

**Order of the  
Inter-American Court of Human Rights  
of May 12, 2007  
Request for Broadening of Provisional Measures regarding  
Colombia  
Case of the 19 Tradesmen  
(Sandra Belinda Montero Fuentes and next of kin, Salomón  
Flórez and next of kin, Luis José Pundor Quintero and next of  
kin, Ana Diva Quintero Quintero de Pundor and next of kin,  
Wilmar Rodríguez Quintero and next of kin, and Yimmy Efraín  
Rodríguez Quintero and next of kin)**

**HAVING SEEN:**

1. The judgment on merits, reparations, and costs delivered by the Inter-American Court of Human Rights (hereinafter "the Court" or "the Inter-American Court") on July 5, 2004, in the case of the 19 Tradesmen with regard to the State of Colombia (hereinafter "the State" or "Colombia").
2. The Order on provisional measures of the Inter-American Court of September 3, 2004, in which it decided, *inter alia*, "[t]o ratify the Order of the President of the Court [...] of July 30, 2004, in the terms set out in the fifteenth considering paragraph of the Order, concerning the protection of Sandra Belinda Montero Fuentes and her son, Juan Manuel Ayala Montero" and "[t]o require the State: (a) to maintain the necessary measures to protect the rights to life and personal integrity of Sandra Belinda Montero Fuentes and her son, Juan Manuel Ayala Montero; and (b) to adopt, forthwith, all necessary measures to protect the rights to life and personal integrity of the child, María Paola Casanova Montero, of 7 years of age, daughter of Sandra Belinda Montero Fuentes".
3. The Order on provisional measures of the Inter-American Court of July 4, 2006, in which it was decided, *inter alia*, "[t]o ratify the Order of the President of the Court [...] of April 28, 2006, and, consequently, to require the State of Colombia to maintain the measures it had adopted and to adopt, forthwith, the necessary measures to protect the rights to life and personal integrity of Salomón Flórez Contreras, Luis José Pundor Quintero and Ana Diva Quintero Quintero de Pundor, and their respective families" and "[t]o reiterate to the State that it must adopt and maintain the necessary measures to protect the rights to life and personal integrity of Sandra Belinda Montero Fuentes and her children, Juan Manuel Ayala Montero and María Paola Casanova Montero".
4. The brief of September 15, 2006, in which the State submitted its report on the provisional measures pursuant to the fourth operative paragraph of the Order on

expansion of measures issued by the Court on July 4, 2006. In this brief, Colombia reported, *inter alia*, that: "it was mindful of the measures required to ensure the due and effective protection of the right to life and personal integrity" of the beneficiaries; and that the investigation being conducted by the 49<sup>th</sup> Prosecutor's Office, Cartagena Section, into "the alleged threats against Luis José Pundor Quintero and Ana Diva Quintero" was in its preliminary stages.

5. The brief of September 25, 2006, in which the representatives of the beneficiaries of the provisional measures (hereinafter "the representatives") submitted their observations on the State's report of September 15, 2006 (*supra* fourth having seen paragraph). In this brief, the representatives indicated the following, *inter alia*:

