

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 2012





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

The Office of Children’s Issues (CA/OCS/CI), a part of the U.S. Department of State’s Bureau of Consular Affairs, acting in its capacity as the 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, 2011 through December 31, 2011. 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 on CA/OCS/CI’s Convention compliance webpage, travel.state.gov/abduction/resources/resources_3860.html. The page includes reporting methodology, [IPCA statistics](#), and other compliance-related information.

Not Compliant with the Convention

COUNTRY	ASSESSMENT
<p>Costa Rica</p>	<p>Costa Rican courts responsible for hearing Convention cases routinely denied Convention return applications, holding that domestic laws relating to child custody or commitments made pursuant to other non-abduction-related international agreements supersede the Convention. Costa Rican courts generally handled Convention cases as custody cases on the merits without regard to Article 16 of the Convention. In addition, Costa Rican courts ordered psychological examinations and home studies without clear justification and then used those reports as the basis for determining custody or denying return pursuant to Article 13(b).</p> <p>Judges hearing Convention cases appear to be influenced by positions and opinions expressed by outside groups and media reports, rather than basing their decisions solely on the facts of the case. Both the Costa Rican Public Defender's Office and the Costa Rican Women's Rights Ombudsman's Office incorrectly assert that preventing children from being separated from their mothers is the Convention's primary aim. Personnel changes in the Costa Rican Central Authority (CRCA) hindered communication and impeded training efforts by the USCA and international organizations.</p>
<p>Guatemala</p>	<p>The USCA experienced extreme difficulty communicating with and obtaining timely responses from the Guatemalan Central Authority (GCA) on Convention abduction cases. The USCA was unable to confirm whether the GCA received applications or whether the GCA referred applications to the court. Even when the GCA did respond to requests for status updates, the information conveyed was often inaccurate. For example, in at least two cases, the GCA informed the USCA that the case had been referred to the court, when in fact the court had no knowledge of the case and had never received the application from the GCA. Those cases have still not been referred to any court for a decision on the application for return under the Convention.</p>
<p>St. Kitts and Nevis</p>	<p>Despite overtures by the USCA throughout 2011, St. Kitts continues to be non-compliant. While there were no new applications in 2011, the St. Kitts Central Authority (SKCA) has still taken no action on an application filed in late 2009 and again in February 2010. The Crown Counsel of St. Kitts continues to assert that the Convention does not have the force of law in St. Kitts because it had never been properly implemented through domestic legislation. The Crown Counsel's analysis also suggested that the St. Kitts Constitution would prohibit the return of a St. Kitts national under the Convention. That position runs counter to the express framework of the Convention, which applies without regard to the child's nationality, by directing courts to focus on the issue of what country was the child's "habitual residence" when determining whether to order return. In accordance with the Crown Counsel's legal analysis, no Convention proceedings have been initiated and, to date, the child in question remains in St. Kitts.</p>

Patterns of Non-compliance with the Convention

COUNTRY	ASSESSMENT
<p>Argentina</p>	<p>Argentina demonstrated patterns of non-compliance in judicial performance. The USCA is not aware of any successfully enforced order for return from Argentina to the United States since 2006. In 2011, the USCA continued to observe significant delays in the execution and enforcement of return orders under the Convention. In one longstanding case, the Supreme Court upheld an order for return in December 2010, but has stayed enforcement of the order pending the left-behind parent’s fulfillment of several undertakings regarding the taking parent’s immigration status and financial requests. These particular undertakings go well beyond the scope of the Convention.</p> <p>The USCA and the Argentine Central Authority (ACA) maintain an excellent working relationship. The ACA has been extremely attentive and very responsive to USCA inquiries, and provides prompt status updates on cases. However, the USCA has concerns regarding the working relationship between the ACA and the <i>Departamento de Cooperación Internacional</i> (General Prosecutor’s Office, or GPO), which assigns public defenders to left-behind parents in need of pro-bono legal assistance. The USCA noted the ACA had great difficulty contacting and communicating with the GPO during the reporting period, particularly with offices outside Buenos Aires. Public defenders in two cases were not responsive to the ACA, USCA, U.S. Embassy, or to left-behind parents’ inquiries, which resulted in excessive delays in scheduling Hague hearings and left-behind parents unable to communicate with their legal counsel. One of these cases, filed in 2009, has not yet had a Convention hearing after more than two years.</p>
<p>Brazil</p>	<p>Brazil demonstrated patterns of non-compliance with the Convention in the area of judicial performance. Despite excellent central authority performance, the Brazilian judiciary demonstrated continued delays in case processing and a tendency to base judicial decisions in Convention proceedings on factors beyond the scope of the Convention. The judicial process is drawn out in Brazil; appeals add months, and sometimes years, to Convention cases. One return case has been pending in Brazilian courts since 2005.</p> <p>The Brazilian Central Authority (BCA) and Office of the Attorney General (OAG) utilized mediation to successfully resolve three Convention cases in 2011. Two children were also returned to the United States by court order. Notwithstanding some successful returns, enforcement of Convention court orders was a problem. In one case, the federal court and law enforcement refused to enforce the return order after the child displayed aggressive behavior toward the left-behind parent; the court subsequently suspended its own return order citing an interest in the child’s welfare. The OAG met with the federal judge to request an expeditious and final ruling in the case, but to date the case remains open and unresolved. Further, in an access case that was initially filed in 2004 and finally resolved by the court in 2010, the court-ordered access never occurred because the taking parent refused to apply for a passport for the child to travel to the United States for visitation and the designated escort did not appear for a scheduled visa interview. The USCA requested that the OAG ask the court to enforce the order; however, it is unclear what the status of the request is at this time.</p>

COUNTRY	ASSESSMENT
Ecuador	<p>Ecuador demonstrated patterns of non-compliance in central authority performance and judicial performance. Although the Ecuadorian Central Authority (ECA) performed adequately early in 2011, its responsiveness diminished drastically during the second half of the year. The ECA has a severe shortage of resources and did not provide requested case updates. The ECA did not acknowledge receipt of a Convention application sent in September, and it did not provide a copy of the denial judgment in an access case decided in August, despite multiple requests. The judicial system is slow to schedule hearings and provide decisions, although this practice is not specific to Convention or other family law cases. The ECA’s responsibility to represent parents was recently transferred to the Public Defenders’ office; it remains unclear how this transfer of authority will be handled.</p> <p>In November 2010, the USCA forwarded an application for access to replace a June 2008 application for return, which was not assigned a court date after nearly two years. The USCA asked the ECA to press the court for a hearing date, but no date was given, and the discouraged parent withdrew his access application in July 2011. In another case, filed with the ECA in September 2010, the court has not yet held a hearing on the application. In Ecuador, Convention cases are not formally initiated in court until the court officially orders law enforcement to locate the child and the child is subsequently located.</p> <p>In one instance, for reasons unknown to the USCA, notwithstanding the fact that law enforcement located the child outside the official court process based on an Interpol request, the court declined to officially order law enforcement to locate the child. Thus, the court has not formally opened the case and there has been no further progress to date.</p> <p>During judicial training on the Convention held in Quito in January 2011, the USCA noted that judges throughout Ecuador will require substantial additional training before the Convention will become fully operational in the country.</p>
Panama	<p>Panama demonstrated patterns of non-compliance with the Convention in the area of judicial performance. In four specific cases, the USCA observed significant delays in scheduling hearings during appeals. In addition, the courts requested extensive and costly psychological and socioeconomic evaluations of parents’ homes in the United States. Even when parents submitted positive evaluations to fulfill the courts’ requests, the return of children was denied. As at least one Panamanian judge noted in her dissenting opinion, Panamanian courts appear to treat Convention proceedings as custody hearings rather than determinations of habitual residence.</p> <p>Communication between the USCA and Panamanian Central Authority (PCA) on Convention cases was good. In January 2011, the Government of Panama participated in a judicial training seminar for Panamanian judges and prosecutors. The PCA expressed interest in holding annual seminars for Panamanian judges to discuss best practices of the Convention, but did not respond to follow-up communication in January and October.</p>

