PODER JUDICIAL DE LA FEDERACI

Sixteenth District Court in the State of Baja California, seated in Tijuana.

Amparo Proceeding [REDACTED]

JUDGMENT

HAVING REVIEWED, for decision, the record of amparo proceeding [REDACTED]; and,

FINDINGS

FIRST. Filing and contents of the petition for amparo.

By written submission filed on September 3, 2025, through the judicial mailbox of the Common Correspondence Office of the District Courts in the State of Baja California, [REDACTED], through defense counsel, sought the amparo and protection of the Federal Judiciary against the following authorities and acts:

"III. RESPONSIBLE AUTHORITIES:
[…]
AGENT OF THE FEDERAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR'S OFFICE ASSIGNED TO CELL II-4.
IV. CHALLENGED ACT:
a) The refusal by the Federal Public Prosecutor regarding my request for the release of my property, filed on August 28, 2025, in connection with the real property owned by me located at [REDACTED], pursuant to the order issued on August 28, 2025, within criminal case [REDACTED], in which I appeared as the accused."

SECOND. Procedure.

The most relevant procedural background of this indirect amparo proceeding is as follows:

On September 3, 2025, the matter was physically assigned to this court.

By order dated September 4, 2025, the amparo proceeding was registered under number [REDACTED] and admitted for processing.

Thereafter, once the proceeding had been conducted in accordance with law, the constitutional hearing was held as reflected in the minutes that precede this judgment; and,

CONSIDERATIONS

FIRST. Jurisdiction.

This Court has jurisdiction to decide this proceeding pursuant to Articles 103 and 107 of the Political Constitution of the United Mexican States; Chapter Two of the Organic Law of the Federal Judiciary, under Article 46 of that statute; Articles 33, section IV, 35, 37 and 107 of the Amparo Law; and General Agreements 3/2013 and 107/2022 of the Plenary Council of the Federal Judiciary, because the subject matter challenged is alleged to have material consequences within the territorial jurisdiction in which this Court exercises authority.

SECOND. Identification of the challenged acts.

Before addressing whether the challenged acts are established, it is necessary to determine precisely what those acts are, in accordance with Article 74, section I, of the Amparo Law. For that purpose, the petition must be analyzed as a whole, as held by the Plenary Supreme Court of Justice of the Nation in the following thesis:

Digital Record: 181810
Court: Plenary
Ninth Judicial Era
Subject Matter: Common
Thesis: P. VI/2004
Source: Federal Judicial Weekly and its Gazette, Volume XIX, April 2004, page 255
Type: Isolated Thesis

CHALLENGED ACTS. RULES FOR THEIR CLEAR AND PRECISE IDENTIFICATION IN AN AMPARO JUDGMENT. Article 77, section I, of the Amparo Law provides that judgments issued in constitutional proceedings must contain a clear and precise identification of the challenged acts…

…as well as an assessment of the evidence leading to a determination as to whether such acts have or have not been established. The Supreme Court of Justice of the Nation has also held that, in order to achieve that identification, the petition must be read in its entirety without being controlled by the labels used by the petitioner as to the constitutionality or unconstitutionality of the acts. In some cases, however, that reading may be insufficient, and the amparo judge must also harmonize the information contained in the initial petition with the remainder of the record, in a manner consistent with all of its elements and with the full body of information in the proceeding, giving preference to the author's intended meaning and disregarding statements that create obscurity or confusion. In other words, when identifying the challenged acts, the amparo judge must attend to what the petitioner intended to say, and not merely to what the petitioner appeared to say, because only in that manner can congruence be achieved between the relief requested and the decision rendered."

Accordingly, from the analysis of the petition for amparo and the documents contained in the record, it is apparent that the petitioner designated the following responsible authority and challenged act:

Responsible Authority:

Agent of the Federal Public Prosecutor's Office assigned to Cell [REDACTED], resident in this locality.

Challenged Act:

The order dated August 28, 2025, issued in investigation file [REDACTED], by which the return of the real property seized in that investigation was denied.

THIRD. Certainty of the challenged act.

The challenged act attributed to the responsible authority is established, because the authority expressly acknowledged it in its justified report. That acknowledgment is treated as an express admission with full evidentiary value for purposes of establishing the act at issue, pursuant to Articles 199 and 200 of the Federal Code of Civil Procedure, which applies supplementally to the amparo proceeding by express operation of Article 2 of the Amparo Law.

