

REPORT No. 27/13
PETITION P-164-01
ADMISSIBILITY
JORGE LUIS LOPEZ SOSA
PARAGUAY¹
March 20, 2013

I. SUMMARY

1. On December 11, 2000, the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (hereinafter “Commission,” “Inter-American Commission,” or “IACHR”) received a petition submitted by Mr. Jorge Luis López Sosa (hereinafter “the petitioner” and/or “alleged victim”) against the State of Paraguay (hereinafter “State,” “Paraguayan State,” or “Paraguay”) alleging the State’s international responsibility based on the alleged victim’s having been subjected to torture by state employees while he was serving as a police officer.

2. The petition account includes allegations that Mr. Jorge Luis López Sosa was the victim of torture by state employees following the failed coup d’état of May 18, 2000, as well as allegations regarding unwarranted delay in the investigation and eventual punishment of those responsible for those actions, given that the investigation remained inactive for some time. It is pertinent to indicate that when submitting the petition, the petitioner stated that he was detained in the National Police Special Forces Headquarters and would be prevented from presenting a criminal complaint for fear of reprisals. For its part, the State maintains that the petition should be declared inadmissible, alleging a failure to exhaust domestic remedies in that the domestic criminal process is still ongoing. In addition, the State alleges a change in the political context and its commitment to respect procedural deadlines in the ongoing case.

3. Without prejudging the merits of the complaint, after analyzing the parties’ positions, and pursuant to the requirements of Articles 46 and 47 of the American Convention on Human Rights (hereinafter the “Convention” or the “American Convention”), the Commission decides to declare the case admissible for purposes of examining the alleged violation of rights enshrined in Articles 5, 7, 8, and 25 of the American Convention, in connection with Articles 1.1 and 2 of that international instrument, as well as the rights enshrined in Articles 1, 6, and 8 of the Inter-American Convention to Prevent and Punish Torture (hereinafter the “IACPPT”). The Commission also decides to notify the parties of this decision, to publish it and include it in its Annual Report to the General Assembly of the OAS.

II. PROCESSING BY THE COMMISSION

4. On December 11, 2000 the Commission received the referenced petition at its headquarters. On March 13, 2008, in response to a request from the IACHR, the petitioner submitted additional information. In a note dated June 6, 2008, the Commission processed the petition and asked the State to submit its observations regarding the admissibility of the case within a period of two months, in accordance with IACHR Rules of Procedure. The State asked for an extension to submit its response, which the IACHR granted on September 4, 2008.

¹ Commissioner Rosa María Ortiz, a Paraguayan national, did not participate in the deliberations or in the decision on this petition, in accordance with the provisions of Article 17 (2) (a) of the Commission’s Rules of Procedure.

5. The State submitted its response to the petition in a communication dated September 11, 2008, duly forwarding it to the petitioner. In notes dated October 24, 2008, May 19, 2009, and November 15, 2011, the Commission again forwarded it to the petitioner. The petitioner sent his response in a communication dated January 11, 2012, which was duly forwarded. The State submitted its observations on July 5, 2012, and forwarded it accordingly.

III. POSITIONS OF THE PARTIES

A. Position of the petitioner

6. According to the petition, Mr. Jorge Luis López Sosa, who at the time of the events was serving as a police officer, reports that he was the victim of torture in May 2000 at the hands of three police officers, who were allegedly acting under the orders of the Minister of the Interior at the time. He stipulates that he was beaten on the soles of his feet and that they strung him up by his arms with his hands cuffed behind him, causing intense pain in both shoulder joints. He states that he was tortured so that he would implicate others in the failed coup d'état of May 2000, in which he alleges he had no part. At the time he submitted the petition to the IACHR, the petitioner stated that he was detained at the National Police Special Forces Headquarters, where he claims to have been pressured to reach a financial arrangement with his torturers in exchange for withdrawing his complaint and that he would be prevented from presenting a criminal complaint for fear of reprisals. He also stated that his wife was in intensive care for a medical condition at the time and he was not allowed to care for her.