COUNTRY	ASSESSMENT
<p style="text-align: center;">The Bahamas</p>	<p>The Bahamas demonstrated patterns of non-compliance in judicial performance. During the reporting period, the USCA noted excessive delays in Convention cases. To address the USCA concerns regarding delays in Convention cases, the Bahamian Central Authority (BCA) worked with a non-governmental organization to establish a formal system of mediation to help parents resolve cases without waiting for cases to be processed through the court system. Bahamian courts tend to treat Convention cases as custody matters. Evaluations of taking parents' homes are mandatory in all Convention cases, and courts often request left-behind parents to obtain a home study before decisions are rendered in Convention cases. These requests cause significant delays and financial hardship to left-behind parents.</p> <p>Central authority performance improved substantially over the course of 2011, particularly during the last quarter of the reporting period. In November, the BCA launched a public relations campaign on the Convention on an official website and in the media, and established a 24-hour hotline to assist and educate the general public about international parental child abduction. Communication between the USCA and BCA improved significantly. The BCA's recent responsiveness demonstrated the commitment of the newly appointed Acting Head of the Legal Division for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs to improve The Bahamas' understanding and implementation of the Convention.</p>

Efforts to Encourage Other Countries to Join the Convention

Many of the IPCA cases that the USCA handles involve abductions to countries not yet parties to the Convention. As 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 Jacobs, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Overseas Citizens Services James Pettit, Special Advisor for Children's Issues Susan Jacobs, and a variety of other Department of State personnel at all levels have actively engaged foreign government officials around the world to accede to or ratify the Convention. In 2011, Special Advisor Jacobs held bilateral discussions with government officials in Egypt, Japan, Jordan, Korea, and the Philippines, urging them to join the Convention. She also met in Washington with official delegations from a variety of countries to promote accession to the Convention.

Special Advisor Jacobs promoted accession to the Convention in a number of her public speeches both in the United States and abroad. In May 2011, she, with Deputy Assistant Secretary Pettit, participated in several events to mark National Missing Children's Day, and in June led the U.S. delegation to the Sixth Special Commission meeting in The Hague on the operation of the Convention. At that meeting, the U.S. delegation promoted adherence to Convention principles and held bilateral discussions with a number of non-member countries to encourage their accession to the Convention. In November 2011, Special Advisor Jacobs returned to The Hague to lead a Technical Working Group to establish criteria for providing assistance to countries seeking to implement the Convention.

The USCA continues to provide input to the Governments of Japan, Morocco, Russia, Singapore, South Korea, and Thailand, as each country has drafted implementing legislation for Convention ratification or accession. In 2011, USCA officials met with foreign officials from the following countries to discuss IPCA and progress towards joining the Convention: Egypt, Ghana, India, Japan, Jordan, Nicaragua, the Philippines, Russia, Saudi Arabia, South Korea, and Trinidad and Tobago. USCA officials regularly meet with officials from the European Union, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand to coordinate multilateral efforts to encourage countries to join the Convention.

The Department regularly instructs its diplomatic missions in non-Convention countries to approach host governments to encourage them to join the Convention. Embassy public affairs 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 join the Convention. In Washington, U.S. government officials raise the Convention in their discussions with senior officials from non-member 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 (NGOs) that can assist in the return of children to their country of habitual residence under the Convention.

USCA officials collaborated with the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children (NCMEC) on individual cases, met with the International Center for Missing and Exploited Children (ICMEC) to discuss strategies for working with law enforcement to locate children and enforce court orders in specific countries, and met with International Social Services (ISS) to discuss the repatriation of children and assistance to families in individual cases. USCA officials discussed mediation efforts with multiple non-governmental organizations.

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 due to the absence of prompt and effective enforcement mechanisms.

COUNTRY	ENFORCEMENT CONCERN
Argentina	Hague return order not enforced; Hague access order not enforced.
Brazil	Hague return order not enforced; Hague access order not enforced.
France	Hague return order not enforced.
Mexico	Hague return order not enforced; Hague access order not enforced.
Poland	Hague return order not enforced.
Romania	Hague return order not enforced.

Unresolved Return Applications

As of December 31, 2011, the USCA had 118 applications for return that remained open and active 18 months after the date of filing with the relevant foreign central authority in the 22 countries listed below. The following section describes each unresolved case and the actions taken by the USCA to resolve them.

NOTE: Foreign central authorities are referred to below as “CA,” preceded by the initial of the country, e.g., “MCA” for the Mexican Central Authority.

COUNTRY	ABDUCTED/ RETAINED	APPLICATION FILED	CHILD LOCATED	SUMMARY OF CASE
ARGENTINA	6-2008	6-2009	Yes	The first hearing on the Convention application occurred in November 2009. In August 2010, the left-behind parent (LBP) initiated a non-Convention proceeding in family court; that court recognized a U.S. court order awarding the LBP sole legal custody and physical custody of the children. In October 2011, the court hearing the Convention case refused to recognize the custody order and denied return under the Convention. An appeals court reversed the decision and ordered the family court to execute the order of return. The taking parent (TP) appealed to the Supreme Court, which has not yet issued a decision. The USCA and U.S. Embassy Buenos Aires have regularly requested updates from the ACA on court proceedings.
ARGENTINA	8-2009	6-2010	Yes	No hearing on the Convention application has been scheduled. In December 2010, the ACA informed the USCA that the LBP’s attorney was no longer handling the case and the court assigned two public defenders in February 2011. For nine months the public defenders did not respond to communication from the ACA, USCA, the U.S. Embassy, or the LBP. In October 2011, the court appointed another public defender. In November 2011, the USCA convened a conference call with the LBP and public defender. The public defender is working with the court to schedule the first hearing in the Convention proceeding. The USCA and U.S. Embassy Buenos Aires have regularly requested updates from the ACA on the progress of setting a Hague hearing date.