- (a) Regarding the beneficiary, Sandra Belinda Montero, and her next of kin, that the Government "had not notified Sandra Montero about the results of the risk studies conducted on her situation"; that they have "been unable to obtain any information on her safety situation directly," and that "the means of communication (Avantel) she had been given as a protection mechanism [...had been] returned to the Ministry of the Interior and Justice." They added that the Government "had not included any information on the status of the suspended investigation";
- (b) Regarding the beneficiary, Salomón Flórez, and his next of kin, "[t]he delay in the implementation of the support mechanisms to facilitate their displacements means that this family is currently in a dangerous area." In addition, they stated that "[t]he Flórez family has chosen to move frequently as a protection mechanism, and this has prevented [the representatives] from keeping in permanent contact; consequently, [they do not have] recent information about the status of the implementation of the measures or about this family's safety situation." They also said that the next of kin of other victims in the case of the 19 Tradesmen "have indicated that rumors persist concerning possible cases of extortion";
- (c) Regarding the beneficiaries, Ana Diva Quintero and Luis José Pundor, and their next of kin, "[t]he most recent news is that these families had to leave the country as a safety measure; consequently, [the representatives] have not advised the State about their requirements, with the exception of the need to determine the identity of those responsible for the threats, and that the risk factors that obliged the families to abandon their usual place of residence should be eliminated." The representatives added that "[i]n view of the above, [they] do not understand how the investigation that the Government mentions in its report was originated and why it is being conducted in a city such as Cartagena that is so far from where the events took place"; and
- (d) "The absence of a monitoring mechanism and entity to ensure compliance with the measures adversely affects the possibility of making progress towards complying with the measures ordered by the Court."

6. The brief of November 14, 2006, in which the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (hereinafter "the Commission" or "the Inter-American Commission") submitted its observations on the State's report of September 15, 2006 (*supra* fourth having seen paragraph). The Commission stated, *inter alia*, that:

- (a) It reiterated its "concern owing to the absence of descriptive information on the security mechanisms and assistance that had been assigned and on the safety situation of the beneficiaries in the State's report"; and
- (b) It considered it opportune "to reiterate the question raised by the representatives of the beneficiaries regarding the judicial district (Cartagena) used to conduct the investigation [into the threats to Luis José Pundor and Ana Diva Quintero]."

7. The brief of November 24, 2006, in which the State presented its bi-monthly report on the provisional measures. In this report, the State indicated, *inter alia*:

- (a) The measures for protection that Sandra Belinda Montero Fuentes and her next of kin had received, according to official records prepared between August 2004 and July 2005;
- (b) The measures for protection that Salomón Flórez and his next of kin had received, according to "[o]fficial record 38 of March 30, 2006"; and
- (c) "That there was no record [concerning measures for protection] for [...] José Pundor Quintero and Ana Diva Quintero de Pundor."

8. The brief of January 22, 2007, in which the Commission submitted its observations on the State's report of November 24, 2006 (*supra*, seventh having seen paragraph), indicating, *inter alia*, that the State had not made any reference to "measures for protection agreed or implemented during the period covered by the progress report" for Sandra Belinda Montero and Salomón Flórez. It therefore "reiterated its concern about the absence [...] of detailed information on the security mechanisms and assistance that had been assigned and on the safety situation of the beneficiaries."

9. The brief of February 5, 2007, in which the representatives requested the Inter-American Court, *inter alia*, to order "immediate and effective actions to guarantee the life and personal integrity of Wilmar [Rodríguez Quintero] and Yimmy Rodríguez Quintero" and, "in this regard, that [the State] should order the implementation of preventive measures that put an end to the continuing threats." The representatives stated that Wilmar Rodríguez Quintero and Yimmy Rodríguez Quintero are brothers of Gerson Javier Rodríguez Quintero, a victim in the case of the 19 Tradesmen, and that Wilmar Rodríguez Quintero gave testimony during the public hearing on merits, reparations, and costs held at the seat of the Court. They also indicated the place of residence of the Rodríguez Quintero brothers.

10. The grounds mentioned by the representatives in their request for expansion of provisional measures (*supra* ninth having seen paragraph), which are summarized below:

- (a) "[...] on February 2, six armed men arrived at the home of Wilmar [Rodríguez Quintero] and Yimmy [Rodríguez Quintero], and introduced themselves as members of a group of the self-defense forces [...]. Two of the men entered the house and demanded that Yimmy give them ten million pesos (10,000,000 pesos) and said 'they would settle the rest later'";

