

# WorldCourts™

---

Institution:	Inter-American Commission on Human Rights
File Number(s):	Report No. 24/90; Case No. 10.014
Session:	Seventy-Ninth Session (11 – 22 February 1991)
Title/Style of Cause:	Angel Francisco Perez Ali, Dionisia Huamani Tineo, and Humberto Orosco v. Peru
Doc. Type:	Report
Decided by:	Chairman: Patrick L. Robinson; First Vice Chairman: Marco Tulio Bruni Celli; Second Vice Chairman: Oscar Lujan Fappiano; Members: Gilda M.C.M. de Russomano; Oliver Jackman; Leo Valladares Lanza; Michael Reisman
Dated:	22 February 1991
Citation:	Perez Ali v. Peru, Case 10.014, Inter-Am. C.H.R., Report No. 24/90, 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 Conditions found at <a href="http://www.worldcourts.com/index/eng/terms.htm">www.worldcourts.com/index/eng/terms.htm</a>

---

## BACKGROUND:

1. On May 11, 1987, the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights received the following complaint:

According to reports, Angel Francisco Perez Ali, a 22-year-old student at the School of Computer Science of the University of San Marcos, Lima, was detained by the police following incidents in the vicinity of that university and two other universities in Lima. His whereabouts have been unknown since his detention on February 27, 1987. His "disappearance" has been reported to the Attorney General and to the General Prosecutor for local human rights organizations.

In mid-February 1987, a large-scale police operation was mounted at the universities of San Marcos, Engineering, and la Cantuta, on the pretext of searching for members of terrorist organizations. About 4,000 policemen took part in the operation, which resulted in the detention of about 800 people and the death of a guard at one of the universities. It is alleged that some of the detainees were tortured when subjected to interrogation in Bocanegra, which is a ranch of the Peruvian Investigations Police, located on the outskirts of Lima. The large majority of the detainees have been released, but 34 people charged with terrorism are still in detention.

There is also concern regarding the fate of Dionisia Huamani Tineo and Humberto Orosco, members of the rural community of Huhuapuquio, in Cangallo, Department of Ayacucho, who were detained by army forces on April 12, 1987. Their whereabouts are unknown, and their detention has been denied. Writs of habeas corpus have been filed in their names, and the Ayacucho Farmers Federation has expressed its concern to the commander of the political-military post of the area.

2. In a note of May 19, 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 19, 1988, June 7, 1988, February 22, 1989, and September 8, 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 May 11, 1987, on the arbitrary detention by Peruvian government agents and the subsequent disappearance of Angel Francisco Perez Ali, on February 27, 1987, in Lima, and Dionisia Huamani Tineo and Humberto Orosco, on April 12, 1987, in Cangallo, Department of Ayacucho.

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.