

WorldCourts™

Institution:	Inter-American Commission on Human Rights
File Number(s):	Communication No. 1942
Session:	Thirty-Sixth Session (6 - 24 October 1975)
Title/Style of Cause:	Unknown v. Chile
Doc. Type:	Report
Decided by:	President: Dr. Andrés Aguilar (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:	6 - 24 October 1975
Citation:	Unknown v. Chile, Comm. 1942 Inter-Am. C.H.R., OEA/Ser.L/V/II.37, doc. 20, corr. 1 (1975)
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] Communication 1942, of May 8, 1975, makes observations on the general status of human rights in Chile and the particular status of legal recourses and remedies to ensure respect for basic human rights, specially the right to freedom, integrity protection against arbitrary arrest and to due process. Attached to this denunciation was a list of 200 individuals arrested in Chile for political reasons listing the age, profession, identification document, place and date of the event being denounced.

[2] The Commission considered this communication during its thirty-fifth session (May 1975) and decided to address the Government of Chile to request information on the individuals arrested, in accordance to Articles 42 and 44 of the Regulations.

[3] Pursuant to that decision, a note was sent to the Government of Chile on August 5, 1975, The claimant was informed of this measure on August 28, 1975.

[4] Subsequent to the transmittal of the note of August 5, the Commission received more specific and exact data with regard to a number of the individuals named in the appendix of the note of August 5. Therefore it addressed the Government of Chile through a note of September 22, 1975, transmitting to it the new data with regard to the denunciation.

[5] During the thirty-sixth session (October 1975), the Commission looked into the status of the case and since the period provided for under Article 51 of the Regulations had not yet elapsed it decided to postpone examination of the case until next session.