- (b) Yimmy Rodríguez Quintero “asked them to wait a moment; he walked over to the workshop where he was employed, which was close to his home, reported the presence of the men in his house and attracted the community’s attention; however, one of the men approached him and demanded that he hand over the money; so he re-entered his home and took out a gun which he pointed at two of the men who were in the house and who were unarmed”;
- (c) “As a result of the community’s action, the police arrived and detained the two men. It appears that one of these men was known as Yimmy Ovalle and the other by the alias ‘Moroco’”;
- (d) “The police also took Yimmy [Rodríguez Quintero] to the police station, and he filed a complaint [...]”;
- (e) “At the police station [...], ‘Moroco’ shouted at them that he would finish off all of them when he got out, and it was there that Wilmar [Rodríguez Quintero] and Yimmy [Rodríguez Quintero] discovered that this individual formed part of a group of demobilized paramilitary personnel, receiving a subsidy from the Colombian Government and that, on several occasions, he had been detained accused of extortion and paramilitary activities, but had always been released”;
- (f) “Men from the same group have demanded that Wilmar and Yimmy withdraw their complaint to avoid problems”;
- (g) On February 4, 2007, “a man, known as ‘Pablo’, approached the home of Wilmar [Rodríguez Quintero] and Yimmy [Rodríguez Quintero] and told them that the ‘*Patrón*’ [the Boss] wanted to talk to them. [...]he man dialed a number on a mobile telephone and put Wilmar in communication with a man [...] who told him that it had all been a mistake, because they had been told that what [Wilmar and Yimmy] possessed was derived from drug trafficking and that is why they had attempted to extort money from [Wilmar and Yimmy]; however, if the latter paid a lawyer to obtain his men’s release from prison, he promised that there would be no problems.” That evening, “at approximately 10.30 p.m., unidentified men fired at the Rodríguez Quintero brothers’ vehicle and, following the intervention of Colonel Efraín Oswaldo Aragón, a member of the National Police responsible for human rights, the local Police came to the house and detained three individuals”;
- (h) “Subsequently, around midnight, an unidentified man telephoned the RODRÍGUEZ QUINTERO brothers’ home and threatened them to make them withdraw the complaint”;
- (i) On February 5, [2007,] the representatives “contacted the Director of Human Rights and International Humanitarian Law of the Vice Presidency, the Director of Human Rights and International Humanitarian Law of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and Colonel Aragón, and coordinated with them an escort from the National Police to remove the RODRÍGUEZ QUINTERO brothers from the place where they were in danger”; and
- (j) “Wilmar and Yimmy are in an extremely grave situation of vulnerability and danger. [...] Members of the paramilitary groups continue intimidating the

population [in Northern Santander], which is in a situation of extreme defenselessness, because 'the demobilized paramilitaries,' who have now legalized their situation, are acting with complete freedom and retain their organizational structures [...]"

11. In light of the above, the representatives requested the Court to require the State:

(a) To order immediate, effective actions to guarantee the life and personal integrity of Wilmar and Yimmy RODRÍGUEZ QUINTERO and their next of kin.

(b) In this regard, to order the implementation of preventive measures that impede the continued threats from companions of the individuals who retained by the police authorities.

(c) To take adequate measure of protection immediately, in coordination with the beneficiaries and their representatives, so that the beneficiaries can continue their daily life in Ocaña or, if this is not possible, the necessary measures to transfer the place of residence of the RODRÍGUEZ QUINTERO brothers and their families to another zone where the State can guarantee their personal integrity.

(d) To inform the Court of the measures it has taken and is taking to control and prevent the activities of paramilitary groups in the region where the facts on which this petition is based occurred and, specifically, of the actions taken to control the conduct of the members of the groups of "demobilized paramilitaries" in Ocaña.