7. Regarding the acts of torture in particular, the petitioner alleges that in the early hours of Friday, May 19, 2000, the Chief of the Ecological and Rural Protection Group told him that to report to Metropolitan Police Station 11. He states that when he reached that police station and went to the office of that chief, they relieved him of his service weapon and tied his hands behind his back, leaving him tied up for a period of about 75 hours. He states that a second officer proceeded to rip the uniform shirt he was wearing in order to remove it from him "with brutal ferocity," conduct he alleges would only be valid if had been convicted of treason. He maintains that they later blindfolded him with a piece of paper attached with packing tape, making him lie face down on the ground. The petitioner states that other police officers were subjected to the same treatment.

8. He alleges that while the Police Chief was interrogating him about what he had done the night before, the Second Officer and the Assistant Police Chief beat the soles of his feet. He also states that the Second Officer stood above him and stretched his arms upwards, almost lifting him off the ground, causing him intense pain in his shoulder joints. That treatment continued until about noon. According to the petitioner, he and his companions were later taken to a room located next to the cell, where they uncovered their eyes, and where other police officers were brought who had also been mistreated and beaten.

9. He states that the Police Chief said he had orders from the Minister of the Interior at the time to conduct investigations regarding the frustrated coup d'état that had taken place the night before, on May 18, 2000. He states that about 4:00 p.m. they were transferred to the place known as the "four walls" (*cuadrilátero*). The petitioner states that the next morning he was again brought to Police Station 11, where the Police Chief ordered he be held in the cell, handcuffed, along with common prisoners. The petitioner states that on the following day, Sunday, May 21, 2000, the Minister of Interior appeared at Police Station 11, so he had to remain on his knees against the wall for an hour. He

indicates that the Police Chief later asked him to collaborate in the investigation, threatening him about the serious condition of his wife, who was also serving as a police officer.

10. That night he was transferred to the Marine Corps where there was another police officer, who was the Police Superintendent, in order to confirm or deny what he was saying, so that he was again blindfolded and forced to lie face down on the floor. The petitioner alleges that he heard them beating the Superintendent and interrogating him about who had financed the coup. He also states that, under the blindfold that covered his eyes, he noted that the Minister of the Interior at the time was present. At about daybreak on the next day, he states they again took him to Police Station 11. Later, he states he was transferred to the Police Special Forces Headquarters, where he was moved, without handcuffs on his hands, to a room for officers, indicating that for a period of 15 days he was not examined or diagnosed by any qualified physician.

11. The petitioner states that 15 days after the alleged acts of torture he was visited by staff from the International Red Cross and four days later by a judicial commission made up of a judge and a forensic physician sent by the Supreme Court of Justice. He also states that due to newspaper reports about his torture, in July 2000 he was visited by two prosecutors, an actuary, and a physician. He maintains that when his report of torture was confirmed to these prosecutors, he was transferred to "four walls" for a few days as punishment. The petitioner also reports that he was offered money to withdraw his torture complaint on numerous occasions, which he states he was able to record and hand over to the prosecutor's office as evidence. Regarding his detention, at the time he filed this petition, the petitioner indicated that he was sure that his case would be dismissed since he had not violated any legal standard.

12. In the brief received on March 13, 2008, the petitioner states that the case against those allegedly responsible for the acts of torture was inactive "due to deals between the accused and the country's judicial authorities." He also states that "it is in [his] interest and in the interest of the other victims of torture to press ahead with the documentation but they are entirely defenseless" and that the accused "in addition to having political assistance have sufficient financial resources to obtain impunity." The petitioner attaches to his brief documents relating to the case on the offense of "bodily injury in the performance of public duties," among them the indictment and the request to open a trial. In the communication dated January 11, 2012, the petitioner reported that the case has been pending a preliminary hearing before the judge in the case since June 2009, but the process has been excessively delayed due to motions submitted by the accused's defense. He also stated that with the motions recently resolved, the case should return to the first instance judge for the preliminary hearing, at which time a decision should be made on whether the case will go to oral and public trial, as he has requested.

B. Position of the State

13. In its response to the petition, the State asked the IACHR to declare the petition inadmissible, alleging a failure to exhaust the domestic remedies, in view of evidence received subsequent to the petition. In addition, the State indicated that consideration should be given to the situation created with the installation of the new government and that government's formal commitment to respect procedural deadlines and to prosecute the public officials responsible, in breach of conduct cases.

