Research Article

Reinforced Motivation in The Face of Media Pressure on Pretrial Detention, Jurisprudential Contrast Between Peru and Ecuador

Rosita del Pilar Fernández Armas[1], Cecilia Vela Rengifo[1], Rubén Santisteban Seclén[2]

[1]Student, Faculty of Law, César Vallejo University, Tarapoto campus, San Martín, Peru.
[2]Doctor of Law, Faculty Member and Researcher, César Vallejo University, Tarapoto campus, Peru.
[1]ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4809-1998 (R. Fernández Armas); https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2053-159X (C. Vela Rengifo)
[2]ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8396-2437 | Institutional email: santistebans8@ucvvirtual.edu.pe

ABSTRACT:

The study aimed to determine how parallel trials influence due process within pretrial detention, based on a contrast between Peruvian and Ecuadorian case law. It was basic research with a qualitative approach and a grounded theory design, whose only technique was documentary analysis, applied through a record sheet to ten rulings, five from Peru and five from Ecuador, interpreted with a hermeneutic method. The findings showed that both systems demand individualized reasoning that does not rest on the gravity or notoriety of the case, and that this demand works as the only verifiable indicator of judicial neutrality against media pressure. It was also observed that Peru corrects afterwards, through habeas corpus, whereas Ecuador intervenes in advance, by requiring prosecutors to justify why alternative measures are insufficient and by preventing pretrial detention from approaching the length of the sentence. It was determined that parallel trials endanger the impartiality of the judge and the presumption of innocence, although neither legal system yet has binding criteria that expressly acknowledge that influence.

Keywords: parallel trials, pretrial detention, presumption of innocence, judicial reasoning, comparative law.

1. Introduction

Parallel trials can be understood as informal prosecution processes that the media and public opinion carry out at the same time as the formal criminal process, with their own version of the facts that anticipates what the court will resolve (Lascurain, 2025). With the expansion of social networks, the phenomenon ceased to depend on large newsrooms, as a viral publication installs a story of guilt in a few hours, and with it judicial independence is eroded in subtle ways, difficult to prove before the courts of review (Castro, 2023).

In the region, the problem has been approached from close angles. In Ecuador, the adverse effect that freedom of information produces on the mediate publicity of the criminal process has been described; in Colombia, constitutional jurisprudence has had to balance the right to inform with the guarantees of the accused, given the risk that coverage will condition the judicial response in cases of high exposure; and in Chile, the extent of the right to be informed about matters of public interest without invading the sphere of the accused has been discussed (San Miguel, 2021; Carvajal, 2021; Droguett & Walker, 2020).

Regarding the most burdensome precautionary measure, Ecuadorian evidence points to the fact that the public exposure of the accused produces an anticipated penalty that operates before the ruling, and that preventive imprisonment ends up functioning as an advance punishment (Martínez, 2024). This reading is reinforced by studies that warn of coercion by news channels on those who resolve precautionary measures (Intriago et al., 2023) and with the observation that the mediatization of hearings lacks neutrality and constitutes a systemic problem, which requires regulatory reforms and joint training of operators (Cuesta & Vázquez, 2026).

In Peru, the guarantee of non-guilt provided for in numeral II of the Preliminary Title of the 2004 Code of Criminal Procedure is not always respected when the social temperature of the case rises, and media criminalization can make the defendant guilty in the eyes of public opinion before any responsibility is proven (Pezo, 2023). The Supreme Court has recognized that media trials are contrary to the constitutional rule of law, although it has specified that journalistic pressure alone is not enough to prove the violation if it is not demonstrated that it effectively conditioned the judge (Bahamonde, 2022). In the judicial district of San Martín, moreover, a divided perception has been found, as lawyers and communicators consider that the current of opinion influences detention decisions, while the majority of magistrates and prosecutors deny it (Pinchi, 2024).

Despite this panorama, the way in which parallel trials affect the guarantees of the accused within pretrial detention remains an open question, and the Ecuadorian studies reviewed describe the problem without contrasting the

jurisdictional remedies of both countries. The inquiry is also linked to targets 16.3 and 16.6 of Sustainable Development Goal 16, aimed at the primacy of the law and responsible institutions (United Nations, 2015). Consequently, the objective of the article was to determine, through documentary analysis of ten Peruvian and Ecuadorian resolutions, the influence of parallel trials on due process within pretrial detention, in the light of comparative law.

