May Crimes," with claims for collective and individual reparations, as well as a formal request for an apology from the State.

Regarding the procedural status of these cases, Public Civil Action No. 1025361-76.2019.8.26.0053 is currently suspended due to institutional meetings being held to evaluate the possible conclusion of an inter-institutional agreement. Public Civil Action No. 1062551-10.2018.8.26.0053, however, was dismissed on the grounds that the statute of limitations provided for in Article 1 of Decree No. 20,910/1932 had expired.

Appeals against this decision were filed by the São Paulo State Public Prosecutor's Office and the State Public Defender's Office, acting as a co-plaintiff. According to information provided by the São Paulo Public Defender's Office, the appeal was filed on the grounds that the "May Crimes" 2006 constitute serious human rights violations, which may be pursued at any time due to their non-statutory nature. The São Paulo State Court of Justice, through a ruling by the 11th Chamber of Public Law, upheld the dismissal of the case.

Subsequently, the Public Defender's Office filed a Special Appeal and an Extraordinary Appeal, both of which were denied, and appeals were filed against the decisions denying the appeals, with favorable opinions from the Office of the Attorney General for Diffuse and

Collective Interests of the São Paulo State Public Prosecutor's Office. The case files were referred to the Superior Court of Justice on September 28, 2020. Currently, the case is pending before Justice [REDACTED] of that court. After the appeal began to be heard, during a session of the First Section held on March 5, 2026, the Justice requested to review the case file (REsp No. 2172497/SP).

Finally, at the institutional level, the Public Prosecutor's Office of the State of São Paulo has been adopting measures aimed at the prevention, investigation, and prosecution of institutional violence, including cases of torture, enforced disappearances, and deaths resulting from police intervention. These measures include filing lawsuits, issuing internal regulations, and strengthening inter-institutional cooperation, with a view to preventing and holding accountable those responsible for serious human rights violations.

II.3 – Information on investigations, legal proceedings, and accountability measures

This section presents information regarding question 3:

3. Detailed information on the measures adopted to ensure that investigations are prompt, thorough, independent, impartial, and transparent, as well as explanations of how they have met the requirements established in the United Nations Minnesota Protocol on the Investigation of Potentially Unlawful Deaths (2016), including with regard to the preservation of evidence, forensic examinations, chain of custody, witness interviews, family participation, and the pursuit of accountability and reparations.

Regarding this point, the State provides information on national policies implemented since 2018 aimed at reducing police lethality. First, it is important to highlight Law No. 13,675, of June 11, 2018, which established the National Policy on Public Security and Social Defense and the Unified Public Security System (SUSP), setting forth, among its principles and guidelines, the protection of fundamental rights, respect for human rights, and integrated, results-oriented action. Along the same lines, the National Plan for Public Security and Social Defense 2021–2030, approved by Decree No. 10,822/2021, consolidated the national planning dimension of public security policy. More recently, there was a significant regulatory strengthening with Decree No. 12,341, of December 23, 2024, which regulated Law No. 13,060/2014, governing the use of force and non-lethal weapons by public security professionals, with an emphasis on the principles of legality, proportionality, transparency, protection of life, and respect for human rights. This framework was supplemented by Ministry of Justice and Public Security (MJSP) Ordinance No. 855, dated January 17, 2025, which detailed operational guidelines on the use of force, including regarding record-keeping,

monitoring, and institutional improvement, and by MJSP Ordinance No. 856, dated January 17, 2025, which established the National Committee for Monitoring the Use of Force .

Also in this field, data and evidence on institutional violence and state-related fatalities are being produced and made available, notably through the National Human Rights Observatory (ObservaDH), which began publishing a specific section with information on violence committed by public security agents, including data on deaths resulting from police intervention and the racial breakdown of victims. This initiative contributes to improving the assessment, monitoring the phenomenon, and strengthening evidence-based public policies. Also part of this effort is the agenda of the Ministry of Human Rights and Citizenship (MDHC) focused on developing the National Human Rights Plan for Public Security Professionals, an instrument aimed at promoting an institutional culture of respect for human rights within the public security sector.

