

# WorldCourts™

---

Institution:	Inter-American Commission on Human Rights
File Number(s):	Case No. 1724
Session:	Twenty-Ninth Ordinary Session (16 -27 October 1972)
Title/Style of Cause:	Andrés Ramos Peguero (alias Julio Antonio Jiménez Carbuccia) v. Dominican Republic
Doc. Type:	Report
Decided by:	President: Dr. Justino Jimenez de Aréchaga (Uruguay) Vice-President: Dr. Carlos A. Dunshee de Abranches (Brazil) Members: Prof. Manuel Bianchi (Chile); Dr. Gabino Fraga (Mexico); Mr. Robert F. Woodward (United States); Dr. Genaro R. Carrio (Argentina); Dr. Andrés Aguilar (Venezuela); All members attended the twenty-ninth session.
Dated:	14 march 1972
Citation:	Ramos Peguero v. Dom. Rep., Case 1724, Inter-Am. C.H.R., OEA/Ser.L/V/II/.29, doc. 41 rev. 2 (1972)
Terms of Use:	Your use of this document constitutes your consent to the Terms and Conditions found at <a href="http://www.worldcourts.com/index/eng/terms.htm">www.worldcourts.com/index/eng/terms.htm</a>

---

[1] Case No. 1724 of September 10, 1972, pertains to denunciation of the arbitrary arrest of Mr. Andrés Ramos Peguero (alias Julio Antonio Jiménez Carbuccia) in the city of Santo Domingo, on August 19, 1971.

[2] As the complaint did not fulfill the requirements established in Articles 42 and 44 of the Commission's Regulations, in a communication of September 10, 1971, the Secretariat requested that the petitioner complete it. In a memorandum of September 14, 1971, the petitioner completed the denunciation, supplying detailed data on the detention of Mr. Ramos Peguero and reaffirming the conviction that he was imprisoned in the jail of the National Police in Santo Domingo. The petitioner enclosed press clippings and other corroborative documents with his memorandum.

[3] In a note of October 4, 1971, the Commission requested that the Government of the Dominican Republic supply the corresponding information and transmitted the pertinent parts of the complaint, as provided in Articles 42 and 44 of its Regulations.

[4] This case was considered at the Twenty-Sixth Session (October-November 1971). As the 180-day period established in Article 51 of its Regulations for the Government of the Dominican Government to supply the requested information had not expired, the Commission decided to postpone consideration of this case.

[5] At its Twenty-Seventh Session (February-March 1972) the Commission considered the status of this case and decided to reiterate to the Dominican Government its request for information. In conformity with this decision it again addressed that government in a note dated March 30, 1972.

[6] At the request of the Permanent Mission of the Dominican Republic to the OAS (Third-person

note No. 85, of April 19, 1972), in a third-person note of May 1, 1972, the Executive Secretary of the Commission transmitted the documentation pertaining to the case to that Mission.

[7] At its Twenty-Ninth Session (October 1972) the Commission verified the status of Case No. 1724 and noted that the government concerned had not yet supplied pertinent data for considering the denunciation.

Nevertheless, as the 180-day period established in Article 51 of the Regulations had not elapsed since the date on which the data on the case had been transmitted to the Permanent Mission of the Dominican Republic, the Commission decided to postpone consideration of the case until its next regular session.