COUNTRY	ABDUCTED/ RETAINED	APPLICATION FILED	CHILD LOCATED	SUMMARY OF CASE
ARGENTINA	9-2009	12-2009	Yes	The court ordered the child's return under the Convention in May 2010. The TP filed a complaint against the court, and also filed an appeal of the Convention return order. On October 28, 2010, the appellate court decided not to hear the appeal of the return order until TP's previous complaint was heard. Both the complaint and appeal are still pending the appellate court's decision. The LBP's attorney filed motions asking the court to address the appeal urgently and the ACA has reminded the court of the importance of reaching a prompt decision under the Convention. The USCA and U.S. Embassy Buenos Aires have regularly requested updates from the ACA on court proceedings.
ARGENTINA	1-2009	4-2009	Yes	The court ordered the child's return in November 2009. The TP appealed. In May 2010, the appellate court rejected the TP's appeal and affirmed the ordered return of the child to the United States. In August 2010, the TP filed an "extraordinary appeal" with the Supreme Court of Argentina, which dismissed the appeal and ordered the lower court to execute the return order. In April 2011, the Argentina's Ministry of Interior denied the TP's request for asylum because she is an Argentine citizen and thus had no basis for seeking asylum. In November 2011, the court stayed the execution of the return order until undertakings requested by the TP are met, which require that the United States grant the TP legal permanent residency and that the LBP provide financial support and health care to the TP. The USCA and U.S. Embassy Buenos Aires have regularly requested updates from the ACA on court proceedings.
ARGENTINA	8-2008	4-2009	Yes	The court interviewed the child in accordance with the U.N. Convention on the Rights of the Child. During the interview, the child stated that he wanted to stay in Argentina. The court determined it would not continue with the case until the LBP responds to domestic violence allegations, provides a U.S. police report, and provides information regarding whether the TP will be able to reside and work in the United States until 2014. In August 2011, the ACA indicated that the TP presented documentation to the court, from the LBP, authorizing the TP to seek the permanent residency of the child in Argentina. The USCA is waiting to receive confirmation from the LBP regarding this matter. The USCA and U.S. Embassy Buenos Aires have regularly requested updates from the ACA on the progress of scheduling a Hague hearing.

COUNTRY	ABDUCTED/ RETAINED	APPLICATION FILED	CHILD LOCATED	SUMMARY OF CASE
BAHAMAS	1-2009	8-2009	Yes	The BCA acknowledged receipt of the Convention application on August 4, 2009. In June 2010, the Attorney General's Office (AGO) requested that a home study be conducted by the Department of Social Services and the AGO received the report on December 2010. The AGO's request for apostilled documents caused significant delays in the case. The USCA forwarded apostilled documents received from LBP to the BCA in January 2011. In September 2011, the AGO informed the LBP in September 2011 that a Convention hearing was tentatively scheduled for October 2011; however, the hearing was subsequently delayed until further notice for no stated reason. The USCA and U.S. Embassy Nassau have regularly requested updates from the BCA on court proceedings.
BAHAMAS	8-2009	8-2009	Yes	In September 2009, the AGO's contacted the Indiana Department of Child Services, which conducted a home study with the LBP. A non-Convention-related exploratory hearing took place in November 2009 and a Convention hearing was held in January 2011. A ruling scheduled for February 4, 2011 was postponed. The judge reviewed the case in April 2011, but delayed the decision until further notice. The USCA and U.S. Embassy Nassau have regularly requested updates from the BCA on court proceedings.
BAHAMAS	3-2010	5-2010	Yes	The USCA forwarded the Convention application to the BCA in May 2010. The BCA did not acknowledge receipt of the application until October 2010. After the case was filed in court, a hearing scheduled for July 2011 was postponed after the judge recused himself because he is acquainted with the TP. The AGO is still waiting for a new hearing date before a new judge. Based on domestic procedures for initiating Convention cases, the application will remain pending with the AGO until a new judge is assigned. The AGO received home study report on July 22, 2011. The USCA and U.S. Embassy Nassau have regularly requested updates from the BCA on court proceedings.

COUNTRY	ABDUCTED/ RETAINED	APPLICATION FILED	CHILD LOCATED	SUMMARY OF CASE
BELGIUM	10-2008	6-2009	Yes	<p>In March 2010, the court denied return under Article 13(b) of the Convention. In February 2011, the appellate court vacated the lower court's denial and ordered the child's return to the United States. Belgium's highest court, the Court of Cassation, upheld the appeal in December 2011. The TP filed an application with the European Court of Human Rights (Strasbourg Court) to reverse the return order, and the Strasbourg Court ordered the return be stayed pending the outcome of the application before it. The USCA responded to a request for information from the BCA in connection with the Strasbourg Court. The U.S. Embassy in Brussels raised the case with Belgian officials, and the U.S. Consulate General in Strasbourg has expressed U.S. concerns with the Strasbourg Court regarding the issuance of the stay order. The USCA is in regular contact with the BCA to request updates and to seek enforcement of the Hague return order.</p>
BRAZIL	9-2004	3-2005	Yes	<p>The court ordered the child returned under the Convention in June 2007. The TP appealed, and simultaneously obtained temporary custody from a different federal court, in conflict with Article 16. An appellate court vacated the return order in September 2008. In May 2010, the Office of the Attorney General (OAG) filed a special appeal in the Convention case, however, the court has not yet ruled on that appeal. In August 2011, the OAG asked whether the LBP would be willing to participate in mediation with the TP. In September 2011, the LBP indicated that he is willing to participate, but requested more information before agreeing to do so. As of the close of the reporting period, the LBP had not received that information from the OAG. The USCA and U.S. Embassy Brasilia have regularly requested updates from the BCA on court proceedings and mediation services.</p>
BRAZIL	7-2009	12-2009	Yes	<p>The OAG filed the Convention case in court in August 2010. During a September 2011 conciliation hearing, the court ordered a psychological evaluation of the child, and granted the TP's motion to hear testimony from character witnesses for both the TP and LBP. The date for the next hearing has not been set. The USCA and U.S. Embassy Brasilia have regularly requested updates from the BCA on court proceedings.</p>

COUNTRY	ABDUCTED/ RETAINED	APPLICATION FILED	CHILD LOCATED	SUMMARY OF CASE
BRAZIL	8-2009	6-2010	Yes	In June 2011, the judge cancelled a conciliation hearing. In October 2011, the child underwent a court-ordered psychological examination. The BCA asked whether the LBP would submit to a home study prepared by a U.S.-based psychologist or social worker. The LBP and his attorney are considering the request. The USCA and U.S. Embassy Brasilia have regularly requested updates from the BCA on the court proceedings.
BRAZIL	7-2006	11-2006	Yes	In April 2008, a federal court ordered the child returned. The TP appealed and the Superior Court of Justice granted a suspension of the lower court's decision. In May 2011, the OAG appealed the suspension order. In July 2011, the federal court awarded the LBP access rights to the child pending the outcome of the appeal of the suspension order. The LBP was unable to travel to Brazil in August 2011 to exercise access rights due to Hurricane Irene. The court must reschedule the access for the LBP; however, the LBP has not provided a suggested date to the court. The USCA and U.S. Embassy Brasilia have regularly requested updates from the BCA on the court proceedings.
BRAZIL	2-2009	3-2009	Yes	In September 2010, the federal court ordered the return of the child. The TP appealed the decision. An appeals hearing was scheduled for October 19, 2011, but the judge cancelled the hearing. The OAG attempted to contact the judge to discuss rescheduling, but the judge repeatedly refused to discuss the matter with either Brazilian or foreign authorities. An appeals hearing was held December 2, 2011. The court's decision has not yet been published. The USCA and U.S. Embassy Brasilia have regularly requested updates from the BCA on court proceedings.
BRAZIL	11-2007	11-2008	Yes	In November 2009, the LBP and the TP independently reached a visitation agreement. The LBP and the TP plan to finalize the agreement in the United States and Brazil. Once they do so, they plan to withdraw the Convention application. The USCA and U.S. Embassy Brasilia have regularly requested updates from the BCA regarding the progress of the visitation agreement.