Regarding training on the proportional use of force and the investigation of deaths resulting from police intervention, the Senasp Distance Learning Network offers a nationwide selection of courses focused on the continuing professional development of SUSP professionals, notably “Differentiated Use of Force” and “Less Lethal Weapons,” both of which are self-paced. Furthermore, in 2025, the MJSP/Senasp established the National Project for the Qualification of the Use of Force, which provides for the training of multipliers and specific training related to the use of body cameras, reinforcing the national standardization of procedures, the supervision of activities, and the mitigation of risks of abusive use of force. In the same year, Senasp reported conducting approximately 140,000 training sessions, demonstrating significant investment in professional training, including in the operational and investigative fields.

In the area of death investigations, there are also national initiatives focused on training and standardizing procedures. The Senasp Distance Learning Network offers courses such as “Homicide Investigation 1” and “Criminal Investigation: Conceptual Aspects,” which contribute to improving investigative performance in cases of violent deaths. Furthermore, the MJSP reported that the Project to Enhance Homicide Investigation Capacity trained 656 professionals in 2025. Concurrently, in 2024, a new collection of Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) for Criminal Forensics was made available, with nationwide coverage, including specific volumes on crime scenes, forensic medicine, and forensic genetics—tools essential for preserving evidence, conducting technical-forensic examinations, and ensuring the chain of custody. Although this is not a protocol exclusively for deaths resulting from police intervention, this set of regulatory and training guidelines strengthens the state’s response in

investigations of potentially unlawful deaths, in line with internationally recognized technical standards.

With regard to public policies aimed at assisting victims of police lethality and their families, the Ministry of Housing and Urban Development (MDHC) has notably implemented the Center for the Memory of Victims of State Violence (CMVV) and the Center for Access to Rights and Social Inclusion (CAIS) Mães por Direitos, in partnership with the Ministry of Justice and Public Security (MJSP), announced in Santos, São Paulo, in March 2026. This is an unprecedented initiative in the country, aimed at promoting memory, truth, reparations, prevention, support, and access to rights for family members affected by state violence. As officially announced, the pilot project provides priority assistance to family members of victims of state-sanctioned killings, integrating psychosocial counseling, legal support, memory-building, and institutional advocacy. The initiative also engages in the development of public responses formulated in dialogue with movements of mothers and family members, including the Mães de Maio movement and other victim collectives. In this sense, the CMVV and CAIS Mães por Direitos constitute, at the federal level, the primary currently identifiable initiative for structured support for family members of victims of contemporary state violence.

The São Paulo State Public Prosecutor's Office reported that, regarding the investigative process for incidents involving possible violations committed by public security agents against civilians, police inquiries are initiated and, where applicable, military police inquiries, aimed at gathering evidence for potential criminal prosecution, in accordance with the rules of the constitutional criminal justice system. Furthermore, pursuant to Resolution No. 1,364/2021-PGJ-CPJ, the Public Prosecutor's Office has the authority to initiate a Criminal Investigative Procedure (PIC), presided over by a Public Prosecutor, aimed at obtaining evidence and information to support the formation of *the opinio delicti*.

In this context, Resolution No. 2,175/2025-PGJ established the Center for Support in Combating Institutional Violence (NEVI) within the Public Prosecutor's Office of the State of São Paulo. The Center aims to consolidate institutional strategies focused on the prevention and accountability of state practices that violate fundamental human rights (). The Center works on cases related to police lethality, torture, enforced disappearances, and other forms of institutional violence, promoting coordination with institutions within the justice system and developing strategies aimed at holding public officials accountable and protecting victims. Among its responsibilities, it monitors decisions by international human rights courts and identifies institutional measures capable of preventing the recurrence of violations, in accordance with international standards for prevention and guarantees of non-repetition.

Also noteworthy is the creation and refinement of a dynamic monitoring dashboard for deaths resulting from police intervention, a public transparency and data management tool that enables the collection and analysis of information in real time, including geolocation, the police unit involved, and other characteristics of the incidents.

Concurrently, the Criminal Operational Support Center (CAOCRIM) developed a specific protocol for investigating deaths resulting from police intervention, aligned with the guidelines established by Resolution No. 310/2025 of the National Council of the Public Prosecutor's Office, whose full implementation is scheduled for April 2026.

