

WorldCourts™

Institution:	Inter-American Commission on Human Rights
File Number(s):	Case No. 1690
Session:	Thirtieth Session (16 - 27 April 1973)
Title/Style of Cause:	Indians of Planas Region v. Colombia
Doc. Type:	Report
Decided by:	President: Dr. Justino Jimenez de Aréchaga (Uruguay) Vice-President: Dr. Carlos A. Dunshee de Abranches (Brazil) Members: Professor Manuel Bianchi (Chile); Dr. Gabino Fraga (Mexico); Dr. Robert Woodward (United States); Dr. Genaro R. Carrio (Argentina); Dr. Andrés Aguilar (Venezuela)
Dated:	16 - 27 April 1973
Citation:	Indians of Planas Region v. Colom, Case 1690, Inter-Am. C.H.R., OEA/Ser.L/V/II.32, doc. 3 rev. 2 (1973)
Terms of Use:	Your use of this document constitutes your consent to the Terms and Conditions found at www.worldcourts.com/index/eng/terms.htm

[1] Case No. 1690, August 26, 1970, denouncing acts of persecution and terror against Indian populations in the Planas region, Meta Department, allegedly committed by members of the Administrative Department of Security (DAS) and the Armed Forces.

[2] The Commission began its examination of this communication at its Twenty-fourth Session (October 1970), during which it decided, in accordance with articles 42 and 44 of its Regulations, to request the Government of Colombia to provide the pertinent information.

[3] In a communication dated December 11, 1970, the Government of Colombia replied by stating that the denunciation had been forwarded to the competent authority within the administration.

[4] At its Twenty-fifth Session (March 1971), the Commission appointed Dr. Mario Alzamora Valdez, then a member of the CIDH, as rapporteur for this case. He presented a report containing recommendations on the basis of which the Commission decided to again request from the Government of Colombia information that would permit an examination of the claim.

[5] At its Twenty-sixth Session (October-November 1971), inasmuch as that government had not yet provided the information requested, the Commission decided, in the absence of Dr. Alzamora Valdez, to appoint Dr. Carlos A. Dunshee de Abranches as the new rapporteur. On the basis of the report and recommendations presented by the new rapporteur, the Commission decided to request once again that the government send the pertinent information, granting a 90-day extension beyond the period set forth in Article 51 of the Regulations and, at the same time, forwarding the pertinent parts of the additional information received on the case.

[6] In a note dated January 25, 1972, the Government of Colombia replied, sending documentation on measures adopted to promote the observance of human rights in the area mentioned in the complaint and in other areas of the national territory in which Indians lived. As for the forceful acts denounced in

Case 1690, it rejected as "false and tendentious, with no proof whatsoever, the accusations submitted to the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights of the Organization of American States with regard to events in the Planas region."

[7] At its Twenty-seventh Session (February-March 1972), the Commission considered this case, together with the information provided by the government.

The rapporteur, Dr. Alzamora Valdez, presented another report in which he recommended that additional information be requested "on the results of the investigations undertaken by national authorities in the place mentioned in the claim, so that the Commission might complete its examination of the case." On the basis of that recommendation, the Commission decided to request the Colombian Government to provide the following documents:

- (a) a copy of the report of the Office of the Attorney General of the Republic on the investigations carried out in the area of the denounced events; and
- (b) a copy of the report of the Office of the Military Court of the Seventh Brigade of the Armed Forces of Colombia.

[8] Accordingly, the Commission addressed the Government of Colombia in a note dated March 29, 1972.

[9] At its Twenty-ninth Session (October 1972) the Commission, in view of the fact that the Government of Colombia had not yet provided the supplementary reports requested on March 29, 1972, decided, against the recommendation of the rapporteur appointed at that time, Dr. Carlos A. Dunshee de Abrantes (who had recommended that the case be filed without prejudice), to request that the government send the aforementioned supporting reports within 30 days. Upon the expiration of that period, the Commission would, pursuant to Article 51 of its Regulations, presume the events of the case to be confirmed.

[10] The Commission sent a note to that effect to the Government of Colombia on November 1, 1972.

[11] By notes of November 27, 1972 (No. 752), and February 7, 1973 (No. 75/60), the Government of Colombia transmitted the following information:

- (a) a copy of the report submitted to the Office of the Attorney General of the Republic by the agricultural and juridical advisers of that Office on the events that had occurred in the Planas region, fully describing the measures adopted by the national authorities to correct the alleged conditions, and reporting as well on judicial proceedings and actions under way for investigating and punishing those guilty of the unlawful acts denounced in the case,
- (b) a copy of the official communication from the Ministry of National Defense dated November 23, 1972;
- (c) a copy of the official communication dated January 25, 1971; from the Commandant of the 7th Brigade of the Army to the Attorney General of the Republic of Colombia on the events in Planas; and
- (d) a copy of the official communication from the Principal Military Judge of that brigade, on the same matter. These official communications give an account of the status of the investigations and actions of the Military Criminal Justice System in the case.

[12] At its Thirtieth Session (April 1973), the Commission continues its examination of case 1690, together with the information provided by the Government of Colombia, and decided the following:

- a. To file this case, without prejudice to reopening its examination should new factors arise to make

such a step necessary or should the action of the authorities on behalf of those involved cease, and
b. To send a note to the Government of Colombia, expressing satisfaction at the conscientious and open manner in which that government had provided the information requested of it.

[13] In compliance with that decision, the Commission addressed the Government of Colombia in a note dated June 15, 1973.