By identity of reasoning, the following jurisprudence of the Plenary Supreme Court of Justice of the Nation is applicable:

Judicial Era: Fifth Era
Digital Record: 917812
Court: Plenary
Type of Thesis: Jurisprudence
Source: Appendix 2000
Volume VI, Supreme Court Jurisprudence
Subject Matter: Common
Thesis: 278
Page: 231

AFFIRMATIVE JUSTIFIED REPORT. If, in its justified report, the responsible authority admits that the challenged act is true, that act must be deemed fully established, and the court must proceed to examine its constitutionality or unconstitutionality.

In addition, the responsible authority's statements are corroborated by the certified copy of the records comprising investigation file number [REDACTED], which the authority submitted and which are before this Court for decision. Those public documents have full evidentiary value under Articles 129, 197 and 202 of the Federal Code of Civil Procedure, which applies supplementally to the Amparo Law by express operation of Article 2 thereof.

Judicial Era: Fifth Era
Digital Record: 394182
Court: Plenary
Type of Thesis: Jurisprudence
Source: Appendix of 1995
Volume VI, Supreme Court Section
Subject Matter: Common
Thesis: 226
Page: 153

PUBLIC DOCUMENTS, CONCEPT AND EVIDENTIARY VALUE. Testimonies and certifications issued by public officials in the exercise of their duties have that character and, consequently, constitute full proof.

FOURTH. Examination of the procedural availability of amparo relief.

Under Article 62 of the Amparo Law, the examination of grounds of inadmissibility is a matter of public order and must be given priority, whether such grounds are raised by the parties or are noticed sua sponte. The following should nevertheless be stated:

Standing.

The petitioner has standing to bring this amparo proceeding through defense counsel, for the reasons and legal grounds set forth in the order admitting this federal constitutional controversy.

Timeliness.

The petition for amparo was filed in a timely manner, as shown by the record.

Accordingly, the Court proceeds to analyze the grounds of constitutional violation asserted by the petitioner, which are those contained in the petition for amparo.

FIFTH. Grounds of constitutional violation.

In accordance with the principle of procedural economy, the grounds of constitutional violation asserted by the petitioner are not transcribed because no legal rule requires their reproduction; moreover, each of the petitioner’s objections will be addressed in full so that the matter actually presented may be resolved.

This approach is supported by the jurisprudence issued by the Second Chamber of the Supreme Court of Justice of the Nation, which provides:

[redacted]

Digital Record: 164618
Court: Second Chamber
Ninth Judicial Era
Subject Matter: Common
Thesis: 2a./J. 58/2010
Source: Federal Judicial Weekly and its Gazette, Volume XXXI, May 2010, page 830
Type: Jurisprudence

GROUNDS OF CONSTITUTIONAL VIOLATION OR ASSIGNMENTS OF ERROR. THEIR TRANSCRIPTION IS UNNECESSARY TO COMPLY WITH THE PRINCIPLES OF CONGRUENCE AND EXHAUSTIVENESS IN AMPARO JUDGMENTS. Nothing in Chapter X, "Judgments," of Title One, "Amparo in General," of the Amparo Law imposes an obligation on the court to transcribe the grounds of constitutional violation or, where appropriate, the assignments of error in order to satisfy the principles of congruence and exhaustiveness. Those principles are satisfied when the issues actually in dispute, arising from the amparo petition or the brief setting forth errors, are identified, analyzed, and answered in a manner connected with and responsive to the claims of legality or unconstitutionality actually raised, without introducing matters outside the controversy. There is no prohibition against transcription, however, and the court may decide prudently whether it is appropriate in light of the particular circumstances of the case, provided that the issues actually raised are analyzed in order to satisfy the principles of exhaustiveness and congruence.

SIXTH. Analysis and decision.

The grounds of constitutional violation asserted by the petitioner are well-founded, even though it is necessary to supplement any deficiency in the claim pursuant to Article 79, section III, subsection (a), of the Amparo Law.

The petitioner essentially contends that the challenged act violates the fundamental rights recognized in Articles 14 and 16 of the Political Constitution of the United Mexican States because the responsible authority's refusal to lift the seizure of the real property whose return was requested was not duly supported by adequate legal grounds and reasoning.

For purposes of analyzing the matter, it is appropriate to set forth the background that gave rise to the challenged act:

1. On March 29, 2022,

investigation file [REDACTED] was opened for the offense established in Article 159, section I, of the Migration Law, involving the smuggling of persons for profit by taking one or more persons into another country without the required documentation.

