

WorldCourts™

Institution:	Inter-American Commission on Human Rights
File Number(s):	Report No. 40/90; Case No. 10.326
Session:	Seventy-Ninth Session (11 – 22 February 1991)
Title/Style of Cause:	Noe Pastor Romo Antonio 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:	Romo Antonio v. Peru, Case 10.326, Inter-Am. C.H.R., Report No. 40/90, 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 www.worldcourts.com/index/eng/terms.htm

BACKGROUND:

1. On April 13, 1989, the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights received the following complaint:

On January 15, Noe Pastor Romo Antonio, law student at the University of San Marcos and member of the Human Rights Commission of Villa El Salvador, was arrested together with other individuals whose identities are unknown. After his arrest, his house was searched and his passport, bearing a Nicaraguan entry visa, was found and taken by the police as sufficient grounds upon which to accuse him of assault, robbery, and terrorism.

2. Through a note of May 2, 1989, the Commission sent the relevant parts of the claim to the Government of the Republic of Peru and asked that Government to provide the information it deemed appropriate. An answer was not received within the statutory time limit.

3. This request for information was repeated in a note addressed to that Government on September 8, 1989, which mentions the possibility that Article 42 of the Commission's Regulations would be applied. Still no reply was received.

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 claims presented in the April 13, 1989, correspondence pertaining to the arbitrary arrest by agents of the Peruvian state and subsequent disappearance of Noe Pastor Romo Antonio in Lima on January 15, 1989.

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 victim.

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.