The relevance of the study is theoretical, practical and social. In theory, it organizes a dispersed jurisprudence around the same question and contrasts it with three doctrinal constructions. In practice, it offers judges, prosecutors and defenders an indicator observable in the text of the resolutions, which makes it possible to evaluate the neutrality of the judge without entering into his internal forum. In the social sphere, a deprivation of liberty dictated under journalistic pressure marks the life of the accused and his family and weakens public confidence in criminal justice.

The theoretical framework was based on three constructions. The first is penal guarantees, which conceives the law as a system of limits to the punitive power of the State, including the presumption of innocence, regular judgment, and the proportionality of precautions, and which considers the deprivation of liberty prior to conviction an institution in crisis in the face of the principle of jurisdictionality (Ferrajoli, 1995). The second is Alexy's theory of rights, for which guarantees operate as optimization mandates subject to an examination of suitability, necessity, and weighting in the strict sense, so that no restriction of liberty is justified if it does not pass that scrutiny in a rational and objective manner (Alexy, 1993). The third is the thesis of the distortion of pretrial detention, according to which it loses legitimacy when it ceases to ensure the appearance of the accused and the integrity of the process and begins to operate as an anticipated punishment, so that it cannot be used to placate an exalted public opinion (Roxin, 2000).

From this framework, two categories were delimited. The parallel trial was broken down into media trial, social condemnation, and cognitive bias, the latter understood as the distortion of the judge's reasoning by information received outside the process, which usually operates without being noticed. Due process in pretrial detention included proportionality, effective jurisdictional protection, and the presumption of innocence, the latter in its dimension as a rule of treatment, which requires the accused to be considered innocent also in the social and media sphere (Guerrero, 2025). Added to this is impartiality, which is conceived as a structural requirement of a fair process and not as a simple personal virtue of the judge (Gonzales, 2025), and the non-automatic nature of the measure, which must be based on objective assumptions and reasoned motivation (Floriano & Contreras, 2024).

2. Methodology

The research was of a basic type, since it was aimed at expanding the available knowledge about parallel trials and their impact on due process within pretrial detention, without intervening in the reality studied. It adopted a qualitative approach, since it was interested in understanding how media pressure can condition the judicial decision and not count how many times it occurs, and a grounded theory design, which allows the categories and their relationships to emerge from the material itself and not from previous hypotheses, through the constant comparison of data (Campos & Falcón, 2025).

Two categories were worked on, parallel trial, with the subcategories media trial, social condemnation and cognitive bias, and due process in pretrial detention, with the subcategories proportionality, effective jurisdictional protection and presumption of innocence. The unit of analysis was made up of ten resolutions, four from the Constitutional Court and one from the Supreme Court of Peru, and three from the Constitutional Court and two from the National Court of Justice of Ecuador (Table 1). Sources that dealt with media pressure or procedural guarantees with an impact on pretrial detention within the Peruvian system and Ecuadorian jurisprudence were included, and incomplete, illegible texts or texts without legal examination of the presumption of innocence or due process were discarded. The selection was intentional, without any claim to statistical representativeness.

The only technique was documentary analysis, which allows texts with pertinent information to be examined in an orderly manner and to achieve a critical understanding that goes beyond mere formal description (Marín & Ledesma, 2024). The instrument was a documentary analysis sheet, prepared to record in each resolution the presence or absence of the subcategories, the legal criterion on the presumption of innocence and pretrial detention, and the decision taken regarding parallel trials and due process. Three legal specialists, one of them a methodologist, validated the file in terms of clarity, relevance, and coherence with the purpose of the study.

The material was processed using the hermeneutical method, which allows us to go beyond the literal tenor of the decisions to access their meaning in the context in which they operate and link the findings with the normative and

theoretical foundations (Vázquez, 2024). As these are publicly accessible documents, there were no human participants or the need for informed consent, and authorship was respected through the citation and referencing of the sources.

3. Results

The results are presented in the order of the analysis sheet, first by system and then in contrast. Table 1 summarizes the decisive criterion of each of the ten decisions examined.