12. The Order of the President of the Court (hereinafter "the President") of February 6, 2007, in which, in consultation with the other judges of the Court, he decided: (1) to reiterate to the State that it must adopt and maintain the necessary measures to protect the right to life and personal integrity of Sandra Belinda Montero Fuentes, and her children, Manuel Ayala Montero and María Paola Casanova Montero; and of Salomón Flórez Contreras, Luis José Pundor Quintero and Ana Diva Quintero Quintero de Pundor, and their respective families; (2) to expand the measures in the case of the 19 Tradesmen and to require the State to adopt, forthwith, all necessary measures to protect the rights to life and personal integrity of Wilmar Rodríguez Quintero and Yimmy Efraín Rodríguez Quintero, and also of their next of kin, taking into account the information provided by the representatives concerning the specific members of the said households who need protection; (3) to require the representatives to forward to the Court the requested information concerning the specific individuals who need protection, within five days; (4) to require the State to investigate the facts that gave rise to the adoption of the urgent measures and, if applicable, identify those responsible and impose the corresponding sanctions; (5) to require the State to allow the beneficiaries of the measures or their representatives to take part in their planning and implementation and, in general, to keep them informed about progress in implementation; (6) to require the State, within ten days, to inform the Court about the measures it had adopted to comply with this Order; (7) to request the beneficiaries of these measures or their representatives to submit any observations they deem pertinent to the Court, within five days of notification of the State's report; (8) to request the Inter-American Commission to submit any observations it deems pertinent to the Inter-American Court of Human Rights, within seven days of notification of the State's report, and (9) to require the State to continue reporting to the Court, every two months, on compliance with the measures adopted and to require the beneficiaries of these measures or their representatives to submit their observations on the State's bi-monthly reports within four weeks of receiving them, and the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights to submit its observations on the State's reports within six weeks of receiving them.

13. The note of the Secretariat of the Court of February 22, 2007, in which, on the instructions of the President, it reminded the State that the time limit for presenting the report required in the sixth operative paragraph of the Order issued by the President on February 6, 2007 (*supra* twelfth having seen paragraph), had expired on February 17, 2007.

14. The brief of February 23, 2007, in which the representatives forwarded their response to the request for information in the third operative paragraph of the Order issued by the President of the Court on February 6, 2007 (*supra* twelfth having seen paragraph). In this regard, the representatives provided "the names of the persons for whom implementation of measures of protection is required":

Wilmar Rodríguez Quintero, beneficiary, judgment of July 4, 2004  
 Yimmy Rodríguez Quintero, beneficiary, judgment of July 4, 2004  
 William Rodríguez Quintero, brother of beneficiaries  
 Jhon Carlos Rodríguez Quintero, nephew of beneficiaries  
 Nubia Saravia, wife of Yimmy Rodríguez Quintero  
 Karen Dayana Rodríguez Saravia, 11 years old, daughter of Yimmy and Nubia  
 Valeria Rodríguez Saravia, 2 months old, daughter of Yimmy and Nubia.

The representatives indicated that "this group of persons is displaced [...], because they had to leave Ocaña given the dangerous situation they faced, and the Court has been informed of this."

15. The brief submitted on February 23, 2007, with which the representatives forwarded a copy of "the letters [...] [they] have addressed to various Colombian authorities with regard to taking some concerted actions as protection mechanisms." From these letters, it appears, *inter alia*, that on February 6, 2007, "following coordination with the Director of Human Rights and International Humanitarian Law of the Vice Presidency, the Director of Human Rights and International Humanitarian Law of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and [a Colonel of the National Police], the support of the GAULA group of Ocaña was obtained to transfer the RODRÍGUEZ QUINTERO brothers [...] as an urgent measure of protection."

16. The brief submitted on May 7, 2007, in which the State reported on the measures adopted with regard to Wilmar Rodríguez Quintero and Yimmy Rodríguez Quintero. The State indicated, *inter alia*, that "the Commander of the Ocaña Police State and the Office for the Protection of Victims and Witnesses had been asked to take "the necessary measures to safeguard the life and integrity of the brothers, Wilmar and Yimmy Rodríguez Quintero." The State indicated that "during the year to date, three follow-up meetings had been held, on February 9 and 19, and on April 16, the latter in Ocaña, in order to review the measures of protection, and the actions carried out by the Army to combat the insurgency groups." The State indicated that "the petitioners have undertaken to forward the list of beneficiaries to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, specifying those who require special protection, because, it would appear from what has been said that some of them do not need protection." The State also presented information on the domestic investigations into the facts that had given rise to the measures.