COUNTRY	ABDUCTED/ RETAINED	APPLICATION FILED	CHILD LOCATED	SUMMARY OF CASE
BRAZIL	9-2009	2-2010	Yes	In May 2011, the LBP declined to attend a conciliation (mediation) hearing. The court heard testimony from the TP and the LBP's parents and is expected to make a decision on the Convention application based on that hearing. In October 2011, the LBP informed the USCA that a state court in Rio de Janeiro awarded the TP temporary custody of the child. The USCA informed the BCA of this conflict under Article 16 of the Convention. The BCA and OAG have addressed the issue with the state-level court, which was not receptive to the request to suspend custody action in the case. The USCA and U.S. Embassy Brasilia have regularly requested updates from the BCA on the court proceedings.
CANADA	12-2006	10-2008	Yes	After a delay while the LBP retained legal counsel, the first hearing was held in June 2009. The court declined to make a ruling on the Convention application at that hearing, noting its concern that the Convention was not applicable to the case. The court has still not issued a ruling. In July 2011, the Ontario Office of the Children's Lawyer spoke to the children, and concluded that the children did not wish to see the LBP. Currently, LBP is contemplating whether or not he wishes to proceed with his Convention application for return or pursue a domestic Canadian custody case. The USCA and the U.S. mission in Canada have regularly requested updates from the CCA on the status of the case.
CANADA	4-2008	3-2010	Yes	In April 2011, the USCA resubmitted the paperwork to the CCA after they reported that they did not have the file. Currently, the LBP is waiting to see if he is eligible for legal aid assistance through the CCA. The USCA and the U.S. mission in Canada have regularly requested updates from the CCA on the status of the case.
COLOMBIA	8-2008	1-2009	Yes	In May 2009, the TP agreed to voluntarily return the child. The TP then refused to let the child return to the United States without her and refused to apply for humanitarian parole to accompany the child. During mediation in February 2010, the TP confirmed she would not return the child. In November 2010, the CCA requested the court rule on the Convention application. The court arranged a mediation hearing for December 2010. In January 2011, the LBP notified the USCA that he and the TP reached an agreement to present to a court. During an April 2011 hearing, the TP and her witnesses failed to appear. The hearing was not rescheduled and the TP's attorney requested revisions to the agreement. The USCA and U.S. Embassy Bogota have regularly requested updates from the ICBF on court proceedings.

COUNTRY	ABDUCTED/ RETAINED	APPLICATION FILED	CHILD LOCATED	SUMMARY OF CASE
COSTA RICA	10-2008	1-2009	Yes	The child was located in July 2011. CRCA requested multiple documents establishing the custodial relationship, along with revised Convention documents. After receiving updated information, in September 2011, the CRCA rejected the application based on Article 12 of the Convention. In November 2011, after USCA staff visited the CRCA, CRCA agreed to accept the case and submit it to the court for a decision. The USCA and U.S. Embassy San Jose have regularly requested updates from CRCA on the progress of the case.
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	4-2009	7-2009	Yes	In May 2010, the court denied the return of the child, which was upheld on appeal in July 2010. In September 2010, the LBP's attorney appealed to the Supreme Court. In March 2011, the court accepted the appeal, but has not yet ruled on the case. The USCA and U.S. Embassy Santo Domingo have regularly requested updates from DRCA on court proceedings.
EL SALVADOR	10-2008	3-2010	Yes	The Convention application was filed in March 2010 and a hearing was held in March 2011. The TP requested that the court hear testimony from a number of witnesses. The court declined to hear the testimony and the TP appealed. In October 2011, the appellate court upheld the lower court decision and ordered the lower court to proceed with the case. The USCA and U.S. Embassy San Salvador have regularly requested updates from SCA on court proceedings.
FRANCE	2-2008	3-2010	Yes	The Convention application was filed in March 2010 with the FCA, which sent it to the General Prosecutor (GP) of St. Martin where the child's maternal grandmother has retained her. In December 2010, the GP offered to assist with the child's return. In January 2011, the GP informed the FCA that a court in St. Martin had awarded custody to the TP based on LBP's written consent. The case remains open pending USCA confirmation of this information with the LBP and FCA receipt of appropriate documentation that would allow for withdrawal of the Hague petition. The USCA continues to follow up with the FCA for updates.
FRANCE	11-2007	3-2008	Yes	Successive GPs in France have not enforced the October 2008 Convention return order, which was upheld through the Court of Cassation. The USCA is in regular contact with the FCA to request updates and to seek enforcement of the Hague return order. On multiple occasions, the USCA and the U.S. Mission in France have raised the case with French officials.

COUNTRY	ABDUCTED/ RETAINED	APPLICATION FILED	CHILD LOCATED	SUMMARY OF CASE
GREECE	10-2005	11-2006	Yes	The initial hearing on the Convention application took place in March 2007. In October 2007, the LBP appealed the court's decision to deny return based on Article 13(b) and the children's preference to remain in Greece. The hearing for the appeal was officially delayed twice before the LBP decided to open a separate case in a Greek family court, where his U.S. custody order was recognized. The TP appealed the Greek family court's decision, and in October 2010, the case went before a higher Greek court, which upheld the lower court decision to order the return in April 2011. The Supreme Court will hear the TP's appeal in April 2012. The USCA is in regular contact with the GCA to request updates.
HONDURAS	9-2009	3-2010	Yes	The children were located in August 2010. A court date has not yet been set. Because of a strike of government workers that began in October 2011, the HCA has been largely out of communication with the USCA and new updates are not yet available. The USCA and U.S. Embassy Tegucigalpa continue to regularly request updates from HCA on the status of this case.
ISRAEL	4-2007	4-2007	Yes	The ICA has not filed this case in Israeli court because the LBP has not completed the paperwork to retain either of the legal aid attorneys appointed by the ICA. The USCA continues to seek updates from the LBP and the ICA.
ISRAEL	4-2007	10-2007	Yes	After the Israeli court ordered the children's return in November 2008, the LBP agreed to allow them to remain in Israel through the end of the school year. However, the TP refused to return the children per the Hague return order when school ended in June 2009. In September 2011, the parents reached a mediated agreement to allow the children to remain in Israel and visit the LBP in the United States. Because the mediated agreement has not been certified in either court, the Hague return order remains valid but unenforced. The USCA continues to communicate with the LBP about her intentions and with the ICA to provide and request updates.

COUNTRY	ABDUCTED/ RETAINED	APPLICATION FILED	CHILD LOCATED	SUMMARY OF CASE
ITALY	7-2009	6-2010	Yes	Because the ICA was unable to confirm receipt of the original Convention application, the USCA resubmitted the application on February 8, 2011. The parents are reportedly working towards a voluntary agreement, but the Hague case remains open as the Italian court has not ruled on the petition. The USCA regularly requests updates from the ICA.
MEXICO	6-2008	1-2010	Yes	Mexican social services, <i>Desarrollo Integral de la Familia</i> (DIF), took the children into custody in May 2010, where they remain. In July 2010, the Mexican court ordered the return of the children and the TP immediately filed an appeal. In September 2010, the state Superior Court denied the appeal and the TP then filed an “ <i>amparo</i> ”, a constitutionally-based appeal. In September 2011, the MCA informed the USCA that the <i>amparo</i> was denied and that the MCA would request the court to enforce the return order. The USCA and the U.S. mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on court proceedings.
MEXICO	11-2005	11-2008	No	The California Attorney General’s Office filed the Convention return application with the MCA on behalf of the LBP. The case was forwarded to a court, but the child has not been located. The court has requested the assistance of the <i>Agencia Federal de Investigación</i> (AFI) in finding 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	6-2008	8-2008	Yes	In April 2009, the court denied the Convention return application, which the LBP appealed. In July 2009, the Supreme Court of Guanajuato overturned the decision and ordered the return of the child. However, the 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> . Convention proceedings remain stalled while this <i>amparo</i> is being decided. The LBP has also filed <i>amparos</i> in the case. The USCA and the U.S. mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on court proceedings.

