

**ORDER OF THE  
INTER-AMERICAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS  
OF FEBRUARY 28, 2011  
CASE OF THE ITUANGO MASSACRES v. COLOMBIA  
MONITORING COMPLIANCE WITH JUDGMENT**

**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 1, 2006 (hereinafter "the judgment"), in the case of the Ituango Massacres.
2. The Order on monitoring compliance with judgment issued by the Court on July 7, 2009, in which it declared:
  1. That, in accordance with Considering clauses 50, 54 and 72 of th[e] Order, the State has complied with the following obligations:
    - a) Implement, within a reasonable time, permanent training programs on human rights and international humanitarian law for the Colombian Armed Forces [*operative paragraph twenty-one of the judgment*];
    - b) Publish once, in the official gazette and in another newspaper with national circulation, the chapter on the proven facts in the judgment, without the corresponding footnotes, and the operative paragraphs of the judgment (*operative paragraph twenty-two of the judgment*); and
    - c) Pay the amounts ordered as reimbursement of costs and expenses arising in the domestic sphere and in the international proceedings before the inter-American system for the protection of human rights (*operative paragraph twenty-five of the judgment*).
  2. That, in accordance with Considering clause 71 of th[e] Order, the State has partially complied with the obligation to pay the persons indicated in Appendixes I, II and III of the judgment the compensation for pecuniary and non-pecuniary damage (*operative paragraphs twenty-three and twenty-four of the judgment*);
  3. That, in accordance with Considering clauses 16, 20, 26, 32, 36, 40, 44, 54 and 71 of th[e] Order, the following obligations are pending compliance:
    - a) Take the necessary measures to provide justice in this case (*operative paragraph fifteen of the judgment*);
    - b) Provide, free of charge, and through the national health services, the appropriate treatment required by the next of kin of the victims executed in this case (*operative paragraph sixteen of the judgment*);
    - c) Take the necessary measures to guarantee safe conditions for the former inhabitants of El Aro and La Granja, who were forced to displace, to return to El Aro or La Granja, as applicable and if they so desire [*operative paragraph seventeen of the judgment*];
    - d) Organize a public act to acknowledge international responsibility for the facts of this case in the presence of senior authorities (*operative paragraph eighteen of the judgment*);
    - e) Implement a housing program, to provide appropriate housing to the surviving victims who lost their homes and who require this [*operative paragraph nineteen of the judgment*];

- f) Erect a plaque in an appropriate public place in La Granja and in El Aro, so that the new generations know about the events that resulted in this case (*operative paragraph twenty of the judgment*);
- g) Publish once, in the Official Gazette, the chapter on the proven facts in this judgment, without the corresponding footnotes and the operative paragraphs of the judgment (*operative paragraph twenty-two of the judgment*), and
- h) Pay the persons indicated in Appendixes I, II and III of the judgment, the compensations for pecuniary and non-pecuniary damage (*operative paragraphs twenty-three and twenty-four of the judgment*).
3. The brief of November 17, 2009, in which the Republic of Colombia (hereinafter “the State” or “Colombia”) forwarded its third report on compliance with the judgment.
4. The brief of April 5, 2010, in which the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (hereinafter “the Inter-American Commission” or “the Commission”) forwarded its observations on the State’s report (*supra* third having seen paragraph).
5. The Order of the President of the Court of April 29, 2010, in which he convened the State, the representatives and the Inter-American Commission to a private hearing on monitoring compliance in order to examine the implementation of the measure of reparation ordered in the sixteenth operative paragraph of the judgment, regarding the medical, psychiatric and psychological treatment, as well as similar measures of reparation ordered in another seven cases with regard to Colombia.<sup>1</sup>
6. The private hearing on monitoring compliance held at the seat of the Court on May 19, 2010, on the measure of reparation concerning medical, psychiatric and psychological treatment.
7. The Order of the Court of May 25, 2010, in which it decided to authorize the State to deliver a percentage of the compensation established in favor of María Oliva Calle’s three children, child victims, specifically to purchase a house.
8. The brief of July 26, 2010, in which the representatives of the victims (hereinafter “the representatives”) submitted their observations on the State’s report and specific information requested in the Order of July 7, 2009.
9. The communications of August 23, September 7 and October 5, 2010, in which the representatives, the State, and the Inter-American Commission, respectively, referred to the requested submitted to the Court by the representatives for the State to make an additional payment to acquire a house for three minor victims.
10. The Order of the President of the Court of December 22, 2010, in which he convened the State, the representatives and the Inter-American Commission to a private hearing on monitoring compliance with judgment.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Case of the 19 Tradesmen v. Colombia. Merits, reparations and costs.* Judgment of July 5, 2004. Series C No. 109; *Case of Gutiérrez Soler v. Colombia. Merits, reparations and costs.* Judgment of September 12, 2005. Series C No. 132; *Case of the “Mapiripán Massacre” v. Colombia. Merits, reparations and costs.* Judgment of September 15, 2005. Series C No. 134; *Case of the Pueblo Bello Massacre v. Colombia. Merits, reparations and costs.* Judgment of January 31, 2006. Series C No. 140; *Case of the La Rochela Massacre v. Colombia. Merits, reparations and costs.* Judgment of May 11, 2007. Series C No. 163; *Case of Escué Zapata v. Colombia. Merits, reparations and costs.* Judgment of July 4, 2007. Series C No. 165 and *Case of Valle Jaramillo et al. v. Colombia. Merits, reparations and costs.* Judgment of November 27, 2008. Series C No. 192.