2. On April 27, 2022,

the District Judge Specialized in the Accusatory Criminal Justice System at the Federal Criminal Justice Center in the State of Baja California, seated in Tijuana, acting as Control Judge, authorized a search warrant for the premises located on Venado Street, without a visible street number, adjoining the property numbered three thousand two hundred twenty-one to the north, with its facade facing east, in the neighborhood [REDACTED], Baja California. The search was requested by the Federal Public Prosecutor within investigation file [REDACTED], concerning facts allegedly constituting violations of the Federal Firearms and Explosives Law and the Migration Law.

3. By prosecutorial order dated April 29, 2022,

after arresting officers placed [REDACTED] and another person at the disposal of the Federal Public Prosecutor in connection with the facts constituting the offenses…

[redacted]

…provided for and punishable under the Migration Law and the Federal Firearms and Explosives Law, the real property was ordered seized because it was considered an object related to the offense and in order to prevent it from being altered, concealed or destroyed in a manner that could hinder the investigation, given its connection with the facts under investigation.

4. By order dated April 24, 2025,

the return of the affected real property was denied on the ground that it remained related to the facts giving rise to the investigation file, that the objects of the offense had been seized on those premises, and that the real property itself was considered subject matter of the offense; therefore, its final disposition could not be determined until the matter was definitively resolved.

5. On November 28, 2022,

the Agent of the Federal Public Prosecutor's Office in charge of Cell [REDACTED], seated in this city, filed an accusation against the petitioner and another person and requested forfeiture of the seized assets, without mentioning the affected real property.

6. In an order dated August 28, 2025,

in response to the request submitted by the petitioner, the following was ordered:

"NOTICE OF ORDER REGARDING PETITION TO PRIVATE DEFENSE COUNSEL
Investigation Cell: [REDACTED]
Investigation File: [REDACTED]

In the City of Tijuana, Baja California, at 11:35 a.m. on August 28, 2025, the undersigned attorney [REDACTED], Agent of the Federal Public Prosecutor's Office, Head of Cell [REDACTED], Baja California, seated in Tijuana, having reviewed the written submission received on August 25, 2025 at 12:40 p.m. at the offices of the Office of the Attorney General of the Republic in Tijuana, Baja California, signed by attorney Germán Jalil Terriquez, who states that he is Private Defense Counsel for [REDACTED] within investigation file [REDACTED]…"

[redacted]

"…through which he reiterates the request previously raised on April 16, 2025 before the undersigned, which was ruled upon and duly notified to private defense counsel on April 20, 2025, concerning the manifestly inadmissible request to 'lift the seizure of the real property' before this Office of the Federal Public Prosecutor.

CONSIDERING

First. Article 21 of the Political Constitution of the United Mexican States establishes that the investigation of crimes is the responsibility of the Public Prosecutor and the police, which shall act under the authority and direction of the prosecutor in carrying out that function. Article 127 of the National Code of Criminal Procedure provides that the Public Prosecutor is responsible for conducting the investigation, coordinating the police and expert services during the investigation, deciding on the exercise of criminal prosecution in the manner provided by law, and, where appropriate, ordering the pertinent and useful investigative steps necessary to establish whether an offense exists and the responsibility of the person who committed or participated in it. Article 129 of the same Code further provides that the investigation must be objective and address both incriminating and exculpatory evidence, and must be conducted with due diligence to guarantee respect for the rights of the parties and due process. The investigation must be carried out promptly, efficiently, exhaustively, professionally and impartially, free of stereotypes and discrimination, and must explore all possible lines of investigation that may obtain information necessary to clarify the criminal act and identify the person who committed or participated in it. Also applicable are the principles of adversarial process, equality before the law and equality of the parties, from which follows the right of the parties to know, challenge and confront the evidence, to receive equal treatment and equal opportunities to support the prosecution or defense, and to fully and unrestrictedly exercise the rights recognized by the Constitution, treaties and applicable laws. Among the powers and duties of the defense is the right to gather and offer evidence necessary for the defense. Although Article 129 allows the accused and defense counsel to request that the Public Prosecutor perform investigative acts they consider pertinent and useful, that provision also authorizes the Public Prosecutor to determine which requested measures are conducive to the investigation.