14. In concrete terms, with respect to the failure to exhaust domestic remedies, the State argues that the events that affected the alleged victim originated as a consequence of the "failed coup

d'état attempt of May 18, 2000," in that various arrests and inquiries occurred after that event, particularly with respect to police and military personnel. In that context, it states that, since Mr. Jorge Luis López Sosa was a National Police officer and was at the Police Station that day, he was the subject of inquiries along with other government security agents. In this regard, it states that "as indicated in the charges from the Office of the Public Prosecutor, various acts of torture were in fact committed against several of the detained, including the petitioner" and since those detentions and possible torture were widespread, different cases were opened to investigate them, which were eventually joined based on their common elements.

15. The State reports that in one of the referenced cases three police officers were charged for the punishable act of "bodily injury in the performance of public duties," in another case the former Minister of the Interior was charged for the punishable act of "torture," and after the prosecution's investigation all the accused were indicted for the indicated crimes, at which time the cases were joined. The State indicates that a series of "apparently dilatory" motions were filed against that decision, which resulted in the filing of constitutionality challenges before the Supreme Court of Justice. In addition, it alleges that pursuant to an "apparently malicious exercise of legal maneuvers by the defense attorneys for the accused, supported by a criminal system that still lacks infrastructure and is relatively new (Code of Criminal Procedure – Law No. 1286 promulgated on June 25, 1999 and in effect since March 1, 2000)" the preliminary hearing opened (assessing the merits of the indictment for purposes of referring the case for oral and public trial) on November 26, 2003, with the case file practically "extinct" in accordance with the provisions of Articles 25.3, 136, and 137 of the Code of Criminal Procedure.²

16. Consequently, the State indicates that in the above-mentioned preliminary hearing on November 26, 2003, the Office of the Public Prosecutor and the attached complaint filed an objection the grounds of unconstitutionality, arguing that the referenced Articles 25.3, 136, and 137 of the Code of Criminal Procedure did not apply to the case. The State indicates that the Supreme Court ruled on this objection in a decision dated May 5, 2008, i.e., within a period of four years and eight months, ruling in favor of the arguments made by the Office of the Public Prosecutor and the alleged victim, declaring the challenged articles to be inapplicable. The State maintains that this decision eliminated the impediments to conducting another preliminary hearing where the indictment could be examined and the case could eventually be brought to trial. In summary, the State indicates that despite the years that have elapsed since the start of the process, and despite the case's having been stuck in the Supreme Court of Justice for the indicated period of time, the finding of that Court reopened the doors for handling the case in a future oral trial with full guarantees. Thus, the State alleges a failure to exhaust domestic remedies. It maintains that the new situation created with the decision in the case, issued in its favor, allows the judicial system in Paraguay to search for the real truth, free of legalistic strictures allowing one to argue extinction of the action for any reason other than the deliberation of the case in a trial with full guarantees for the parties.

² Article 25.3 of the Code of Criminal Procedure establishes in the relevant section that: "Criminal proceedings are discontinued: 3) due to expiration of the period provided in Article 136 of this Code." For its part, the State indicates that Article 136 provided (currently that provision is amended by Law 2341/03): "Maximum Duration: Everyone shall be entitled to a decision in a reasonable period of time. Therefore, all proceedings shall have a maximum duration of three years from the first action taken in the proceeding (...)."

Article 137 of the Code provides in the relevant section: "Effects. Once the period provided in the preceding article has expired, the judge or court, *ex officio* or at the request of one of the parties, shall declare the criminal action to have lapsed, in accordance with the provisions of this Code (...)."

17. It adds that the Supreme Court's decision of May 5, 2008 is evidence of the current ability to conduct the preliminary hearing and the oral and public trial and the latent possibility of filing appeals, cassation, and unconstitutionality remedies challenging any decisions that may be issued.

18. In addition, the State alleges that there are other facts supporting the inadmissibility of the petition, making reference to the country's political context. It indicates that at time of the original petition, authorities who belonged to the same political party that had been in power for more than 60 years were still in government, until the general elections of April 20, 2008 produced a democratic change in government, displacing the Colorado Party that had been in power since 1947 and installing an alliance of opposition political parties and social groups.

19. Finally, bearing in mind the time elapsed and the situation created with respect to the criminal case against those allegedly responsible for the crimes of torture denounced by Mr. Jorge Luis López Sosa, the Paraguayan State indicated in its submission that it assumed certain commitments both to the alleged victim and the IACHR. In this regard, it indicated that it assumed the commitment to fully respect procedural deadlines, taking responsibility for administrative, civil, or criminal prosecution arising from the failure of responsible public officials to honor such deadlines.