COUNTRY	ABDUCTED/ RETAINED	APPLICATION FILED	CHILD LOCATED	SUMMARY OF CASE
MEXICO	4-2003	6-2008	Yes	In November 2010, the court began hearings on the Convention application, and eventually denied the child's return. In March 2011, the LBP filed an appeal, and a decision is pending. The USCA and the U.S. mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on court proceedings.
MEXICO	8-2009	12-2009	No	The child was abducted from both parents by an aunt and her friend. The child's whereabouts remain unknown and the MCA has not sent the case to a court. The USCA and the U.S. mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on efforts to locate the child.
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. AFI is searching for the child, who remains missing. The USCA and the U.S. mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on efforts to locate the child.
MEXICO	3-2006	5-2006	No	In May 2008, the court denied the Convention return application, and the 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. AFI is searching for the TP and child, but they have not been located. The USCA and the U.S. mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on efforts to locate the child.
MEXICO	11-2004	5-2005	No	The California Attorney General's Office filed the Convention return application with the MCA on behalf of the LBP. In April 2008, the court requested the assistance of Interpol in locating the children, but their whereabouts are still unknown. AFI is now working to find 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	5-2009	1-2010	Yes	In December 2010, the court ordered a return under the Convention, but the TP filed an <i>amparo</i> . In June 2011, the MCA informed the USCA that the <i>amparo</i> was denied, and the next step is to request that the court enforce the return order. The children are in DIF custody. The USCA and the U.S. mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on court proceedings.

COUNTRY	ABDUCTED/ RETAINED	APPLICATION FILED	CHILD LOCATED	SUMMARY OF CASE
MEXICO	12-2003	7-2009	No	In September 2011, the MCA announced that this case was closed due to the length of time that the child has been missing. The USCA has asked the MCA to clarify whether the court or the MCA made this decision. The USCA and the U.S. mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on the status of the case.
MEXICO	10-2009	1-2010	No	The Hague application was filed with the MCA in January 2010, but the LBP was unable to provide an address for the TP and child. In February 2011, the LBP provided an address, and the MCA sent the case to a court in August 2011. A hearing has not yet been scheduled. The USCA and the U.S. mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on efforts to locate the child.
MEXICO	3-2009	5-2009	No	The TP and children have not been located, and the MCA is working with Interpol to locate them. The LBP has provided information regarding their possible whereabouts. The case was not forwarded to a court as jurisdiction cannot be determined. 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 MCA referred the case to AFI for assistance. The LBP provided information and a picture of the child directly to the AFI. The case has not been forwarded to a court as jurisdiction cannot be determined. The USCA and the U.S. mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on efforts to locate the child.
MEXICO	12-2008	3-2010	Yes	In December 2010, the LBP and TP entered into a judicial agreement in which the child would return. The TP did not comply, and in September 2011, the TP filed an appeal against the agreement. Later that month, the appellate court upheld the return agreement and remanded the case to the original family court handling the return application for a final judicial order. The USCA and the U.S. mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on court proceedings.
MEXICO	12-2003	6-2006	No	In May 2007, the court ordered the child's return under the Convention but did not secure the child before the TP absconded with the child. In November 2009, the MCA requested the AFI's assistance in locating the child. The child's location remains unknown. 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 LOCATED	SUMMARY OF CASE
MEXICO	4-2008	9-2008	No	The case was forwarded to a court but the children were not located. The court requested AFI's assistance in searching for the children. 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 children.
MEXICO	11-2008	4-2009	No	The court asked for AFI's assistance in locating the child. Although the child's whereabouts are unknown, the TP has filed an <i>amparo</i> seeking to halt the Convention proceedings. The USCA and the U.S. mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on efforts to locate the child.
MEXICO	8-2001	6-2002	No	In 2004, the MCA requested Interpol's assistance in locating the child. Since that time, efforts to locate the child have been unsuccessful. The case was not forwarded to a court as jurisdiction cannot be determined. The USCA and the U.S. mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on efforts to locate the child.
MEXICO	10-2007	7-2008	Yes	In August 2008, the court held a hearing on the Convention return application, but the TP did not appear. Since then, the TP has filed three successive <i>amparos</i> , which have effectively halted proceedings on the Convention application. In December 2011, the MCA discovered that the LBP's parental rights were terminated by a Mexican court in August 2008, and the MCA closed the case. The USCA has asked the MCA to reconsider the decision. The USCA and the U.S. mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on court proceedings.
MEXICO	5-2008	3-2009	No	An August 2010 hearing on the Convention application was postponed because the TP did not appear, and the MCA requested the support of AFI in locating the children. In September 2011, AFI discovered that the children had moved to a new state in Mexico. The MCA requested the assistance of Interpol to locate them. The USCA and the U.S. mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on efforts to locate the children.
MEXICO	1-2009	5-2009	No	The California Attorney General's Office filed the Convention return application with the MCA on behalf of the LBP. In May 2010, the MCA confirmed that AFI was searching for the child. In September 2011, the LBP provided updated photos to help AFI to find 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 LOCATED	SUMMARY OF CASE
MEXICO	11-2008	3-2009	Yes	In May 2009, the MCA forwarded the case to a court. However, that same month, the TP filed an <i>amparo</i> , which had the effect of halting proceedings on the Convention application. Court action remains stalled pending the resolution of the <i>amparo</i> . The USCA and the U.S. mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on court proceedings.
MEXICO	12-2007	7-2008	Yes	The California Attorney General's Office filed the Convention return application with the MCA on behalf of the LBP. In September 2008, the court ordered the child's return under the Convention. The TP then filed an <i>amparo</i> . The LBP won the <i>amparo</i> but the TP appealed. In November 2011, the reviewing court upheld the denial of the <i>amparo</i> , and remanded the case for a final order on the Convention return application. The USCA and the U.S. mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on court proceedings.
MEXICO	12-2005	10-2008	No	The California Attorney General's Office filed the Convention return application with the MCA on behalf of the LBP. In May 2010, the MCA confirmed that AFI is trying to locate the minor. In June 2011, NCMEC created age-progression photos of the child to help with the search. The USCA and the U.S. mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on efforts to locate the child.
MEXICO	10-2000	11-2003	No	In April 2004, the MCA forwarded the case to the court, but it was unable to locate the TP and minor. The MCA then referred the case to law enforcement to search for the child, but the child has not yet been located. In May 2010, the MCA asked if the LBP would prefer access rather than return under the Convention due to the many years the child has resided in Mexico. The LBP was not interested in access alone and requested that the return application remain active with the MCA and the court. AFI's search remains open. The USCA and the U.S. mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on efforts to locate the child.
MEXICO	12-2008	5-2009	Yes	In March 2010, the MCA confirmed that the case has been referred to Interpol for assistance in locating the child. In September 2011, the LBP provided a location for the child. The case was forwarded to the court but the TP failed to appear for a hearing in December 2011. AFI is searching for the child.