Table 1. Decisions Analyzed and Decisive Criteria

No.	Country	Resolution	Decisive criterion
1	Peru	Judgment of the Constitutional Court, Exp. No. 04780-2017-PHC/TC and 00502-2018-PHC/TC joined (Humala and Heredia case)	Habeas corpus founded on insufficient motivation of material prerequisites; warns that judges may be influenced by media trials seeking an anticipated sentence.
2	Peru	Judgment of the Constitutional Court, Exp. No. 02534-2019-PHC/TC (Fujimori Higuchi case)	Founded by the absence of reasons regarding the prerequisites; special motivation weighs more in processes of high public connotation; immediate release.
3	Peru	Cassation No. 626-2013, Moquegua, Supreme Court	Binding doctrine that adds proportionality and the duration of the measure to the prerequisites of Article 268 of the CPP.
4	Peru	Judgment of the Constitutional Court, Exp. No. 04818-2017-PHC/TC (Delgado Guzmán case)	Founded; the general reference to the commission of the crime, regardless of its seriousness or notoriety, does not replace individualized motivation.
5	Peru	Judgment of the Constitutional Court, Exp. No. 02926-2019-PHC/TC (Moscol Zapata case)	Founded; the severity of the penalty and conduct alone are not sufficient for the risk of flight; procedural conduct must be assessed as a whole.
6	Ecuador	Judgment No. 8-20-CN/21, CC	The absolute prohibition of substituting the measure (Article 536 of the COIP) is unconstitutional; ultima ratio, exceptionality, necessity and proportionality.
7	Ecuador	Resolution No. 14-2021, CNJ	The prosecutor's office must justify procedural

			risk and the insufficiency of alternatives before requesting it; in minor crimes it can become unlawful.
8	Ecuador	Judgment No. 22-20-CN/24, CC	The time of deprivation cannot coincide with or approach the sentence, because the measure becomes an anticipated penalty.
9	Ecuador	Judgment No. 502-17-EP/22, CC	The lack of impartiality only acquires constitutional relevance in the face of serious violations not corrected by ordinary means, such as recusal.
10	Ecuador	Appeal Judgment No. 09133-2022-00030, CNJ	The severity of the penalty, seen in isolation, does not support the measure; release is ordered for arbitrariness.

Note. Prepared by the authors based on the documentary analysis sheet. TC, Constitutional Court; CC, Constitutional Court; CNJ, National Court of Justice; CPP, Code of Criminal Procedure; COIP, Comprehensive Organic Criminal Code.

In the five Peruvian resolutions, the decision focused on the insufficiency of the motivation and not on the lack of evidence against those under investigation. In the Humala and Heredia and Fujimori Higuchi cases, the Constitutional Court declared habeas corpus founded because the resolutions did not explain how each material prerequisite of the measure was met; in the first, it also warned that judges run the risk of being influenced by media trials that intend the measure to operate as an anticipated sentence, and in the second it stressed that special motivation weighs more when the process enjoys great public connotation. The Delgado Guzmán and Moscol Zapata cases specified that neither the general reference to the commission of the crime nor the severity of the penalty or conduct are sufficient, by themselves, to sustain the measure or the danger of absconding. Cassation No. 626-2013 incorporated the proportionality and duration of the measure as additional prerequisites to those of Article 268 of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

The Ecuadorian resolutions advanced on the very design of the measure. The Constitutional Court declared unconstitutional the absolute prohibition of substituting detention for crimes with a sentence of more than five years and established that it is a last resort, subject to exceptionality, necessity and proportionality (Table 1, resolution 6). In the same vein, the National Court of Justice ordered the prosecutor's office to justify the procedural risk and the insufficiency of less burdensome alternatives before requesting it, and considered that in minor crimes it can become unlawful even in the face of an intense risk (resolution 7). Later, it was established that the time of precautionary deprivation cannot coincide with or approach the duration of the sentence (resolution 8), the standard was set for alleging lack of judicial impartiality (resolution 9), and the release of a defendant was ordered because the severity of the penalty, observed in isolation, did not support the measure (resolution 10).

Read in the light of the subcategories, only one resolution, that of the Humala and Heredia case, expressly alludes to the media trial and the anticipated sentence; in the others, the link with external pressure is noted by way of interpretation, by requiring an individualized motivation that does not rest on gravity or notoriety. Cognitive bias is not mentioned in any of them, but it is seen in the pattern that the decisions correct, that is, resolutions that replace the examination of each prerequisite with general formulas. Proportionality appears expressly in resolutions 2, 3, 6 and 10 and implicitly, through the requirement to individualize each prerequisite, in the others; the presumption of innocence is dealt with directly in resolutions 1 and 8; and effective judicial protection is projected in the impartiality standard of resolution 9.

