

WorldCourts™

Institution:	Inter-American Commission on Human Rights
File Number(s):	Case No. 1771
Session:	Thirty-Second Session (8 - 18 April 1974)
Title/Style of Cause:	Juan Pablo Terra and José Luis Cogorno v. Uruguay
Doc. Type:	Decision
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:	8 - 18 April 1974
Citation:	Santos Mendoza v. Uru., Case 1771, Inter-Am. C.H.R., OEA/Ser.L/V/II.34, doc. 31 rev. 1 (1974)
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 1771. July 30, 1973, reporting the arbitrary arrest of Mr. Juan Pablo Terra, a senator and President of the Christian Democratic Party, and of the trade union leader, José Luis Cogorno.

[2] In a cablegram dated July 31, 1973, the Commission requested the Government of Uruguay to provide the pertinent information, in accordance with Articles 42 and 44 of its Rules of Procedure.

[3] At the thirty-first session (October 1973), bearing in mind the fact that the period of 180 days, established in Article 51 of the Rules of Procedure during which the Government of Uruguay might supply the pertinent information, was still running, the Commission decided to postpone its examination of the case

[4] The Commission continued its examination of Case 1771 at its thirty-second session (April 1974) and appointed Dr. Gabino Fraga rapporteur so that he could make a report, including recommendations, bearing in mind the act that the Government of Uruguay had not replied to the request for information dated July 31, 1973, and that the period of 180 days established in Article 51 of the Rules of Procedure had already expired.

The rapporteur presented a report (doc.18-32) in accordance with whose recommendation the Commission decided, at the same session, to file the case without prejudice to reopening the examination of it, in view of the fact that the complainant had not provided any evidence proving that the arrest of the persons mentioned in the complaint had taken place in violation of human rights, in accordance with Article 39 d of the Rules of Procedure.