COUNTRY	ABDUCTED/ RETAINED	APPLICATION FILED	CHILD LOCATED	SUMMARY OF CASE
MEXICO	1-2009	5-2009	Yes	The California Attorney General's Office filed the Convention return application with the MCA on behalf of a social services agency. Two of three siblings were voluntarily returned to the United States in June 2009. The third child remains in Mexico. The MCA requested the assistance of Interpol in locating the missing child. In January 2011, the LBP provided a report from a Mexican social services agency that verified the child's address. The child was located in November 2011, and the case was sent to the court with an MCA recommendation that the court encourage the TP to return the child voluntarily. The USCA and the U.S. mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on court proceedings.
MEXICO	12-2006	6-2007	No	The California Attorney General's Office filed the Convention return application with the MCA on behalf of a social services agency. The court postponed a hearing on the Convention application in April 2010 because the authorities were unable to locate the TP and children. The case was returned by the court to the MCA, and the MCA referred the case to AFI for assistance in finding 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	6-2006	2-2008	No	In April 2008, a court clerk tried to deliver a court summons but neighbors reported that the TP no longer lived at the address. The MCA referred the case to AFI for assistance in locating the child. Court proceedings meanwhile 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	10-2008	1-2009	Yes	In June 2009, the court held a hearing on the Convention return application, but the TP did not appear. The court asked AFI to locate the child, who was found in January 2011. During Convention proceedings that month, the court requested a psychological evaluation of the LBP. The court has asked the results of the psychological evaluation be provided via letters rogatory. The LBP has objected and court proceedings remain stalled. The USCA and the U.S. mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on court proceedings.

COUNTRY	ABDUCTED/ RETAINED	APPLICATION FILED	CHILD LOCATED	SUMMARY OF CASE
MEXICO	10-2003	9-2009	Yes	The court scheduled three hearings, two of which the LBP attended. Each time, the children and their grandparent guardian did not appear. The LBP provided recent photos of the minors at the TP's parents' home and AFI located the children in November 2011. Court proceedings on the Convention application are ongoing. The USCA and the U.S. mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on court proceedings.
MEXICO	11-2008	9-2009	Yes	In May 2010, the court denied the Convention petition for return after determining that the 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. The USCA and the U.S. mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on court proceedings.
MEXICO	4-2009	12-2009	No	The court had requested the assistance of AFI in locating the child. In July 2011, the LBP provided new address information, which has been forwarded to AFI. The USCA and the U.S. mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on efforts to locate the child.
MEXICO	9-2007	12-2007	No	In November 2007, prior to the filing of the return application, 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 AFI has been unsuccessful in locating the child. In December 2007, the MCA forwarded the Convention application to the court, but the child has not been located. Court proceedings meanwhile 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	12-2007	3-2010	Yes	In October 2011, the children were secured by AFI after a lengthy search. They were placed in DIF custody. In November 2011, the court ordered the return of the children but the order has not been executed and is awaiting the expiration of the TP's right to appeal. The USCA and the U.S. mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on court proceedings.

COUNTRY	ABDUCTED/ RETAINED	APPLICATION FILED	CHILD LOCATED	SUMMARY OF CASE
MEXICO	9-2005	2-2006	Yes	In April 2006, the court held a hearing but the TP did not appear. In December 2006, the court requested psychological evaluations of the TP, LBP, and child over the objections of the LBP, who argued that this was not relevant to a return application. The LBP also requested that the judge recuse himself from the case but the judge declined. According to the MCA, the case is still pending the court's review of the documentation submitted by the parties. The USCA and the U.S. mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on court proceedings.
MEXICO	12-2005	3-2008	Yes	In November 2008, the court denied return under the Convention because the child had resided with the taking grandparents for more than two years prior to the filing of the return petition and was now "settled" in Mexico. The LBP appealed the ruling, and is awaiting a decision. The USCA and the U.S. mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on court proceedings.
MEXICO	5-2009	12-2009	No	The California Attorney General's Office filed the Convention return application with the MCA on behalf of the LBP. The MCA requested the assistance of AFI to locate the child and in October 2010, the MCA requested Interpol's assistance. The child's whereabouts remain unknown. The USCA and the U.S. mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on efforts to locate the child.
MEXICO	9-2006	9-2008	No	In June 2009, the court held a hearing on the Convention return application, but the TP and child did not appear. The LBP has provided information regarding possible locations of the child. At this time, however, law enforcement is not involved in locating 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	9-2006	6-2008	No	The California Attorney General's Office filed the Convention return application with the MCA on behalf of a social services agency. The MCA referred the case to AFI for assistance 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.