The Office of the Attorney General has also issued recommendations and institutional acts aimed at strengthening external oversight of police activities and improving the supervision of investigations involving state agents, notably:

- a) Recommendation No. 21/2025-PGJ-CGMP, addressed to members of the Public Prosecutor's Office with responsibilities for external oversight of police activities, so that, while respecting functional independence, they may initiate administrative monitoring procedures for the exercise of concentrated external oversight of the respective Municipal Guard, as well as communicate the measures adopted to the Criminal Operational Support Center, enabling the integration of information between the Public Prosecutor's Offices and the development of institutional protocols;
- b) Notice No. 324/2025-PGJ-SUBJUR, dated April 29, 2025, which published CNMP Recommendation No. 117/2025, regarding the protocols and procedures to be observed by the Public Prosecutor's Office in addressing prison crises;
- c) Notice No. 055/2025-PGJ-CGMP, dated January 29, 2025, also related to the implementation of Recommendation No. 21/2025-PGJ-CGMP, providing guidance to members of the Public Prosecutor's Office with jurisdiction over the matter regarding the initiation of administrative proceedings aimed at exercising external oversight of municipal guard activities;
- d) Notice No. 016/2025-PGJ-CAOCR, dated January 17, 2025, which instructs members of the Public Prosecutor's Office to notify the Criminal Operational Support Center of the filing of a complaint in cases of Death Resulting from Police Intervention (MDIP), indicating the corresponding case number, with the aim of ensuring the proper quantification and monitoring of these cases.

Such initiatives demonstrate institutional efforts aimed at strengthening the supervision of investigations, expanding data collection, fostering inter-institutional cooperation, and preventing the recurrence of serious human rights violations.

In this vein, it is worth highlighting Resolution No. 279 of 2023¹ and Resolution No. 310 of 2025², approved by the National Council of the Public Prosecutor's Office (CNMP). The resolutions reflect two distinct yet complementary approaches in the Public Prosecutor's Office's response to police activity and state violence. Both are grounded in the protection of human rights and the demand for greater accountability from security forces.

Resolution No. 279/2023 is broad and institutional in nature, regulating the exercise of external oversight of police activity by the Public Prosecutor's Office (MP). It emphasizes systemic and preventive oversight of police activity and establishes objectives ranging from verifying the regularity of procedures and respect for fundamental rights to fostering coordination between the Public Prosecutor's Office and police forces in the context of criminal prosecution. Among the concrete measures provided for, the following stand out: routine and special visits to police units, unrestricted access to internal documents and records, oversight of the chain of custody of evidence, supervision of impound lots for seized vehicles, and the incineration of drugs and weapons. There is also a strong component of statistical monitoring and institutional diagnosis, such as the requirement to record and track data on police lethality and victimization, taking into account ethnic-racial and socioeconomic factors.

Thus, Resolution No. 279/2023 seeks to prevent abuses, correct irregularities, and induce structural changes within the police, functioning as a mechanism for systemic *accountability*.

On the other hand, Resolution No. 310/2025 aims to regulate the direct involvement of the Public Prosecutor's Office in the investigation of serious crimes committed by public security agents, such as intentional homicides, torture, sexual violence, and enforced disappearances. This Resolution directly addresses international commitments undertaken by Brazil, particularly the rulings of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights in the case of *Favela Nova Brasília v. Brazil*, and the interpretation of the Federal Supreme Court in the Motion for Non-Compliance with a Fundamental Precept No. 635 (), which recognized the need for independent investigations when there is evidence of police involvement.

Based on this Resolution, the Public Prosecutor's Office not only oversees but also takes a leading investigative role, with the power to cordon off crime scenes, request forensic examinations, seize weapons, access body camera footage and surveillance systems, and request information on duty schedules and hospital records.

¹ Available at: <https://www.cnpm.mp.br/portal/images/CALJ/resolucoes/Resolucao-279-de-2023.pdf>.

² Available at: <https://www.cnpm.mp.br/portal/images/CALJ/resolucoes/RESOLUO-N-310.pdf>

Resolution 310 also expands the role of the Public Prosecutor's Office as a guarantor of victims' rights and establishes duties regarding physical, psychological, and documentary protection, the active participation of victims and their families in the investigative process, and their inclusion in official protection programs. Another key point is the incorporation of international protocols, such as the Minnesota Protocol (investigation of deaths), the Istanbul Protocol (torture), and the Méndez Protocol (interviews), in addition to national protocols with a gender perspective and provisions for the protection of children and adolescents. Thus, an investigative model is created guided by international human rights standards and specific methodologies for investigating serious violations.