20. In a communication dated July 5, 2012, the State reported that in the criminal case for the crime of "bodily injury in the performance of public duties" with respect to Mr. Jorge Luis López Sosa a preliminary hearing was set for July 24, 2012, stipulating that in that case the alleged victim was a complainant against the accused and that he is represented by counsel.

IV. ANALYSIS OF ADMISSIBILITY

A. Competence of the Commission *ratione materiae*, *ratione personae*, *ratione temporis*, and *ratione loci*

21. The petitioner is empowered by Article 44 of the American Convention to submit complaints to the IACHR. The petition indicates as the alleged victim Jorge Luis López Sosa and his family, with respect to whom Paraguay agreed to respect and guarantee the rights enshrined in the American Convention. With respect to the State, Paraguay has been a party to the American Convention since August 24, 1989, the date on which it deposited the respective ratifying instrument. Therefore, the Commission is competent *ratione personae* to examine the petition.

22. The Inter-American Commission is competent *ratione loci* in that the alleged human rights violations occurred in a State that is party to the American Convention.

23. The petitioner, for his part, refers to violations of rights established in the American Convention so that in the case under review the IACHR is competent *ratione materiae*. In addition, the Inter-American Commission is competent *ratione temporis* given that the obligation to respect and guarantee the rights protected in the American Convention was already in effect for the State on the date when the facts alleged in the petition would have occurred. It is also competent to hear violations of the Inter-American Convention to Prevent and Punish Torture (IACPPT) in that Paraguay has been a party to that treaty since March 9, 1990, when it deposited the respective ratifying instrument.

B. Other requirements for admissibility of the petition

1. Exhaustion of domestic remedies

24. Article 46.1.a of the American Convention requires the prior exhaustion of the remedies available in the domestic jurisdiction in accordance with generally recognized principles of international law, as a requirement for the admission of complaints regarding the alleged violation of the Convention. For its part, Article 46.2 of the Convention provides that the prior exhaustion of domestic remedies requirement is not applicable when (i) the domestic legislation of the state concerned does not afford due process of law for the protection of the right or rights that have allegedly been violated; (ii) the party alleging violation of his rights has been denied access to the remedies under domestic law or has been prevented from exhausting them; or (iii) there has been unwarranted delay in rendering a final judgment under the aforementioned remedies.

25. In the matter under review, the account in the petition and information provided indicate that the petitioner alleges judicial delay in the investigation and punishment of the acts of torture reported by him. For its part, the State alleges a failure to exhaust the domestic remedies. It notes in particular that after the Supreme Court decision of May 5, 2008 ruling on the unconstitutionality motion filed by the Prosecutor's Office and the complainants in the criminal case prosecuting those allegedly responsible for the acts of torture reported by the petitioner, the domestic courts would continue to prosecute the criminal case in the domestic jurisdiction and that a preliminary hearing had been convened for the month of July 2012.

26. The first issue to be clarified is which domestic remedies should be exhausted in the instant case. The Inter-American Court of Human Rights (hereinafter "the I/A Court HR") has indicated that only remedies suitable for remedying the violations allegedly committed must be exhausted. Adequate remedies are those which:

...are suitable to address an infringement of a legal right. A number of remedies exist in the legal system of every country, but not all are applicable in every circumstance. If a remedy is not adequate in a specific case, it obviously need not be exhausted. A norm is meant to have an effect and should not be interpreted in such a way as to negate its effect or lead to a result that is manifestly absurd or unreasonable.³

27. In this regard, in the instant case it should be noted that the precedents established by the Commission recognize that whenever an offense prosecutable *ex officio* is committed, the State has the obligation to advance and promote the criminal process⁴ and that in such cases, this is the suitable route for clarifying the facts, judging those responsible, and establishing the respective criminal penalties, in addition to facilitating other forms of monetary reparations. The IACHR believes that the facts alleged in the instant case involve the alleged violation of fundamental rights such as the right to humane treatment, which are reflected in domestic legislation as offenses prosecutable *ex officio*, and thus it is this process, advanced by the State itself, which should be considered for purposes of determining the admissibility of the complaint.