The contrast between the two systems (Table 2) reveals a difference in the time and object of control. The Peruvian Constitutional Court corrects after the measure has been issued and on its defective application in the specific case, without questioning the design of the institution, while the Ecuadorian courts act on the norm and practice of the prosecutor's office, shifting the burden of justification to the person requesting the deprivation of liberty. None of the ten resolutions establishes a binding criterion that indicates when a parallel trial undermines the presumption of innocence.

Table 2. Contrast Between Peruvian and Ecuadorian Control

Dimension	Peru	Ecuador
Time of control	Subsequent, by means of habeas corpus against the measure already issued	Anticipated, with requirements prior to the application and decision
Object of control	Defective application in the specific case	Design of the norm, deadlines and practice of the prosecutor's office
Burden of justification	Falls to the judge, who must justify each prerequisite	Shifted to the prosecutor's office, which must explain the insufficiency of alternatives
Allusion to external pressure	Express in one resolution and contextual in another	Indirect, by way of impartiality and arbitrariness

Note. Prepared by the authors based on the documentary analysis sheet.

4. Discussion

The results indicate that, in both countries, individualized motivation functions as the only verifiable indicator of judicial neutrality in the face of media pressure. This confirms, from the point of view of jurisprudence, what has been pointed out in the Ecuadorian sphere about the systemic nature of the problem and the need for normative responses, and coincides with the idea that deprivation of liberty should be maintained as a last resort and not become a sentence advanced by scandal (Cuesta & Vázquez, 2026; Martínez, 2024). The difference is one of degree, since those works affirm the influence based on doctrine or norms, while the analysis of resolutions shows how the courts themselves contain it without naming it, demanding reasons that the text of the decision allows to be verified.

Peruvian studies argue that communicational pressure pushes judges to issue the measure in response to popular outcry, that there is a positive association between media pressure and an arrest warrant, and that the measure ends up being applied as a rule and not as an exception (Yto, 2025; Queque, 2024; Apaza, 2022). The present analysis does not confirm this causal relationship, since a resolution revoked for lack of motivation does not prove that the press determined the judge, and that is why the findings are compatible with the caution of the Supreme Court, which requires demonstrating effective conditioning (Bahamonde, 2022). What they do provide is a plausible explanation of the mechanism, the replacement of the examination of each prerequisite with references to seriousness and notoriety, which is precisely what the Constitutional Court corrected. They also qualify the thesis of direct coercion by news channels (Intriago et al., 2023), because what is observable in the texts is the absence of reasons and not the pressure itself.

From the point of view of guarantees, the contrast is revealing. If guarantees are limits to punitive power, a control that only operates later, by way of habeas corpus, leaves the design intact and shifts the burden of litigating his freedom to the accused, while the Ecuadorian model, by eliminating rigid rules, requiring the justification of alternatives from the request, and limiting the time of deprivation, is closer to a guarantee that operates in the norm itself (Ferrajoli, 1995). This difference expands the previous state of knowledge, since the Ecuadorian studies reviewed describe the phenomenon without contrasting its remedies with those of another system.

The proportionality test offers another key to interpretation. Resolutions that rule out the severity of the penalty as an isolated basis for the danger of flight (Table 1, resolutions 5 and 10) apply, in fact, the scrutiny of necessity described by the theory of rights, since a measure sustained only in the outcry or in the alarm does not pass the weighting (Alexy, 1993). This is related to the arbitrariness found in prosecutorial requests in cases of great public exposure and suggests that the Ecuadorian requirement that the prosecutor's office prove the insufficiency of alternatives attacks the problem at its source (Hoyos, 2025).

The Ecuadorian ruling that prevents the time of precautionary deprivation from approaching that of the sentence (Table 1, resolution 8) materializes in the jurisprudence the thesis of denaturalization, according to which the measure becomes a punishment when it deviates from its function of ensuring the process (Roxin, 2000). An equivalent was not found in the Peruvian resolutions analyzed, which suggests a margin of development for national jurisprudence regarding the time limit as a barrier to anticipated punishment.