In effect, Resolution No. 279/2023 functions as a governance tool for the police system, seeking to correct distortions, ensure transparency, and promote policies to reduce violence. Resolution No. 310/2025, on the other hand, ensures that the Public Prosecutor's Office itself conducts the investigation, eliminating the bias that could arise from an investigation carried out by the police force involved.

In terms of complementarity, Resolution No. 279 addresses oversight mechanisms and data collection, which enable the understanding and addressing of police violence. Resolution No. 310, in turn, provides immediate responses to specific cases of serious violations, with the Public Prosecutor's Office taking the lead in investigations. Both, therefore, function as components of an institutional policy focused on prevention and structural reform.

Taken together, these regulations reflect the Brazilian Public Prosecutor's Office's efforts to adapt to contemporary demands for democratic oversight of public security and to ensure effective investigations in cases of police violence. Therefore, it is essential to emphasize that there have been clear regulatory advances, which differ from the context in which the alleged violations occurred.

Within the scope of the National Secretariat for Criminal Policy of the Ministry of Justice and Public Security, training programs for public security officers on the proportional use of force and incident management stand out, as well as activities carried out within the Federal Penitentiary Police, which are guided by international standards and best practices applicable to prison management and the use of force by state agents—standards historically adopted by the Brazilian state as guiding principles.

In this context, the following international instruments, among others, are noteworthy: the United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners (Mandela Rules) and the United Nations Basic Principles on the Use of Force and Firearms by Law Enforcement Officials. These instruments have always been considered relevant benchmarks for the

formulation of institutional guidelines, the development of operational procedures, and the implementation of training and capacity-building activities for police officers, remaining current as important parameters for the continuous improvement of public safety practices.

Finally, the National Secretariat for Access to Justice of the Ministry of Justice and Public Security seeks to develop and implement actions for the prevention, redress, and improvement of the justice system that contribute to the institutional strengthening of policies aimed at victims of violations, including support programs for family members of victims of institutional violence. The main ongoing initiatives are:

- a) “Mirante” Project – Developed in partnership with the Fluminense Federal University (UFF), this project aims to produce data and evidence on human rights violations committed during police operations that result in deaths. The objective is to contribute to the investigation of legal proceedings and to guarantee the victims’ rights to memory, truth, justice, and reparation. The project involves the production of audiovisual materials, expert reports, and multimedia presentations as judicial evidence, using scientific knowledge to promote justice and the defense of human rights. In 2024, surveys on police lethality were conducted, forensic methodologies were adapted, extension courses were held, emblematic cases were selected, and the cataloging of data on police violence for an accessible information database was initiated. The Mirante Project lays the groundwork for the independent production of evidence in cases of police lethality, strengthening legal assistance for victims’ families and broadening the debate on public safety and the control of institutional violence.
- b) Extension Project “Expansion of the Network for Assistance to People Affected by State Violence (RAAVE)” – Developed in partnership with the Federal University of Rio de Janeiro (UFRJ), the project involves 100 mothers of victims of state violence, serving as extension fellows, as well as 32 psychology students and a technical team composed of seven professionals responsible for reception and psychosocial care. The goals include expanding the care network, defining intake procedures, and systematizing data on the services provided. Although it has yielded significant results in the field of victim care and the generation of knowledge on the subject, RAAVE has not yet been established as a structured public policy; however, it contributes to the development of guidelines, care protocols, and strategies for expanding the protection network.
- c) Multidisciplinary Research and Intervention Project – In partnership with the Federal University of São Paulo (UNIFESP), the project provides multidisciplinary care to 150 women— , mothers, and relatives of victims of state violence—in the states of São Paulo, Rio de Janeiro, Bahia, Ceará, and Minas Gerais. Individual and group listening sessions are conducted with the aim of producing a research report containing recommendations for improving public policies focused on reparations and care for these families.

Reinforcing its commitment to this issue, and as a result of the accumulation and development of the aforementioned initiatives, the Ministry of Justice and Public Security, in coordination with the Ministry of Racial Equality and the Ministry of Human Rights and Citizenship, held the Interministerial People’s Workshop – Mothers for Rights. The purpose

of the activity was to support the formulation of integrated public policies focused on care, access to justice, and the protection of victims and family members of victims of police lethality.