11. The private hearing on monitoring compliance with the judgment held on February 25, 2011, during the Court's ninetieth regular session.<sup>2</sup>

**CONSIDERING THAT:**

1. One of the inherent attributes of the jurisdictional functions of the Court is to monitor compliance with its decisions.

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

3. Article 68(1) of the American Convention stipulates that "[t]he States Parties to the Convention undertake to comply with the judgment of the Court in any case to which they are parties." To this end, the State must ensure implementation at the national level of the Court's decisions in its judgments.<sup>3</sup>

4. In view of the final and non-appealable nature of the judgments of the Court, as established in Article 67 of the American Convention, the State must comply with them fully and promptly.

5. Article 69 of the Court's Rules of Procedure<sup>4</sup> stipulate that:

1. The procedure for monitoring compliance with the judgments and other decisions of the Court shall be carried out through the submission of reports by the State and observations to those reports by the victims or their legal representatives. The Commission shall present observations to the State's reports and to the observations of the victims or their representatives.

2. The Court may require from other sources of information relevant data regarding the case in order to evaluate compliance therewith. To that end, the Tribunal may also request the expert opinions or reports that it considers appropriate.

---

<sup>2</sup> The following persons appeared at this hearing: (a) for the State: Francisco Javier Echeverri Lara, Director of Human Rights and International Humanitarian Law of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs; Juan Carlos Forero Ramírez, Assistant Prosecutor General; Hernán Jaime Ulloa Venegas, Director of the President's Human Rights Program; Gloria Beatriz Gaviria Ramos, Head of the Office of Cooperation and International Relations of the Social Protection Ministry; Alex de Jesús Salgado Lozano, Director of Legal Affairs of the Ministry of Defense; Elena Ambrosi Turbay, Director of Human Rights of the Ministry of Defense; Hernando Castañeda Ariza, Head of the National Human Rights and International Humanitarian law Unit of the Prosecutor General's Office; Jorge Alexander Vargas Mesa, Executive Director of the Housing Nationalization Fund; César Vegara Gutiérrez, Adviser to the Sub-Directorate for Attention to the Displaced Population-Social Action; Paulina Gómez Borda, Chargé d'Affaires a.i., of the Embassy of Colombia in Costa Rica; Felipe Medina Ardila, Coordinator of the Inter-institutional Operational Group; Claudia Paola Redondo Polo, Adviser to the Inter-institutional Operational Group; Orlando Páez Barón, Inspector General of the National Police; John Henry Arango Alzáte, Coordinator of the Human Rights Group of the National Police, and Daniel Vásquez Franco, Director of the Housing System of the Vice Ministry of Housing and Territorial Development. In addition, there appeared: (b) for the Inter-American Commission: Lilly Ching Soto, adviser, and (c) for the representatives: John Arturo Cárdenas Mesa, Juliana Bravo Valencia, Erick Benjamín Aldana Mendoza and María Victoria Fallon Morales, of the *Grupo Interdisciplinario por los Derechos Humanos* (GIDH).