28. In this regard, the IACHR has established that as a general rule a criminal investigation should be conducted promptly in order to protect the interests of the victim, preserve the evidence, and

³ I/A Court HR., *Velásquez Rodríguez v. Honduras Case*. Merits. Judgment of July 29, 1988. Series C, No. 4. 64.

⁴ Report No. 52/97, Case 11.218, *Arges Sequeira Mangas*, Nicaragua, 1997 IACHR Annual Report, paras. 96 and 97. See also Report No. 55/97, Case 11.137, *Juan Carlos Abella*, Argentina, para. 392 and Report No. 62/00, Case 11.727, *Hernando Osorio Correa*, Colombia, 2000 IACHR Annual Report, para. 24.

even safeguard the rights of any who may be considered suspect in the context of the investigation.⁵ For its part, the I/A Court HR has indicated that although every criminal investigation must satisfy a series of legal requirements, the rule of prior exhaustion of domestic remedies should not lead to a halt or delay of international action to assist the victims that would render such action ineffective.⁶

29. In the instant case, after the alleged reported acts of torture that occurred in May 2000, an investigation was launched followed by a criminal case in the ordinary criminal jurisdiction, which would be in its preliminary procedural stages.⁷ As reported, the preliminary hearing had been convened for July 2012, although to date the results of that preliminary hearing have not been reported. In this respect, the Commission notes that, after twelve years, the criminal process is in the preliminary stage and the State has not provided information regarding new actions or decisions issued subsequent to the referenced convening of the preliminary hearing. As a result, the IACHR believes that the exception established in Article 46.2.c) of the American Convention is applicable.

30. Finally, it should be indicated that invocation of the exceptions to the exhaustion of domestic remedies provided in Article 46.2 of the Convention is closely linked with the determination of possible violations of certain rights enshrined therein, such as guarantees on access to justice. However, Article 46.2, based on its nature and purpose, is a provision with autonomous content relative to the substantive provisions of the Convention. Therefore, the determination as to whether the exceptions to the exhaustion of domestic remedies rule are applicable to the case must be made prior to and separately from analysis of the merits of the case, in that it depends on a standard of assessment different from that used to determine the possible violation of Articles 8 and 25 of the Convention.

2. Deadline for submitting a petition to the Commission

31. The Convention establishes that in order for a petition to be admissible by the Commission, it must be submitted within a period of six months from the date when the alleged injury party was notified of a final decision. In the complaint under review, the IACHR has established the applicability of the exceptions to the exhaustion of domestic remedies in accordance with Article 46.2.c) of the Convention. In this regard, Article 32 of the Commission's Rules of Procedure establishes that in cases in which the exceptions to the prior exhaustion of domestic remedies are applicable, the petition must be submitted within a reasonable period of time. To this end, the Commission must consider the date on which the alleged violation of rights occurred and the circumstances in each case.

32. In the instant case, the petition was received on December 11, 2000, the facts covered in the petition occurred starting in May 2000, and the effects thereof in terms of the alleged lack of results from the administration of justice continue to this day. Therefore, in view of the context and the characteristics of the case, as well as the fact that the court case continues pending in the initial stages, the Commission deems that the petition was submitted within a reasonable period of time and that the

⁵ IACHR, Report No. 71/09, Petition 858-06, *Massacre of Belén - Altavista*, Colombia, August 5, 2009, para. 36.

⁶ I/A Court H.R., *Velásquez Rodríguez v. Honduras Case*. Preliminary Objections. Judgment of June 26, 1987. Series C No. 1, para. 93.

⁷ It should be noted that the assessment regarding this admissibility requirement is performed when deciding on the admissibility of the petition and not when the petition is received. See, *inter alia*, IACHR, Report No. 25/04, Case 12.361 ("Ana Victoria Sánchez Villalobos et al."), March 11, 2004, Costa Rica, para. 45; Report No. 50/04 (Admissibility – Petition 12.056, Gabriel Oscar Jenkins v. Argentina); October 13, 2004; para. 50; Report No. 20/05, Petition 714/00 ("Rafael Correa Díaz"), February 25, 2005, Peru, para. 32.

admissibility requirement with respect to the submission deadline has been met.

