

WorldCourts™

Institution:	Inter-American Commission on Human Rights
File Number(s):	Case No. 1789
Session:	Thirty-Fourth Session (15 – 25 October 1974)
Title/Style of Cause:	Paul Stuart Wright v. Brazil
Doc. Type:	Decision
Decided by:	President: Dr. Andrés Aguilar, President (Venezuela) Vice-President: Dr. Carlos A. Dunshee de Abranches (Brazil) Members: Professor Manuel Bianchi (Chile); Dr. Gabino Fraga (Mexico); Dr. Justino Jimenez de Aréchaga (Uruguay); Mr. Robert F. Woodward (United States); Dr. Genaro R. Carrio (Argentina)
Dated:	15 – 25 October 1974
Citation:	Wright v. Braz., Case 1789, 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] October 30, 1973, denouncing the arbitrary arrest of the former Brazilian federal deputy, Mr. Paul Stuart Wright (of the Brazilian Workers Party), which took place in December 1973.

[2] In its note dated January 9, 1974, the Commission requested the Government of Brazil to provide the pertinent information, in accordance with Articles 42 and 44 of the Rules of Procedure.

[3] The Commission examined the status of the initial processing of the case at its thirty-second session (April, 1974) and noted that the Government of Brazil had not replied to the request for information. It also noted that, in order to continue the examination of the matter with the appropriate information, it was necessary to determine whether the appeals provided for in the domestic jurisdiction of Brazil had been lodged and exhausted, as prescribed by Article 54 of the Rules of Procedure.

[4] Consequently, it decided, at that session, to request the complainant to supplement the denunciation and inform it whether, in this case, the appeals the laws of that country establish for the defense of human rights had been filed with the competent authorities of Brazil.

[5] In implementation of that decision, the Commission wrote to the complainant on April 24, 1974.

[6] At its thirty-fourth session (October 1974), it was not possible to continue the examination of case 1789 because further information had not been received from the complainant. It was therefore, decided to repeat the request that he send such information and to warn him that, if it were not provided within a reasonable period of time, the matter would be filed without further action being taken.

[7] In implementation of this decision, the Commission wrote to the complainant on November 11, 1974