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *Case of Baena Ricardo et al. v. Panama. Competence*. Judgment of November 28, 2003, Series C. No. 104, para. 131; *Case of Valle Jaramillo et al. v. Colombia. Monitoring compliance with judgment*. Order of the President of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights of December 21, 2010, third considering paragraph, and *Case of the Ituango Massacres v. Colombia. Monitoring compliance with judgment*. Order of President of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights of December 22, 2010, third considering paragraph.

<sup>4</sup> Rules of Procedure of the Court approved at its eight-fifth regular session held from November 16 to 28, 2009.

3. When it deems it appropriate, the Tribunal may convene the State and the victims' representatives to a hearing in order to monitor compliance with its decisions; the Court shall hear the opinion of the Commission at that hearing.

4. Once the Tribunal has obtained all relevant information, it shall determine the state of compliance with its decisions and issue the relevant orders.

5. These rules also apply to cases that have not been submitted by the Commission.

6. The States Parties to the Convention that have accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court are bound to abide by the obligations established by the Court. This duty includes the State's obligation to report on the measures adopted to comply with the measures ordered by the Court in the said decisions. The prompt observance of the State's obligation to inform the Court about how it is complying with each aspect ordered by the Court is fundamental for evaluating the status of compliance in each case.<sup>5</sup>

*a) Regarding the sixteenth operative paragraph of the judgment*

7. Regarding the State's obligation to provide the appropriate treatment required by the next of kin of the victims who were executed during the facts of this case, the Court received information from the State and the representatives of the victims about the implementation of this measure of reparation during the private hearing on monitoring compliance (*supra* sixth having seen paragraph). The Court will rule opportunely on all the information received while processing the joint monitoring of the eight Colombian cases.

*b) Regarding the twenty-second operative paragraph of the judgment*

8. In relation to the obligation to publish the proven facts and the operative paragraphs of the judgment in the Official Gazette, the State indicated that, on April 28, 2009, it had published the pertinent sections of the judgment and attached a copy of the publication;<sup>6</sup> consequently, it asked that the Court "decree total compliance with this measure of reparation." In this regard, the representatives stated that they were aware of the publication, which had been made in very small print. The Commission had already "noted the State's compliance with [this] obligation" in its observations on the State's third report (*supra* fourth having seen paragraph).

9. The Court observes that the State has complied with this measure of reparation.

*c) Regarding the twenty-third and twenty-fourth operative paragraphs of the judgment*

10. With regard to the request made by the Court in its Order of July 7, 2009, for complete and specific information in order to corroborate compliance with the obligation to pay the compensation for pecuniary and non-pecuniary damage indicated

<sup>5</sup> Cf. *Case of the Five Pensioners v. Peru. Monitoring compliance with judgment*. Order of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights of November 17, 2004, fifth considering paragraph; *Case of the Miguel Castro Prison v. Peru. Monitoring compliance with judgment*. Order of the acting President of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights of December 21, 2010, eighth considering paragraph, and *Case of the Ituango Massacres v. Colombia*, *supra* note 3, sixth considering paragraph.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. *Diario Oficial* of the Republic of Colombia of April 29, 2009, pp. 17 to 23 (monitoring compliance file, tome II, folios 761 to 767).

in Appendixes I, II and III of the judgment of July 1, 2006, the State indicated that “[r]ecognition of individuals who [were] not listed in the judgment resulted from the fact that the *Grupo Interdisciplinario de Derechos Humanos* [(the representatives)] proved to the Ministry [of Defense] the relationship of the beneficiaries with the victims, in compliance with paragraph 358 of the judgment.” In this regard, the State forwarded a list of individuals who were recognized by resolutions issued by the Ministry of Defense and who did not appear on the appendices to the judgment, with their names and their relationship to the victims.