**CONSIDERING:**

1. That Colombia has been a State Party to the American Convention on Human Rights (hereinafter “the Convention” or “the American Convention”) since July 31, 1973, and accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court on June 21, 1985.

2. That Article 63(2) of the Convention establishes that in “cases of extreme gravity and urgency, and when necessary to avoid irreparable damage to persons,” the Court may, with regard to a case not yet submitted to it, order such provisional measures as it deems pertinent, at the request of the Commission.

3. That, in this regard, Article 25 of the Rules of Procedure establishes that:

[...]

3. In contentious cases already submitted to the Court, the victims or alleged victims, their next of kin, or their duly accredited representatives, may present a request for provisional measures directly to the Court.

[...]

6. The beneficiaries of urgent measures or provisional measures ordered by the President may address their comments on the report made by the State directly to the Court. The Inter-American Commission of Human Rights shall present observations to the State’s report and to the observations of the beneficiaries or their representatives.

[...]

4. That urgent and provisional measures may also be ordered during the phase of monitoring compliance with judgment, provided the background information submitted to the Court reveals, *prima facie*, the existence of a situation of extreme gravity and urgency and imminent irreparable damage to persons.<sup>1</sup>

5. That Article 1(1) of the Convention establishes the obligation of the States Parties to respect the rights and freedoms recognized therein and to ensure to all persons subject to their jurisdiction the free and full exercise of those rights and freedoms. In compliance with this obligation to guarantee rights, the State Party has the obligation, *erga omnes*, to protect all those subject to its jurisdiction and this obligation is particularly evident as regards those who are involved in proceedings before the supervisory organs of the American Convention.<sup>2</sup>

6. That, under international human rights law, provisional measures are not only precautionary in nature, in the sense that they preserve a juridical situation, but are fundamentally protective, because they protect human rights, inasmuch as they seek to avoid irreparable damage to persons. Provided the basic requirements of extreme

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Matter of Gloria Giralte de García Prieto et al.* Provisional measures. Order of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights of January 27, 2007, fifth considering paragraph; *Matter of the Communities of Jiguamiandó and Curbaradó.* Provisional measures. Order of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights of February 7, 2006, fourth considering paragraph; and *Matter of the Peace Community of San José de Apartadó.* Provisional measures. Order of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights of February 2, 2006, fourth considering paragraph.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Matter of the Penitentiary Center of the Central Occidental Region (Uribana Prison).* Provisional measures. Order of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights of February 2, 2007, fifth considering paragraph; *Matter of the Pueblo indígena de Kankuamo.* Provisional measures. Order of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights of January 30, 2007, fourth considering paragraph; and *Matter of the Yare I and Yare II Capital Region Penitentiary Center.* Provisional measures. Order of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights of March 30, 2006, fourteenth considering paragraph.

gravity and urgency and the prevention of irreparable damage to persons are met, provisional measures of protection become a real jurisdictional guarantee of a preventive nature.<sup>3</sup>

7. That, in paragraph 280 of the judgment on merits, reparations, and costs in the case of the 19 Tradesmen delivered on July 5, 2004, the Court decided that the State should pay particular attention to ensuring the life, integrity and safety of those who gave testimony before the Court and their next of kin, and provide them with the necessary protection against any person, taking into account the circumstances of this case, and because most of the victims' next of kin who gave testimony before the Court and before notary public expressed their fear of reprisals.