Therefore, based on Articles 21 and 102, Section A, of the Political Constitution of the United Mexican States; Articles 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 40, sections I, II and IV, of the Organic Law of the Office of the Attorney General of the Republic;…"

[redacted]

"…Articles 1, 2, 4, 8, 10, 11, 113, 117 section VI, 129, 131, 213, 215 and 216 of the National Code of Criminal Procedure, it is hereby:

ORDERED

First. With respect to the request contained in the above-referenced submission, there are no grounds to grant the relief requested. Since the first date on which the defense requested that the seizure be lifted—April 16, 2025—and again when the request was reiterated on August 25, 2025, technical defense counsel has confused the prosecutorial seizure arising from the commission of an offense, in which the real property to be seized constitutes an object or proceeds of the offense, as in the present case, with the legal concept of forfeiture, which as of this date has not been ordered by the competent judicial authority.

This is consistent with Article 229 of the National Code of Criminal Procedure, which provides:

Article 229. Seizure of property, instruments, objects or proceeds of the offense. The instruments, objects or proceeds of the offense, as well as property bearing traces of or potentially related to the offense, provided they are directly connected to the place of the events or discovery, shall be seized during the investigation so that they are not altered, destroyed or caused to disappear. Specific controls shall be established for their safekeeping, taking into account at a minimum the nature of the property and the risks associated with its preservation.

It is also relevant to cite again the statutory requirements contained in Articles 230 and 231 of the same National Code for carrying out a prosecutorial seizure, because, following the unsuccessful request by defense counsel, at the next hearing before the Control Judge defense counsel requested an order lifting the seizure. That request was found inadmissible because the judge lacked authority to take that action, since the legal figure at issue is the prosecutorial seizure of real property considered proceeds of criminal conduct and, given the current procedural posture—the intermediate stage, without a final conviction or acquittal—the authority to decide that issue belongs exclusively to the Public Prosecutor, as provided in Article 245 of the National Code of Criminal Procedure:

Article 245. Grounds for return of seized property. Seized property shall be returned in the following cases:
1. When the Public Prosecutor decides not to exercise criminal prosecution, applies a discretionary prosecution criterion, orders a provisional closure or temporary archive, refrains from filing an accusation, or lifts the seizure in accordance with applicable law.

These arguments, inapplicable circumstances and nonexistent hypotheses have already been raised by the requesting defense counsel both…"

[redacted]

"1) In the written request dated April 16, 2025, which was denied and duly notified.
2) At the hearing held on July 1, 2025, where the same relief was denied by the Control Judge.
3) In the renewed written request filed on August 25, 2025.

Accordingly, because the defense request again concerns the same legally ineffective and inadmissible proposition, the petition of private defense counsel is DENIED, pursuant to Articles 229, 230, 231, 237, 245, 246 and 247 of the National Code of Criminal Procedure, because the seizure of the affected real property constitutes proceeds of the offense under investigation and is directly related to the facts, since it also derives from a search warrant issued by a competent Federal Judge based on the probable commission of criminal conduct; moreover, as of this date and at the current procedural stage, there has been no final judicial determination on that issue.

Second. Notify Private Defense Counsel, attorney Germán Jalil Terriquez Córdova, of this order through the notification methods provided…"

That determination constitutes the challenged act.

From the challenged determination, it is apparent that the responsible authority violated, to the petitioner's detriment, the fundamental rights of legality and legal certainty recognized in Articles 14 and 16 of the Political Constitution of the United Mexican States because the determination lacked adequate legal foundation and reasoning.

It is therefore appropriate to consider the relevant portions of Articles 14 and 16 of the Constitution:

"Article 14. No law shall be given retroactive effect to the detriment of any person. No person may be deprived of life, liberty, property, possessions or rights except through proceedings before previously established courts, in which the essential procedural formalities are observed and in accordance with laws enacted prior to the event.

Article 16. No person may be disturbed in his or her person, family, home, papers or possessions except pursuant to a written order issued by a competent authority stating the legal grounds and reasons for the proceeding…"

Those constitutional provisions recognize the human right of legality, under which every act of governmental authority that interferes with an individual must be contained in a written order issued by a competent authority and must state the legal grounds and reasons supporting the proceeding.

The requirement of legal foundation consists of the precise citation of the legal provisions applicable to the particular case, while the requirement of reasoning entails a statement of the special circumstances, particular reasons or immediate causes that led the authority to issue the act, together with an adequate relationship between those reasons and the legal provisions invoked.