The problem, moreover, is not exhausted in the judicial sphere. The presence of media criminology and punitive populism in Peruvian legislative production (Mamani et al., 2023) and the divergent perception between litigants and magistrates about the influence of public opinion in San Martín (Pinchi, 2024) indicate that the pressure operates at several levels, so that a subsequent correction, which depends on the reviewing body also managing to evade it, is fragile. Hence, the original contribution of the contrast consists in placing the response closer to normative and procedural prevention than to the late remedy.

Among the limitations, the analysis was limited to ten intentionally chosen resolutions, most of them issued in habeas corpus or constitutionality consultations, that is, in cases where control had already been activated, which prevents generalizing to the ordinary practice of the courts. Subsequent studies could examine the text of arrest warrants issued in cases of high and low journalistic coverage, to directly contrast whether the imbalance of motivation grows with media exposure.

5. Conclusion

It was determined that parallel trials have an impact on due process within pretrial detention by jeopardizing the impartiality of the judge and the presumption of innocence, since they favor the seriousness or notoriety of the case replacing the examination of each prerequisite, and that this incidence, expressly recognized in only one of the ten resolutions analyzed, is contained in both systems through the requirement of individualized reasoning. It was also determined that Peru corrects this influence subsequently, by means of habeas corpus, while Ecuador contains it in advance, by requiring the prosecutor's office to justify the insufficiency of less burdensome alternatives and by preventing the deprivation of liberty from approaching the duration of the sentence, without either of the two systems yet having binding criteria that indicate when a parallel trial undermines the presumption of innocence.

7. Acknowledgements

The authors acknowledge the documentary sources and publicly available planning and jurisprudential materials consulted for this study. No external funding or additional institutional support was reported.

8. Author Declaration

The authors declare that this manuscript is original and has not been published elsewhere. The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

6. References

1. Alexy, R. (1993). Theory of fundamental rights. Center for Constitutional Studies. https://www.pensamientopenal.com.ar/system/files/2014/12/doctrina37294.pdf
2. Apaza Tito, H. L. (2022). Media pressure, parallel trials, and public opinion influence the jurisdictional body, leading to the excess of pretrial detention in the city of Arequipa between 2010 and 2014 [Undergraduate thesis, José Carlos Mariátegui University]. UJCM Institutional Repository. https://repositorio-api.ujcm.edu.pe/server/api/core/bitstreams/69656742-2917-4f0a-b530-c9e7c0916eab/content
3. Bahamonde, R. (2022). Presumption of innocence, prior trials, and parallel trials. Revista Internacional Consinter de Direito, 335–348. https://doi.org/10.19135/revista.consinter.00014.14
4. Campos de Falcón, Y., & Falcón Campos, Y. (2025). Grounded theory: A qualitative research approach for the generation of new theories. Ethos Journal, 16(1), 8–23. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14933559
5. Carvajal, J. (2021). Media and judicial processes: A view from constitutional jurisprudence. Revista Republicana, 31, 145–163. https://doi.org/10.21017/Rev.Repub.2021.v31.a111
6. Castro, J. (2023). Judicial independence, degradation trials, and parallel trials. Cuadernos de Derecho Penal, 24, 149–200. https://revistas.usergioarboleda.edu.co/index.php/cuadernos_de_derecho_penal/article/view/2596
7. Cuesta Reinoso, J. F., & Vázquez-Martínez, D. S. (2026). The influence of the mediatization of criminal trials on judicial impartiality: A study in the Ecuadorian penal system. Pacha. Revista de Estudios Contemporáneos del Sur Global, 7(20), e260490. https://doi.org/10.46652/pacha.v7i20.490