3. Duplication of proceedings and international *res judicata*

33. Article 46.1.b provides that petitions are admitted subject to the matter's not being "pending in another international proceeding for settlement," and Article 47.d of the Convention stipulates that the Commission will not admit a petition that "is substantially the same as one previously studied by the Commission or by another international organization." In the instant case, the parties have not argued the existence of either of these inadmissibility circumstances nor can they be inferred from the proceedings.

4. Characterization of the alleged facts

34. The Commission believes that at this stage in the proceeding it is not appropriate to decide whether or not the alleged violations to the detriment of the alleged victim occurred. For admissibility purposes, the IACHR must at this time resolve only whether facts are presented that, should they prove to be true, would characterize violations of the American Convention, as established in Article 47.b thereof, and whether the petition is "manifestly groundless or obviously out of order, as indicated in paragraph (c) of the same article. The criterion for assessing these points is different from that required to rule on the merits of a complaint. The IACHR must perform a *prima facie* evaluation and determine whether the complaint forms the basis for an apparent or potential violation of a right guaranteed by the American Convention, but not establish the existence of that violation.⁸

35. At this stage, a summary analysis should be performed that does not entail prejudgment or an advance opinion on the merits. The Inter-American Commission's own Rules of Procedure, by establishing an admissibility phase and another merits phase, reflects this distinction between the assessment the Inter-American Commission must perform in order to declare a petition admissible and that required to establish whether a violation attributable to the State has been committed.⁹

36. Neither the American Convention nor the IACHR Rules of Procedure require the petitioner to identify the specific rights that are alleged to have been violated by the State in the matter submitted to the Commission, although the petitioners may do so. It is up to the Commission, based on the system's case law, to determine in its admissibility reports which provision of the relevant inter-American instruments is applicable and could be established to have been violated if the facts alleged are proven through sufficient evidence.

37. Given the evidence presented by the parties and the nature of the matter brought to its knowledge, the Commission deems that in the instant case it is appropriate to establish that the petitioner's allegations regarding the failure to judicially clarify the alleged acts of torture reported, the

⁸ See IACHR, Report No. 128/01, Case 12.367, *Mauricio Herrera Ulloa and Fernán Vargas Rohrmoser of "La Nación" Newspaper*, Costa Rica, December 3, 2001, para. 50; Report No. 4/04, Petition 12.324, *Rubén Luis Godoy*, Argentina, February 24, 2004, para. 43; Report No. 32/07, Petition 429-05, *Juan Patricio Marileo Saravia et al.*, Chile, April 23, 2007, para. 54.

⁹ See IACHR, Report No. 31/03, Case 12.195, *Mario Alberto Jara Oñate et al.*, Chile, March 7, 2003, para. 41; Report No. 4/04, Petition 12.324, *Rubén Luis Godoy*, Argentina, February 24, 2004, para. 43; Report No. 32/07, Petition 429-05, *Juan Patricio Marileo Saravia et al.*, Chile, April 23, 2007, para. 54; Report No. 33/07, Petition 581-05, *Víctor Manuel Ancalaf LLaupe*, Chile, May 2, 2007, para. 46.

detention, and the alleged denial of justice could characterize possible violations of the rights enshrined in Articles 5, 7, 8, and 25 of the American Convention, in connection with Articles 1.1 and 2 of that instrument and could also constitute violations of the rights established in Articles 1, 6, and 8 of the IACPPT.

V. CONCLUSION

38. The Commission concludes that it is competent to examine the complaints submitted in this matter and that the petition is admissible pursuant to Articles 46 and 47 of the American Convention.

39. Based on the factual and legal arguments presented above and without signifying a prejudgment as to the merits of the case,

THE INTER-AMERICAN COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS,

DECIDES:

1. To declare this case admissible with respect to the rights enshrined in Articles 5, 7, 8, and 25 of the American Convention, in connection with the obligations under Articles 1.1 and 2 of the same convention, as well as the rights enshrined in Articles 1, 6, and 8 of the Inter-American Convention to Prevent and Punish Torture;

2. To forward this report to the petitioners and to the State;

3. To continue its analysis of the merits of the case;

4. To publish this report and include it in the Commission's Annual Report to the General Assembly of the OAS.

Done and signed in the city of Washington, D.C., on the 20th day of March 2013. (Signed): José de Jesús Orozco Henríquez, President; Tracy Robinson, First Vice-President; Rose-Marie Belle Antoine, Felipe González, Dinah Shelton and Rodrigo Escobar Gil, Commissioners.