8. That, in Orders of September 3, 2004, and July 4, 2006, the Court required Colombia to adopt the necessary measures to protect the rights to life and personal integrity of Sandra Belinda Montero Fuentes and next of kin, Salomón Flórez and next of kin, Luis José Pundor Quintero and next of kin, and Ana Diva Quintero Quintero de Pundor and next of kin.

9. That the background information provided by the representatives in their request for expansion of measures (*supra* ninth, tenth and eleventh having seen paragraphs) reveals *prima facie* a situation of urgent and grave danger for the life and personal integrity of Wilmar Rodríguez Quintero and Yimmy Efraín Rodríguez Quintero, brothers of Gerson Javier Rodríguez Quintero, victim in the case of the 19 Tradesmen. Wilmar Rodríguez Quintero testified before the Inter-American Court during the public hearing in the case of the 19 Tradesmen, held on April 21 and 22, 2004.

10. That, in response to the request made in the third operative paragraph of the Order of the President of February 6, 2007 (*supra* twelfth having seen paragraph), the representatives provided the names of the next of kin of Wilmar Rodríguez Quintero and Yimmy Rodríguez Quintero who need protection (*supra* fourteenth having seen paragraph). This information was forwarded to Colombia.

11. That, in response to the request made in the fourth operative paragraph of the Order of the President of February 6, 2007 (*supra* twelfth having seen paragraph), on February 23, 2007 (*supra* fifteenth having seen paragraph), the representatives indicated that the State had provided "support" to transfer the Rodríguez Quintero brothers to another town, "as an urgent measure of protection." On May 7, 2007 (*supra* sixteenth having seen paragraph), the State reported on the measures taken towards adopting measures of protection and also on the investigations that had been initiated into the facts that gave rise to the measures. In addition, the State did not contest the representatives' indication that the next of kin of the beneficiaries, Wilmar Rodríguez Quintero and Yimmy Rodríguez Quintero, needed protection. However, it indicated that "the petitioners have undertaken to forward the list of beneficiaries to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, specifying those

---

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *Matter of the Penitentiary Center of the Central Occidental Region (Uribana Prison)*. Provisional measures. Order of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights of February 2, 2007, fourth considering paragraph; *Matter of the Pueblo indígena de Kankuamo*. Provisional measures. Order of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights of January 30, 2007, fifth considering paragraph; and *Matter of the Yare I and Yare II Capital Region Penitentiary Center*. Provisional measures. Order of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights of March 30, 2006, fifth considering paragraph.

who require special protection, because it would appear from what has been said that some of them do not need protection.”

12. That, having examined the facts and circumstances that justified the Order of the President of February 6, 2007, to expand the measures in favor of two beneficiaries and their next of kin (*supra* ninth, tenth and eleventh having seen paragraphs) and the information provided by the representatives (*supra* fourteenth, fifteenth and sixteenth having seen paragraphs), the Court considers it appropriate to ratify the decisions taken by the President, because the information submitted reveals, *prima facie*, that Wilmar Rodríguez Quintero and Yimmy Rodríguez Quintero and their next of kin are in a situation of extreme gravity and urgency, because their life and personal integrity are threatened and in grave danger. The standard for the *prima facie* assessment of a case and the application of presumptions in the face of the need for protection have led the Court to order provisional measures on different occasions.<sup>4</sup>

13. That, based on the detailed list presented by the representatives concerning the next of kin of Wilmar Rodríguez Quintero and Yimmy Rodríguez Quintero who require provisional measures (*supra* fourteenth having seen paragraph), the Court considers that the measures adopted by the President should also protect: Nubia Saravia, wife of Yimmy Rodríguez Quintero; Karen Dayana Rodríguez Saravia, 11 years old, and Valeria Rodríguez Saravia, 2 months old, both daughters of Yimmy Rodríguez Quintero; William Rodríguez Quintero, brother of the beneficiaries; and Jhon Carlos Rodríguez Quintero, nephew of the beneficiaries. The Court emphasizes that, according to the representatives, these persons had to move to another town owing to the dangerous situation they faced in Ocaña.