8. Droguett, C., & Walker, N. (2020). The right to be informed about matters of public interest: Defense of parallel trials in Chile. Problems and solutions. Revista Chilena de Derecho, 47(1), 33–56. https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=7461220
9. Ferrajoli, L. (1995). Law and reason: Theory of penal guarantees. Trotta. https://archivos.juridicas.unam.mx/www/bjv/libros/9/4122/9.pdf
10. Floriano Rodríguez, R., & Contreras Horna, R. F. (2024). Analysis of the principle of proportionality when applying pretrial detention in Peru. Revista InveCom, 4(2). https://ve.scielo.org/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S2739-00632024000200145
11. Gonzales Mantilla, G. (2025). The impartiality of the judge as a challenge or the limits of an illusion. Anuario Iberoamericano de Justicia Constitucional, 29(1), 79–113. https://doi.org/10.18042/cepc/aijc.29.03
12. Guerrero Palomares, S. (2025). The right to the presumption of innocence as a rule of treatment ad intra or intra processum. Revista de Estudios Europeos, 85, 71–118. https://dialnet.unirioja.es/descarga/articulo/9935760.pdf
13. Hoyos-Benavides, A. J. (2025). Pretrial detention and proportionality: Arbitrariness in prosecutorial requirements from the Keiko Fujimori case in Peru. Revista CES Derecho, 16(2), 131–145. https://doi.org/10.21615/cesder.7905
14. Intriago-Solorzano, D. G., Navia-Cedeño, A. K., Linzán-Saltos, M. F., & Gutiérrez-Izquierdo, M. A. (2023). Imposition of pretrial detention due to pressure from the media. Journal Scientific MQR Investigar, 7(4), 1512–1529. https://doi.org/10.56048/MQR20225.7.4.2023.1512-1529
15. Lascurain, J. A. (2025). Parallel trials. Almacén de Derecho. https://almacendederecho.org/los-juicios-paralelos
16. Mamani Chipana, L. D., Choquemamani Murillo, L., Mamani Manzano, F., Arizaca Mamani, M. A., Vilca Valencia, P. O., Chambi Sanchez, J. D., Pilco Huanca, A. D., Rivera Catari, L. C., & Mamani Condori, V. (2023). Media criminology and punitive populism in Peru's legislative function. Revista de Derecho, 8(1), 23–39. https://doi.org/10.47712/rd.2023.v8i1.223
17. Marín Aboytes, L. A., & Ledesma Lois, F. A. (2024). The teaching of qualitative research techniques in the field of legal education on human rights. LATAM Revista Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales y Humanidades, 5(3), 894–905. https://doi.org/10.56712/latam.v5i3.2082
18. Martínez Izquierdo, D. X. (2024). Pretrial detention and media trials. Revista Iuris, 19(2), 117–132. https://doi.org/10.18537/iuris.19.02.07
19. Pezo, O. (2023). Case study on the presumption of innocence, parallel trials, and media criminalization. Revista de Derecho UPT, 1(1), 40–55. https://revistas.upt.edu.pe/ojs/index.php/derecho/article/view/787
20. Pinchi-Bartra, M. (2024). Influence of the current of opinion in the preparatory investigation courts of the judicial district of San Martín. Revista Científica Ratio Iure, 4(1), e580. https://doi.org/10.51252/rcri.v4i1.580
21. Queque Condori, M. (2024). Media pressure and its influence on the issuance of the preventive detention order in the Preparatory Investigation Courts of Puno in the period 2020–2021 [Master's thesis, Jorge Basadre Grohmann National University]. UNJBG Institutional Repository. https://repositorio.unjbg.edu.pe/server/api/core/bitstreams/b2d71413-03a7-4aca-ac33-61ecd828cbfa/content
22. Roxin, C. (2000). Criminal procedure law (G. Córdoba & D. Pastor, Trans.). Editores del Puerto. https://es.scribd.com/document/262413013/Roxin-Derecho-procesal-penal-2000-pdf
23. San Miguel, C. (2021). Parallel trials in Ecuador: The adverse effect of freedom of information on mediated publicity. Revista Brasileira de Direito Processual Penal, 7(1), 443–475. https://doi.org/10.22197/rbdpp.v7i1.419
24. United Nations. (2015). Transforming our world: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. https://www.un.org/sustainabledevelopment/es/peace-justice/
25. Vázquez Azuara, C. A. (2024). Digital legal hermeneutics and artificial interpretation methods: The use of AI-based applications for the interpretation of legal norms. Universita Ciencia, 12(35), 110–128. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14291827
26. Yto Cutipa, F. A. (2025). Media pressure in the application of pretrial detention that violates the presumption of innocence [Undergraduate thesis, National University of the Altiplano]. UNAP Institutional Repository. https://repositorio.unap.edu.pe/server/api/core/bitstreams/4759806a-6ecc-4e70-9f27-02d7058ef2a1/content