

# WorldCourts™

---

|                       |  |
|-----------------------|--|
| Institution:          | Inter-American Commission on Human Rights  |
| File Number(s):       | Report No. 20/90; Case No. 9859  |
| Session:              | Seventy-Ninth Session (11 – 22 February 1991)  |
| Title/Style of Cause: | Roberto Huaman Ayala and Alciades Bernardo Huayta Leiva v. Peru  |
| Doc. Type:            | Report   |
| Decided by:           | Chairman: Patrick L. Robinson;<br>First Vice Chairman: Marco Tulio Bruni Celli;<br>Second Vice Chairman: Oscar Lujan Fappiano;<br>Members: Gilda M.C.M. de Russomano; Oliver Jackman; Leo Valladares<br>Lanza; Michael Reisman |
| Dated:                | 22 February 1991   |
| Citation:             | Huaman Ayala v. Peru, Case 9859, Inter-Am. C.H.R., Report No. 20/90,<br>OEA/Ser.L/V/II.79, doc. 12 rev. 1 (1990-1991)  |
| Terms of Use:         | Your use of this document constitutes your consent to the Terms and<br>Conditions found at <a href="http://www.worldcourts.com/index/eng/terms.htm">www.worldcourts.com/index/eng/terms.htm</a>                                |

---

## BACKGROUND:

1. On January 22, 1987, the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights received the following complaint:

Roberto Huaman Ayala, a bricklayer, 28 years old, married, with five children, was detained on December 19, 1986, at his home in the community of Soccoscocha, in Huanta, and it is believed that he was taken to the army barracks in the town of Castrocampa. Relatives of the detainee say that his detention has been denied by authorities in the zone.

Alciades Bernardo Huayta Leiva, a student, 17 years old, is reported to have been detained by army forces on December 18, 1986, at his home in the town of Soccoscocha in the Province of Huanta. It is also believed that he was taken to the Castrocampa barracks, but authorities have denied his detention.

2. In a note of February 5, 1987, the Commission transmitted the pertinent parts of the complaint to the Government of the Republic of Peru, with a request for any relevant information, but failed to receive a reply within the statutory period.

3. The request for information was reiterated through notes sent to the Government on January 21, 1988, June 7, 1988, February 17, 1989, and September 9, 1989, which referred to the possibility of applying Article 42 of the Regulations of the Commission. No reply was received to those notes either.

## CONSIDERING:

1. That in resolution AG/RES. 666 (XIII-O/83) the General Assembly declared that "the practice of forced disappearance of persons in the Americas is an affront to the conscience of the hemisphere and constitutes a crime against humanity."

2. That the period established in Article 34, paragraph 5, of the Regulations of the Commission has elapsed without the Government of Peru having responded to the request for information made by the IACHR in the notes referred to in the background section of this report, so that it may be presumed that there are not any remedies under domestic jurisdiction to be exhausted (Article 46 of the American Convention), in light of the adversarial procedure established in that Convention.

3. That Article 42 of the Regulations of the Commission reads:

#### Article 42

The facts reported in the petition whose pertinent parts have been transmitted to the government of the State in reference if, during the maximum period set by the Commission under the provisions of Article 34, paragraph 5, the government has not provided the pertinent information, as long as other evidence does not lead to a different conclusion.

4. That Article 1, paragraph 1, of the American Convention on Human Rights reads:

#### Article 1. Obligation to Respect Rights

1. The States Parties to this Convention undertake to respect the rights and freedoms recognized herein and to ensure to all persons subject to their jurisdiction the free and full exercise of those rights and freedoms, without any discrimination for reasons of race, color, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, economic status, birth, or any other social condition.

5. That the Republic of Peru is a State Party to the American Convention on Human Rights and has ratified the binding jurisdiction of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights.

Therefore, in view of the related background and the considerations as well as of the fact that the Commission does not have any other evidence that would lead it to a different conclusion, based on Article 42 of its Regulations,

#### THE INTER-AMERICAN COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS, RESOLVES:

1. To presume to be true the facts denounced in the communication of January 22, 1987, on the arbitrary detention by Peruvian government agents and the subsequent disappearance of Roberto Huaman Ayala and Alciades Bernardo Huayta Leiva, in the town of Soccoscocha, Province of Huanta, on December 19, 1986 and December 18, 1986, respectively.

2. To declare that that act constitutes a serious violation by the Peruvian state of the rights to life, humane treatment, personal liberty and a fair trial (Articles 4, 5, 7, and 8, respectively, of the American Convention on Human Rights).

3. To recommend to the Government of Peru that it conduct the most exhaustive investigation possible of the acts denounced in order to identify those who are directly or indirectly responsible so that they may receive the corresponding legal penalties and that it inform the Commission of its decision and the measures taken, within a maximum period of 60 days.

4. To recommend to the Government of Peru that it adopt the measures established under national law to indemnify the families of the victims.

5. To transmit this report to the Government of the Republic of Peru and to the petitioners.

6. If, within the period set in operative paragraph 3 of this report, the Government of Peru has not presented observations, the Commission shall include this report in its Annual Report to the General Assembly, in accordance with Article 48 of the Regulations of the Commission.