14. That, the Court considers it does not have up-to-date, clear and precise information about the danger of their situation and effective measures of protection with regard to the other beneficiaries of these measures adopted by the Court (Sandra Belinda Moreno Fuentes, Salomón Flórez, Luis José Pundor, Ana Diva Quintero Quintero de Pundor, and their respective families). The Court considers that the State must submit precise current information in this regard, so that it has the necessary information to assess the implementation of the measures.

**THEREFORE:**

**THE INTER-AMERICAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS,**

pursuant to the authority conferred by Article 63(2) of the American Convention on Human Rights and Article 25 of its Rules of Procedure

**DECIDES:**

1. To ratify all the terms of the Order of the President of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights of February 6, 2007.

---

<sup>4</sup> Cf. *Matter of the Yare I and Yare II Capital Region Penitentiary Center*. Provisional measures. Order of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights of March 30, 2006, twentieth considering paragraph; *Matter of Monagas Judicial Confinement Center (“La Pica”)*. Urgent measures. Order of the President of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights of January 13, 2006, sixteenth considering paragraph; and *Matter of Children Deprived of Liberty in the “Complexo do Tatuapé” of FEBEM*. Provisional measures. Order of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights of November 30, 2005, twenty-second considering paragraph.

2. To require the State of Colombia to maintain any measures it has already adopted and to adopt, forthwith, the necessary measures to protect the rights to life and personal integrity of Wilmar Rodríguez Quintero and Yimmy Efraín Rodríguez Quintero and their next of kin: Nubia Saravia, wife of Yimmy Rodríguez Quintero; Karen Dayana Rodríguez Saravia and Valeria Rodríguez Saravia, both daughters of Yimmy Rodríguez Quintero; William Rodríguez Quintero, brother of Wilmar and Yimmy Rodríguez Quintero; and Jhon Carlos Rodríguez Quintero, nephew of Wilmar and Yimmy Rodríguez Quintero.
3. To reiterate to the State that it must adopt and maintain the necessary measures to protect the rights to life and personal integrity of Sandra Belinda Montero Fuentes, and her children, Juan Manuel Ayala Montero and María Paola Casanova Montero; and Salomón Flórez Contreras, Luis José Pundor Quintero and Ana Diva Quintero Quintero de Pundor, and their respective families.
4. To require the State to investigate the facts that gave rise to the adoption of these provisional measures and, if applicable, identify those responsible and impose the corresponding sanctions.
5. To require the State to allow the beneficiaries of these measures or their representatives to take part in the planning and implementation of the measures and, in general, keep them informed of progress in their execution.
6. To require the State to inform the Inter-American Court of Human Rights about the measures it has adopted to comply with this Order, within fifteen days of its notification.
7. To request the beneficiaries of these measures or their representatives to submit any observations they deem pertinent to the Inter-American Court of Human Rights, within five days of notification of the State's report.
8. To request the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights to submit any observations it deems pertinent to the Inter-American Court of Human Rights, within ten days of notification of the State's report.
9. To require the State to continue reporting to the Inter-American Court of Human Rights on compliance with the measures adopted, every two months, and to require the beneficiaries of these measures or their representatives to submit their observations on the State's bi-monthly reports within four weeks of receiving them, and on the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights to present its observations on the State's reports within six weeks of receiving them.
10. To require the Secretary of the Court to notify this Order to the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, the representatives of the beneficiaries of these measures, and the State.

Sergio García Ramírez  
President

Cecilia Medina Quiroga

Manuel E. Ventura Robles

Diego García-Sayán

Leonardo A. Franco

Margarette May Macaulay

Rhadys Abreu Blondet

Pablo Saavedra Alessandri  
Secretary

So ordered,

Sergio García Ramírez  
President

Pablo Saavedra Alessandri  
Secretary