COUNTRY	ABDUCTED/ RETAINED	APPLICATION FILED	CHILD LOCATED	SUMMARY OF CASE
MEXICO	7-2009	11-2009	Yes	In June 2010, the court denied the return of the minors as the two older children objected to their return to the United States. The LBP filed an appeal and is awaiting a decision. The USCA and the U.S. mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on court proceedings.
MEXICO	12-2008	12-2009	No	In April 2010, the court scheduled a hearing but the child was not located. The court referred the case to AFI for assistance in locating 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	8-2007	10-2007	Yes	In September 2008, the court ordered the return of the child under the Convention, and the TP appealed. In December 2008, the appellate court overturned the decision to return the child. In January 2009, the 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 had become “settled” in Mexico; the LBP appealed. In October 2010, the appellate court ruled for the LBP and 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. The TP then filed a new <i>amparo</i> , which remains pending. The USCA and the U.S. mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on court proceedings.
MEXICO	7-2009	10-2009	No	The court held several hearings in March 2010, April 2010, October 2010, and January 2011 but the TP has not appeared. The TP has filed multiple <i>amparos</i> . The children’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 children.
MEXICO	3-2006	3-2009	No	The child was not found at the location that the LBP initially provided and the case was sent to Interpol. The LBP later provided further location information and in August 2011, the MCA forwarded the Convention application to the court. The TP filed an <i>amparo</i> as soon as the court received it. The <i>amparo</i> is still pending. 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 LOCATED	SUMMARY OF CASE
MEXICO	12-2003	10-2005	Yes	The California Attorney General's Office filed the Hague return application with the MCA on behalf of the LBP. The MCA referred the case to Interpol for assistance in locating the minors. In April 2011, an updated possible location for the children was provided and in July 2011, the MCA forwarded the case to the state Supreme Court. One of the two children has since turned 16, and would not be returned under the Hague Convention. The USCA and the U.S. mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on court proceedings.
MEXICO	3-2009	3-2010	Yes	After several months of searching, the child was located and a hearing was scheduled in June 2011, but the TP was not notified. The court then closed the case. The LBP contested the decision and the court reopened the case in July 2011. The USCA and the U.S. mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on court proceedings.
MEXICO	7-2005	3-2008	No	In April 2010, the TP was arrested in Mexico on charges of international parental child abduction, and in November 2011, was extradited to the United States. A hearing scheduled for April 2011 was postponed because the child could not be located. The TP's family indicated the child was now living in the United States, but this is not confirmed. The USCA and the U.S. mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on efforts to locate the child.
MEXICO	2-2009	11-2009	No	In May 2010, the MCA forwarded the case to the court, but it was unable to find the TP and child. In May 2011, the MCA requested the assistance of AFI and Mexican immigration authorities to search 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	1-2008	10-2009	No	The case was initially forwarded to a court, but in January 2010, the court returned the file to the MCA after it could not find the children. In early April 2011, the case was sent back to the court with a possible location for the children. No hearing date has been set. 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 LOCATED	SUMMARY OF CASE
MEXICO	1-2002	4-2005	No	Law enforcement has been searching for the child since 2005. In September 2011, there were indications that the child had left Mexico. The MCA has requested the assistance of Mexican immigration authorities to verify exit records. The USCA and the U.S. mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on efforts to locate the child.
MEXICO	6-2007	2-2009	Yes	In January 2010, the MCA sent the case to AFI for assistance in locating the child. AFI located the child in June 2010, but a court date has not yet been set on the Convention application. In August 2011, the MCA informed the USCA that they had filed a complaint against the court due to extended delays in this, and other Convention cases. The USCA and the U.S. mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on court proceedings.
MEXICO	6-2005	1-2006	No	In September 2006, the MCA forwarded this case to the court, but the child was not located. In December 2009, the MCA requested the assistance of AFI in locating the child. In August 2010, the LBP forwarded additional information regarding the possible whereabouts of the child. Meanwhile, there has been no movement in the courts on the Convention application. In October 2011, the TP was arrested in the United States on child abduction charges. The USCA and the U.S. mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on efforts to locate the child.
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 minors' whereabouts remain unknown and in January 2009, the MCA requested AFI's assistance to search for them. The USCA and the U.S. mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on efforts to locate the children.
MEXICO	10-2005	9-2006	No	In October 2006, the MCA forwarded the Convention application to the court. In May 2007, the MCA informed the USCA that the case file had been lost and that it had resubmitted the relevant documents to the court. A hearing was scheduled for November 2007, but the TP and child could not be located. AFI and Interpol have been unable to locate the child since that time, further stalling Convention proceedings in the court. The TP has also filed an <i>amparo</i> against the proceedings, which remains unresolved. 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 LOCATED	SUMMARY OF CASE
MEXICO	6-2008	10-2009	Yes	In March 2010, the court denied the children's return. The LBP appealed the decision. In November 2011, the appeals court overturned the denial and the child was ordered returned. The TP did not appeal and the LBP is awaiting the execution of the order. The USCA and the U.S. mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on court proceedings.
MEXICO	1-2009	4-2010	No	The California Attorney General's Office filed the Convention return application with the MCA on behalf of the LBP. In August 2010, the court postponed the hearing when they were unable to find the children. The court requested assistance from the <i>Seguridad Publica</i> , but the unit charged with locating children closed. In October 2011, the MCA asked the court to transfer the case to AFI or Interpol to search for the children. 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 children.
MEXICO	6-2008	11-2009	Yes	In October 2010, the court secured the child and held a hearing but the TP filed an <i>amparo</i> . The court then returned the child to the TP. In July 2011, the court rejected the <i>amparo</i> , but the TP requested a review. The review was denied and the court scheduled a Convention hearing for November 2011. However, the TP filed a new <i>amparo</i> and is waiting for a hearing to be scheduled. The USCA and the U.S. mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on court proceedings.
MEXICO	1-2005	2-2008	Yes	In May 2008, the first scheduled court hearing was postponed because the TP and child could not be located. In August 2008, the TP and child were located and a hearing was held. In September 2009, the court requested information from the USCA and NCMEC regarding reunification counseling, which was provided. The court denied the return in December 2011, and the LBP is deciding whether or not to appeal the ruling. The USCA and the U.S. mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on court proceedings.
MEXICO	9-2008	6-2009	No	In October 2010, the MCA requested AFI's assistance in locating the children. AFI has spoken with the LBP but has not yet been able to locate the children. The USCA 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 LOCATED	SUMMARY OF CASE
MEXICO	3-2007	1-2008	No	The child was in the custody of a state social services agency when he was abducted by his maternal grandmother. At that time, the child's mother was in jail. In March 2009, the court scheduled a hearing on the Convention return application, but 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 MCA and the court requested the assistance of Mexican federal law enforcement, AFI, in locating the child. The child has not been located and is presumed to be living with his biological mother in Mexico. 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	10-2007	3-2008	No	The California Attorney General's Office filed the Convention return application with the MCA on behalf of the LBP. The court requested the assistance of Interpol to locate the child in April 2008. The TP also filed an <i>amparo</i> in April 2008, which delayed the case. In November 2008, the TP was located and the court ordered a home study, however, the TP disappeared once again. In April 2011, the TP was located but filed a new <i>amparo</i> . In August 2011, an <i>amparo</i> was filed on behalf of the abducted child, however, this was denied. The USCA and the U.S. mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on efforts to locate the child.
MEXICO	4-2003	6-2008	Yes	In October 2009, the court ordered the return of the child under the Convention, but the child was not present at the hearing. AFI has been unable to locate the child. The TP filed an <i>amparo</i> in February 2010, but no decision on the <i>amparo</i> has been reached. The USCA and the U.S. mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on court proceedings and efforts to locate the child.
MEXICO	3-2007	8-2009	No	In March 2010, the MCA confirmed that the case has been referred to Interpol for assistance in searching for the child. The child has not been located. 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 LOCATED	SUMMARY OF CASE
MEXICO	6-2007	10-2007	No	The court scheduled a hearing on the Convention application in November 2008, but when the court notified the TP, he disappeared with the child. In November 2009, the MCA requested AFI's assistance in finding the TP and the child. Court proceedings meanwhile 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	7-2008	9-2008	No	The MCA forwarded the Convention application to the court, but the children have not been located. In April 2010, the MCA referred the case to AFI for assistance in finding the children. 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 children.
MEXICO	2-2005	3-2006	Yes	The California Attorney General's Office filed the Convention return application for two siblings with the MCA on behalf of a social services agency. The minors were ordered returned in April 2007, but the TP has filed a succession of court <i>amparos</i> that have delayed a resolution. The most recent <i>amparo</i> remains pending. One child has since turned 16, and would no longer be eligible for return under the Convention. The USCA and the U.S. mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on court proceedings.
MEXICO	2-2008	6-2008	No	In November 2008, the MCA sent the case to AFI for assistance in locating the children, but the whereabouts of the children remain unknown. The case was not forwarded to a court as jurisdiction cannot be determined. NCMEC created age-progression photos of the minors to help with the search. The USCA and the U.S. mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on efforts to locate the children.
MEXICO	8-2007	8-2008	No	The MCA forwarded the case to the court in September 2010. The court requested the AFI's assistance in locating the child. 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.

COUNTRY	ABDUCTED/ RETAINED	APPLICATION FILED	CHILD LOCATED	SUMMARY OF CASE
MEXICO	11-2008	12-2009	Yes	The California Attorney General's Office filed the Convention return application with the MCA on behalf of the LBP. In January 2011, the court ordered the TP to turn over the child but the TP filed an <i>amparo</i> , which stayed the return order. The <i>amparo</i> remains pending. The USCA and the U.S. mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on court proceedings.
MEXICO	5-2007	7-2007	No	In August 2008, a court hearing was scheduled but the TP did not appear. The TP then filed an <i>amparo</i> seeking to block the return application. This <i>amparo</i> has not been resolved. The USCA and the U.S. mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on court proceedings and efforts to locate the child.
MEXICO	12-2007	10-2008	No	The California Attorney General's Office filed the Convention return application with the MCA on behalf of the LBP. The MCA requested the assistance of AFI in locating the child. In August 2011, the LBP provided new address information, which the USCA forwarded to 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	9-2008	12-2008	No	The California Attorney General's Office filed the Convention return application with the MCA on behalf of the LBP. The court handling the case did not provide updates for more than a year. In December 2009, after further inquiries from the MCA, the court reported that the TP had appeared at an earlier court hearing but refused to return the child voluntarily. The court took no further action and has not held any hearings since. The TP subsequently disappeared with the child and they have not been located. The USCA and the U.S. mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on court proceedings and efforts to locate the child.
MEXICO	5-2005	5-2009	Yes	In August 2010, the court held a hearing on the Convention return application, but the TP failed to appear. The court has not been able to take the child into custody, and a new hearing date has not been set. The MCA has urged the court to set a hearing date and to proceed with the case. The USCA and the U.S. mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on court proceedings.