II.4 – Information on the applicability of statutes of limitations to the “May Crimes”

This section focuses on information related to points 1 and 4:

1. Any additional information and/or comments regarding the aforementioned allegations.

4. The Brazilian Government’s position regarding the applicability of statutes of limitations to the “May Crimes” and clarification on how such limitations can be reconciled with Brazil’s obligations to investigate, prosecute, and provide effective reparations for serious human rights violations, including extrajudicial executions and enforced disappearances.

In this regard, the State refers to the information already presented in section II.2 of this report, particularly regarding Public Civil Action No. 1062551-10.2018.8.26.0053, concerning the events known as the “May Crimes.”

This is a Public Civil Action filed by the Public Prosecutor’s Office of the State of São Paulo against the State of São Paulo, with the aim of holding it accountable for the events that occurred in May 2006, in light of allegations of violence, omission, and impunity. In this lawsuit, the state entity is sought to be ordered to pay individual compensation—for moral and material damages—and collective compensation, as well as to fulfill obligations aimed at promoting truth and justice, from the perspective of transitional justice.

The lawsuit was dismissed on the grounds that the statute of limitations had expired. In response to this decision, the Public Prosecutor’s Office filed an appeal, arguing that the “May Crimes” that occurred in May 2006 constitute serious human rights violations and, therefore, are not subject to the statute of limitations. The Public Defender’s Office of the State of São Paulo, acting as a co-plaintiff, also filed an appeal in July 2019, arguing that the “May Crimes” constitute serious human rights violations, which may be pursued at any time due to their non-statutory nature. It is further argued that such acts, given the manner in which they were carried out, constitute practices that violate human dignity and may be classified as crimes against humanity.

The Superior Court of Justice has begun hearing Special Appeal No. 2.172.497/SP, in which the matter is being discussed. During a session of the First Section, after the presentation of the reporting judge's opinion, a request for review was filed, and the trial was suspended. Thus, the dispute remains currently under review by the Superior Court of Justice in the context of a special appeal.

The issue falls within a regulatory and jurisprudential context of great relevance, as it involves harmonizing the general statute of limitations rule set forth in Decree No. 20,910/1932 with the Federal Constitution and with the international commitments undertaken by the Brazilian State regarding human rights.

In this regard, Recommendation No. 123/2022 of the National Council of Justice stands out, guiding the organs of the Judiciary to observe the international human rights treaties and conventions in force in Brazil, utilizing the case law of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights and conducting a review of the conformity of domestic norms with international standards, thereby reinforcing the Brazilian State's commitment to the effectiveness of human rights.

Given this scenario, the continuation of the trial before the Superior Court of Justice is awaited, highlighting the significance of the dispute for the development of conventionality review in the context of decisions regarding civil liability for serious human rights violations.

II.5 – Measures taken to search for missing persons.

This section provides details regarding point 5:

5. Information on the measures adopted to search for persons forcibly disappeared in the context of the "May Crimes," determine their fate and whereabouts, and, in the event of death, locate, treat with respect, identify, and return their remains to their families.

As reported in section II.3 of this report, the Ministry of Human Rights and Citizenship, in partnership with the Ministry of Justice and Public Security, the Independent Movement Mothers of May, and the Black Initiative for a New Drug Policy, participated in the creation of the Center for the Memory of Victims of State Violence (CMVV) and the Center for Access to Rights and Social Inclusion (CAIS) Mothers for Rights. The project was launched on March 4, 2026, in the city of Santos, in the state of São Paulo.

This is an unprecedented initiative aimed at implementing a national policy focused on memory, truth, reparations, prevention, and care for families affected by state violence, with an emphasis on intersectoral action and qualified engagement with social movements, such as the Independent Movement of Mothers of May. In this context, it is worth noting that, in line with the Chamber of Deputies' approval in March 2026 of Bill No. 6,240/2013—which defines the crime of enforced disappearance and classifies it as a heinous crime—the Ministry of Human Rights and Citizenship has emphasized the importance of public policies for memorializing state violence and ensuring accountability as essential tools for strengthening democracy and guaranteeing the rights of victims and their families.

The choice of the city of Santos as the headquarters of the CMVV is justified by the recurrence of incidents of police lethality in the State of São Paulo, such as Operations Escudo and Verão (2023–2024), as well as the ““May Crimes”” of 2006, which occurred in the region.

Additionally, the São Paulo State Public Defender's Office reports that, through its Specialized Center for Citizenship and Human Rights, it provides comprehensive and free legal assistance to the families of victims of lethal violence in the state. The purpose of this assistance is to support the families, refer them, when necessary, to the network of municipal and state public services, provide guidance and legal advice on matters related to the death of a family member, and promote multidisciplinary follow-up for those assisted.