Accordingly, a lack of legal foundation exists when the authority fails to cite the legal rules supporting its action, while a lack of reasoning exists when the authority fails to state the reasons justifying issuance of the act. Improper legal foundation or reasoning exists when legal provisions are cited or arguments are stated, but they are not applicable to the specific case or bear no logical relationship to the facts the authority seeks to justify.

These principles are supported, as relevant here, by the thesis of the Second Chamber of the Supreme Court of Justice of the Nation, which states:

Digital Record: 238369
Court: Second Chamber
Seventh Judicial Era
Subject Matter: Common, Administrative
Source: Federal Judicial Weekly, Volume 80, Third Part, page 36
Type: Isolated Thesis

LEGAL FOUNDATION AND REASONING OF ORDERS OF AUTHORITY. ARTICLE 16…

…OF THE CONSTITUTION. To provide a legal foundation means to state the legal or statutory basis for the challenged act; consequently, a challenged resolution is not properly founded if it contains no expression of any legal or statutory authority. To provide reasons means to identify the factual or legal causes that gave rise to the challenged act. It is not sufficient for the authority to rely on a general and abstract expression such as "for reasons of public interest," because such wording does not identify the material or factual causes that actually gave rise to the challenged act.

With the foregoing clarified, it should be noted that the seizure of property within a criminal investigation is a provisional or precautionary measure whose purpose is to preserve the instruments, objects or proceeds of an offense, as well as any property related to the investigated facts, so as to prevent alteration, destruction or disappearance during the investigation, pursuant to Article 21 of the Political Constitution of the United Mexican States and Articles 127 and 229 of the National Code of Criminal Procedure.

By its very nature, however, such a measure does not constitute a final deprivation of the seized property. It is instead a temporary determination whose continued effect must be duly justified by the prosecutorial authority in light of the particular circumstances of the case.

1 Article 21. The investigation of crimes is the responsibility of the Public Prosecutor and the police, which shall act under the authority and direction of the prosecutor in carrying out that function.

2 Article 127. Authority of the Public Prosecutor. The Public Prosecutor is responsible for conducting the investigation, coordinating the police and expert services, deciding on the exercise of criminal prosecution, and ordering pertinent and useful investigative steps.

3 Article 229. Seizure of property, instruments, objects or proceeds of the offense. The instruments, objects or proceeds of the offense and related property shall be seized during the investigation so they are not altered, destroyed or caused to disappear; specific safeguards shall be established in view of the nature and preservation of the property.

[redacted]

In the matter under review, the challenged determination shows that the responsible authority merely stated, in general terms, that the real property constitutes proceeds of the offense, that it is related to the facts under investigation, and that its seizure derives from a search warrant previously authorized by a judicial authority.

Nevertheless, the prosecutorial authority did not identify which investigative steps remained pending with respect to the seized real property, nor did it explain how continuation of the measure was necessary to clarify the facts or to accomplish the purposes of the criminal investigation.

That omission is particularly significant because, on November 28, 2022, the Public Prosecutor filed an accusation in the corresponding criminal case, which means that the investigation stage had concluded. The responsible authority was therefore required to provide a concrete justification for the continued seizure of the real property.

In addition, the responsible authority did not indicate whether any investigative act concerning the real property remained pending, nor did it explain how any such act affected the decision not to return the property; it merely stated that the investigation was at the intermediate stage.

Consequently, the omissions identified above placed the petitioner in a state of defenselessness and generated legal uncertainty regarding the disposition of the seized real property, because the responsible authority failed to specify the reasons why the measure remained in effect or when its continued propriety could be reviewed.

The foregoing is supported by jurisprudence XVII.1o.P.A. J/22, issued by the First Collegiate Court in Criminal and Administrative Matters of the Seventeenth Circuit, which provides:

Digital Record: 2019849
Court: Collegiate Circuit Courts
Tenth Judicial Era
Subject Matter: Constitutional, Criminal
Thesis: XVII.1o.P.A. J/22 (10a.)
Source: Gazette of the Federal Judicial Weekly, Book 66, May 2019, Volume III, page 2203
Type: Jurisprudence

SEIZURE OF REAL PROPERTY BY THE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR. IF IT IS ORDERED FOR AN INDEFINITE PERIOD OR ITS DURATION IS EXCESSIVELY PROLONGED, IT VIOLATES THE FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS OF LEGALITY AND LEGAL CERTAINTY. The seizure of real property by the Public Prosecutor is a provisional or temporary measure whose purposes include clarifying the facts under investigation, guaranteeing reparation of harm, and preventing injury to third parties. The mere passage of time does not promote clarification of the facts; on the contrary, it makes the preservation of traces more difficult. Consequently, if the precautionary measure is ordered for an indefinite period or its duration is excessively prolonged—for one or more years—it becomes contrary to its provisional or temporary nature and produces effects contrary to those intended. In other words, rather than safeguarding the assets of the persons subject to the proceedings, it adversely affects them and, in turn, violates their fundamental rights of legality and legal certainty.