COUNTRY	ABDUCTED/ RETAINED	APPLICATION FILED	CHILD LOCATED	SUMMARY OF CASE
MEXICO	6-2009	10-2009	Yes	The TP attempted to file for custody in Mexico but in December 2009, the MCA advised the custody court to suspend proceedings due to the pending Convention application. The first court hearing on the Convention application was held in January 2010 but the TP then filed a succession of <i>amparos</i> , which were resolved in September 2011. In October 2011, the court ordered the child's return under the Convention. The TP appealed the return decision, and there has not been a ruling on the appeal. The USCA and the U.S. mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on court proceedings.
MEXICO	5-2008	1-2009	Yes	In May 2010, the children were located in a city in central Mexico, and the Convention case was transferred to a court in that jurisdiction. The court scheduled a hearing for April 2011; however, the LBP's lawyer failed to attend. The LBP is working with his lawyer to request a new hearing. The USCA and the U.S. mission in Mexico have regularly requested updates from the MCA on court proceedings.
MEXICO	9-2003	4-2004	No	The California Attorney General's Office filed the Convention return application with the MCA on behalf of a social services agency. In February 2005, the MCA forwarded the application to the court but the child was not located. The MCA then requested Interpol's assistance. In April 2011, the court has asked AFI to help with the search for the child. 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.
NORWAY	12-2009	6-2010	Yes	The LBP filed an application for the child's return directly with the NCA in May 2010. The NCA forwarded the application to the Nordhordland District Court on June 7, 2010. A few months later, the Norwegian court requested an order from the U.S. courts confirming the LBP's custodial rights. The U.S. court hearing is scheduled in June 2012. The USCA continues to monitor the case and seek updates from the NCA and will forward the court's ruling on custodial rights to the NCA.

COUNTRY	ABDUCTED/ RETAINED	APPLICATION FILED	CHILD LOCATED	SUMMARY OF CASE
PANAMA	6-2009	6-2010	Yes	In November 2010, the LBP attended the Convention hearing and traveled to Panama again in December 2010, to participate in psychological evaluations. The LBP informed the USCA that the judge made child support demands and ordered a complete home study. In April 2011, the USCA forwarded the PCA a requested home study report. In June 2011, the PCA stated that the judge awaits a psychological evaluation of the TP and will then reach a decision. The USCA and the U.S. Embassy Panama City have regularly requested updates from the PCA on the court proceedings.
PANAMA	12-2008	2-2010	Yes	In September 2010, the LBP attended the first Convention hearing. The judge ordered a psychological evaluation of the LBP. On September 23, 2010, the judge requested a socioeconomic report of the LBP's home and personal circumstances. In January 2011, the USCA forwarded the PCA an extensive home study report. In March 2011, the judge denied the return of the children. The LBP appealed the decision on March 28, 2011. The USCA and the U.S. Embassy Panama City have regularly requested updates from the PCA on the court proceedings.
PERU	4-2008	11-2008	Yes	In May 2009, the judge ordered the return of the child to the United States. The TP appealed the decision. In January 2011, the appeals court upheld the ruling for return and the TP appealed to the Supreme Court, which is reviewing the case. The USCA and the U.S. Embassy Lima have regularly requested updates from the PCA on the court proceedings.
PERU	8-2008	1-2009	Yes	In December 2009, the court denied return. The LBP appealed. In May 2010, the judge ordered the TP and child undergo psychological evaluations. In July 2010, on appeal, the Superior Court vacated the lower court's denial, but did not order the return. After several months of deliberation, the PCA declined to represent the LBP and pledged to provide representation through the Ministry of Justice. Because the LBP procured a private attorney during the delay, the Ministry of Justice determined that he was able to furnish his own attorney. In August 2011, the case was returned to the Family Court of Lima for a decision. The USCA and the U.S. Embassy Lima have regularly requested updates from the PCA on the court proceedings.

COUNTRY	ABDUCTED/ RETAINED	APPLICATION FILED	CHILD LOCATED	SUMMARY OF CASE
PERU	7-2009	4-2010	Yes	A Convention hearing scheduled for September 2010 was postponed until June 2011, when the court ordered the child's return. The TP appealed to the Superior Court, which is still reviewing the case. The USCA and U.S. Embassy Lima have regularly requested updates from the PCA on the court proceedings.
PERU	2-2009	4-2009	Yes	Following Convention hearings in March and July 2010, the court ordered the child's return in October 2010. The TP absconded with the child. The LBP worked with Interpol and local law enforcement to locate the child. While in hiding with the child, the TP filed an appeal, then returned with the child to their former residence. In March 2011, the court denied the appeal. The TP filed a second appeal with the Superior Court. The Superior Court has not yet ruled on the case. The USCA and U.S. Embassy Lima have regularly requested updates from the PCA on the court proceedings.
ROMANIA	8-2008	10-2008	Yes	Proceedings on the Convention application stalled when the LBP attempted to recover the child extra-judicially. In August 2009, the court denied the child's return on the basis of Article 13(b) of the Convention. In March 2010, the appeals court ordered the child returned; however, the return order has not been enforced. The USCA and the U.S. mission in Romania have regularly requested updates from the RCA on enforcement of the Hague return order.
ST. KITTS AND NEVIS	11-2006	2-2010	Yes	The child was located in St. Kitts and Nevis in February 2010. The USCA forwarded an application for the return to the SKCA, which referred the case to the Crown Counsel for a legal opinion. The Crown Counsel stated that the Convention does not have force of law in St. Kitts because implementing legislation was never passed to incorporate the Convention into local laws. During a meeting with a U.S. Embassy official, an SKCA representative stated that St. Kitts law would prohibit the return of any child who was a citizen of St. Kitts and Nevis. The USCA and U.S Embassy Barbados have regularly requested updates from the SKCA on the status of St. Kitts and Nevi's implementation of legislation into local laws.

COUNTRY	ABDUCTED/ RETAINED	APPLICATION FILED	CHILD LOCATED	SUMMARY OF CASE
TURKEY	2-2007	8-2007	Yes	In April 2008, the family court denied return. The LBP appealed the decision and in October 2008, the Court of Cassation reversed the lower court's decision and sent the case back to the family court. In May 2009, the family court ordered the child's return. The TP appealed the decision to the Court of Cassation, and in December 2011, the Court of Cassation dismissed the TP's appeal. The 2009 family court decision stands as the final return order, but the return has not been enforced. The USCA and the U.S. mission in Turkey have regularly requested updates from the TCA.
URUGUAY	2-2010	5-2010	Yes	In May 2010, the first scheduled court hearing was postponed as the TP and child could not be located. In September 2010, the TP and child were located and a hearing was held. In October 2010, the court requested information from the USCA and the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children regarding reunification counseling, which was provided. The court denied the return in December 2010, and the LBP filed an appeal and was granted the return of the child; however in December 2011, the TP filed an appeal against the return order before the Supreme Court. The USCA and U.S. Embassy Montevideo have regularly requested updates from the UCA on court proceedings.