In the aftermath of the June 2009 coup d'état in Honduras, whereby sitting president Manuel Zelaya was ousted by the military, the country established a truth commission in May 2010. The commission was mainly established to respond to the pressure of the Organization of American States with the purpose of addressing the causes that had led to the coup as well as to deal with the human rights abuses that have occurred during and in the aftermath of the coup. As opposed to truth commissions elsewhere in Latin America (e.g. Peru, Argentina, Guatemala, etc.), the truth commission in Honduras did not receive much (international) attention, nor did it show to have a clear and lasting impact. On the contrary, while former president Zelaya had been ousted for allegedly attempting to run for a second presidential term, sitting president Juan Orlando Hernandez, two presidential terms later, changed the constitutional law in order to be able to run a second time as president. Hernandez was not ousted by a coup, given he had the support of the military and the international community (mainly the US and EU). The question that we want to address in this paper, then, is whether the Honduran truth commission was a genuine attempt to deal with the past human rights abuses and avoid them to be repeated, or a mere effort of ticking the box?