Decision.

Under these circumstances, the proper disposition is to GRANT THE AMPARO AND THE PROTECTION OF THE FEDERAL JUDICIARY, for the effects that will be specified in the seventh consideration of this judgment.

Because amparo relief has been granted on the terms stated above, it is unnecessary to address the remaining grounds of disagreement asserted in the amparo petition or the evidence offered, because even if any of them were well-founded they would not provide the petitioner with any greater benefit than the relief already granted.

[redacted]

Likewise, in the second ground of constitutional violation the petitioner raises arguments concerning the seizure of the real property. Those arguments are ineffective because they do not bear a direct relationship to the challenged acts or to the subject matter of the controversy as framed in this proceeding; therefore, their examination could not alter the result of this judgment.

The foregoing is supported by the following jurisprudence of the Third Collegiate Court of the Second Circuit:

Digital Record: 220006
Court: Collegiate Circuit Courts
Eighth Judicial Era
Subject Matter: Common
Thesis: II.3o. J/5
Source: Federal Judicial Weekly, Volume IX, March 1992, page 89
Type: Jurisprudence

GROUNDS OF CONSTITUTIONAL VIOLATION. STUDY OF THE REMAINING GROUNDS IS UNNECESSARY. When one of the grounds of constitutional violation has been found well-founded and sufficient to grant the requested amparo relief, it is unnecessary to analyze the remaining grounds asserted in the petition for amparo.

SEVENTH. Effects of the grant of relief.

Accordingly, pursuant to Article 77, section I, of the Amparo Law, once this judgment becomes final, the responsible authority shall do the following:

[redacted]

1.

Vacate the order dated August 28, 2025, issued in investigation file [REDACTED], by which the petitioner's request to lift the seizure of the real property located at [REDACTED] was denied.

2.

With full decisional authority, issue a new determination in which, if the responsible prosecutorial authority concludes that return of the real property is not appropriate because there remain proceedings or investigative steps to be completed, it must state the legal basis and reasons supporting that determination.

In addition, if any legal act remains pending, the authority must inform the petitioner how that pending act affects or justifies the continued refusal to return the real property.

EIGHTH. Administrative entries.

Make the corresponding entries in the court's docket book and in the Comprehensive Case Tracking System ("SISE"), specifying that the judgment granting relief in this matter was based on formal/procedural defects.

For the foregoing reasons and legal grounds, it is hereby:

ORDERED

FIRST.

The Federal Judiciary GRANTS AMPARO RELIEF AND PROTECTION to [REDACTED] with respect to the acts specified in the second consideration and attributed to the responsible authorities, for the legal grounds, reasons and effects set forth in the third, sixth and seventh sections of this judgment.

SECOND.

Make the corresponding entries in the docket book and in the Comprehensive Case Tracking System ("SISE"), with the understanding that it must be specified that the judgment granting relief in this proceeding was based on matters of form.

PERSONAL SERVICE IS ORDERED.

So resolved and signed by [REDACTED], Sixteenth District Judge in the State of Baja California, seated in Tijuana, as of March 17, 2026, the date on which the duties of this court permitted issuance of the judgment, assisted by [REDACTED], Court Secretary, who authorizes and certifies it.

Tijuana, Baja California, March 17, 2026. The Court Secretary of the Sixteenth District Court in the State of Baja California, seated in Tijuana, CERTIFIES: Pursuant to Articles 113 and 119 of the Federal Law of Transparency and Access to Public Information, in relation to paragraph 56 of the General Agreement of the Plenary Council of the Federal Judiciary establishing provisions on transparency, access to public information, protection of personal data and archives in the public version of the judgment, information classified by law as reserved, confidential or personal data is omitted. I so certify.

Record. On this date, official communication No. 5540 was issued to the corresponding authority, notifying it of the foregoing determination. So noted.