II.6 – Reparations granted to the families of victims of the “May Crimes”

This section focuses on information regarding points 1 and 6:

1. Any additional information and/or comments regarding the aforementioned allegations.
6. Explain whether reparations, including restitution, compensation, rehabilitation, satisfaction, and guarantees of non-repetition, were granted to the

families of the victims of the “May Crimes,” including members of the “Mães de Maio” movement.

In this regard, the Public Defender’s Office of the State of São Paulo reported that, as early as 2006, it joined an independent commission with the aim of pursuing compensation claims on behalf of the victims’ families. In this context, a specialized support service was established for victims and their families, offering professional counseling and documentation of accounts, led by a Public Defender with expertise in criminal law. Upon identifying evidence of rights violations, the Public Defender’s Office, acting as representative of the victims and their families, filed eight compensation claims.

- A) [REDACTED] (Case No. 0019146-44.2010.8.26.0562): This is a lawsuit for compensation for material and moral damages, filed on June 23, 2010, by [REDACTED] against the São Paulo State Treasury, on the grounds that her son was the victim of homicide and that his death resulted from the criminal conduct of armed public officials. After the claim was dismissed, an appeal was filed, which was granted, resulting in an award for material damages (expenses related to the death, stolen and damaged property, and a monthly pension equal to one-third of the minimum wage) and moral damages (300 times the minimum wage). Twenty years after the summary execution of [REDACTED] son, the State has still not paid the amounts owed as monetary compensation, which has been included on the list of court-ordered debt payments.
- B) [REDACTED], parents of the fatal victim [REDACTED] (Case No. 0017540-78.2010.8.26.0562): This is a lawsuit for compensation for moral and material damages and specific performance, filed by [REDACTED], represented by the Public Defender’s Office, on May 17, 2010, due to the death of their son [REDACTED]. After the claim was dismissed, an appeal was filed, which was granted on March 11, 2013, with an award for material damages (R\$ 1,001.50) and moral damages (250 minimum wages). Twenty years after [REDACTED] death, the compensation for moral and material damages was added to the list of court-ordered debt payments, meaning that the State has not yet paid the amounts owed as monetary reparations.
- C) [REDACTED], surviving victim (Case No. 0017536-41.2010.8.26.0562): This is a damages lawsuit filed by [REDACTED], a surviving victim of a summary execution carried out by military police officers on May 15, 2006. The action was dismissed in 2011. The Honorable Court of Justice of the State of São Paulo argued, disregarding the State’s responsibilities regarding the operations carried out in May 2006 and the entire context of the May crimes, that “if even in the criminal sphere, with its broader scope of inquiry and prosecution aimed at ascertaining the actual truth, the evidence gathered was inconclusive, a fortiori it will not be in this forum that a better outcome will be achieved (...) In this spiral, nothing suggests that the attack under examination cannot be attributed to members of that faction, not to mention the possibility that others—that is,

other groups of different affiliations—may have taken advantage of the moment of declared hostilities to incite and foment the chaos.” An appeal was filed through the Public Defender’s Office, which was denied. Similarly, the special and extraordinary appeals filed with the Honorable Court of Justice of the State of São Paulo were not admitted.

- D) [REDACTED], mother of the fatal victim [REDACTED] (Case No. 0017538-11.2010.8.26.0562): This is a lawsuit seeking compensation for moral and material damages and an injunction, filed in May 2010, in connection with the homicide of [REDACTED], son of [REDACTED], who was represented by the Public Defender’s Office. The lawsuit was dismissed. In its decision, the Honorable Court of Justice of the State of São Paulo stated that “there is no basis for concluding that state police officers bore direct or indirect responsibility for the attack that resulted in the death of the plaintiff’s son. Although the attack presented dynamics similar to other massacres, there is no evidence that points with any certainty to the conclusion that state police officers were the perpetrators of those shots.” The court then cites another appeal in a similar case to state that “there is no element in the lawsuit capable of proving state inefficiency in the duty to guarantee citizens’ safety. It must be acknowledged that on the day of the plaintiffs’ deaths, police authorities were engaged in countering attacks perpetrated by the aforementioned criminal faction. However, even so, the State has no duty to pay compensation for the aforementioned fault. On the date of the attacks, there was a large mobilization of police forces deployed in an attempt to prevent them, and the State was successful in many instances, as evidenced by the numerous suspects detained following various violent confrontations.” The decision continues to refuse to recognize the lack of due diligence in the investigations as a factor giving rise to civil liability: “the deficiencies in the investigative work and the ineffectiveness of the agencies responsible for criminal prosecution should be the subject of a separate line of inquiry within the scope of internal affairs.” The Public Defender’s Office filed all applicable appeals with the higher courts, which were dismissed.
- E) [REDACTED], mother of the fatal victim [REDACTED] [REDACTED] (Case No. 0017537-26.2010.8.26.0562): This is a lawsuit for compensation for moral and material damages against the State of São Paulo, arising from the homicide of [REDACTED] [REDACTED] son of [REDACTED]. The lawsuit was dismissed in the lower court. The Court of Appeals (TJSP) denied the appeal, stating that “for the plaintiff, her son’s death was linked to the actions of police officers who acted in retaliation for these attacks. However, the Public Administration did not contribute to the outcome through any action or omission on the part of its agents, having instead taken steps to clarify the perpetrator of the crime.” The Public Defender’s Office filed Extraordinary and Special Appeals, which were not admitted.
- F) [REDACTED], mother of the fatal victim [REDACTED] (Case No. 0017535-56.2010.8.26.0562): This is a lawsuit seeking compensation for moral and material damages and an injunction against the State of São Paulo, arising from the homicide of [REDACTED], son of [REDACTED]. The action was dismissed in the lower court on the grounds that “the attacks were orchestrated by criminal groups and that the leaders of these movements were incarcerated in various prisons.” The decision to dismiss the case was upheld by the Court of Justice of the State of São Paulo, on the grounds that “from a technical legal standpoint, there was no evidence of an act of

omission or commission on the part of a state agent.” The Public Defender’s Office filed Extraordinary and Special Appeals, which were not admitted.

- G) [REDACTED], mother of the fatal victim [REDACTED] (Case No. 0017539-93.2010.8.26.0562): This is an action for compensation for moral and material damages and for specific performance against the State of São Paulo, arising from the homicide of [REDACTED], son of [REDACTED]. The action was dismissed in the lower court. The Court of Justice, despite the fact that the action was brought against the State of São Paulo, upheld the preliminary objection of statute of limitations, applying the three-year rule applicable to civil torts committed against private parties. The decision rendered on appeal included a dissenting opinion by Judge [REDACTED], who considered the five-year statute of limitations for filing actions against the Public Treasury. The Public Defender’s Office filed Extraordinary and Special Appeals, which were not admitted.
- H) [REDACTED], grandmother of the fatal victim [REDACTED] (Case No. 0018667-51.2010.8.26.0562): This is a lawsuit seeking compensation for moral and material damages and an injunction against the State of São Paulo, arising from the homicide of [REDACTED], grandson of [REDACTED]. The lawsuit was dismissed at the trial court level. The trial court dismissed “claims for specific performance consisting of an apology and the construction of a monument due to absolute legal impossibility.” On appeal, the Court of Justice of the State of São Paulo, disregarding the context in which the “May Crimes” occurred, argued that “the fact that the plaintiff’s grandson was the victim of a homicide does not allow for the conclusion that there was an omission on the part of the police/state authorities.” The Public Defender’s Office filed Extraordinary and Special Appeals, which were not admitted.

Additionally, within the scope of the Ministry of Human Rights and Citizenship, actions related to the aforementioned Center for the Memory of Victims of State Violence (CMVV) and the Center for Access to Rights and Social Inclusion (CAIS) Mães por Direitos were officially announced and launched in March 2026 in the city of Santos, São Paulo.

III – FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

In light of the foregoing, it is observed that the Brazilian State has been making efforts to implement measures of reparation and satisfaction in the context of the events related to the so-called “May Crimes,” as well as to improve public security policies and provide assistance to victims and their families. Furthermore, institutional measures have been adopted aimed at strengthening the prevention and control of police lethality, improving the quality of investigations, and promoting transparency and inter-institutional cooperation, in line with national and international human rights standards.

The Brazilian State stands ready to assist the Special Procedures mandates of the Human Rights Council and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) in providing any additional clarifications and reaffirms its commitment to providing periodic updates on the case in question.