11. The representatives stated, in general, “that all the information forwarded by the State concerning the payment of compensation is correct; however, in order to declare that the measure referred to in Appendix III has been complied with, it should be taken into account that the housing program is part of this and has not yet been fulfilled.” They also indicated that the case of Mercedes Barrera is the only one pending, and it will be examined below (*infra* \* considering paragraph).

12. Regarding the alleged failure to make the payment in favor of the next of kin of the victim Omar Ivan Gutiérrez Nohava, the State indicated that the statement of sums due in the judgment failed to acknowledge the payments made by the State to seven of his next of kin under Resolution 1459 of September 12, 2005, in which it ordered payment for the damages recognized in the conciliatory agreement, which exceeded the amounts established in the Court’s judgment. The State indicated that there was a similar situation with two next of kin of Otoniel de Jesús Tejada because, under Resolution 1458 of December 12, 2005, payment was ordered for the damages recognized in the conciliatory agreement that exceeded the compensation established by the Court. The representatives did not contest the information presented by the State.

13. Regarding the claims submitted directly to the Court by Marta Marleny Barrera Pino, and which were detailed in considering paragraph 63 of the Order of the Court of July 7, 2009, the State advised that “to date no claim [had been submitted].” For their part, the representatives reported that they have never represented her and that, according to the information systems of the contentious jurisdiction, no lawyer has represented her in complaints against the State.

14. With regard to the situation reported to the Court concerning José Marcelino Barrera Sucerquia and described in considering paragraph 64 of the Order of the Court of July 7, 2009, the State indicated that the compensation in his favor was paid under Resolution 5898 of December 28, 2007. In addition, the representatives advised that “as soon as they became aware of [Mr.] Barrera’s alleged disagreement with the sum he received and the sum paid to the *Grupo Interdisciplinario de Derechos Humanos* as fees, [they contacted him] to hear his version directly.” In this regard, the representatives advised that Mr. Barrera explained to them that another beneficiary, Rosa Posada, had told him that, in “2005, an amount had been paid out,” and that he should make a claim because he had not received anything. Lastly, regarding all these discrepancies, the representatives indicated that Mr. Barrera Sucerquia had stated “that he thought [the payment of fees] was in order and that he had not realized that the 2005 payment was for a complaint at the domestic level that he had never filed.” The representatives attached a statement made by Mr. Barrera before notary on March 9, 2010, certifying this statement.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> Cf. statement in relation to proceedings No. 00.1641 of March 9, 2010, given by José Marcelino Barrera Sucerquia (monitoring compliance file, tome III, folios 1177 and 1178).

15. Regarding the discrepancies about the compensation received by the beneficiary Rosa María Posada George, the State indicated that, in a note of June 9, 2008, it had informed the beneficiary of the amounts it had paid for the death of Marco Aurelio Aleiza. For their part, the representatives indicated that Mrs. Posada is illiterate and that, "owing to aversion and problems with the wife and children of Aurelio Aleiza – father of her children – she had signed with her fingerprint several petitions sent to the Court by an unknown person stating that the lawyer who processed the domestic proceedings had not paid her the sum that corresponded to her." The representatives indicated that they had charged Mrs. Posada 30% of the fees, in keeping with the prior oral agreement, which, according to the representatives, the beneficiary was trying to disregard.

16. Regarding Mercedes Barrera, whose compensation was established in Ministry of Defense Resolution 1946 of May 19, 2008, the State advised that the amount was deposited in a bank account so that her heirs could request it, a procedure that has not been carried out to date. During the private hearing, the representatives indicated that the heirs of Mercedes Barrera had not been able to access the amount deposited in their favor because the Treasury Department of the Ministry of Defense would not permit this without the corresponding succession procedures. In their opinion it was impossible to comply with because, owing to the way in which the events occurred, there is no death certificate for the victim, or other documents required for this procedure. During the private hearing, the representatives proposed that the State should assume the obligation to issue a death certificate for Mercedes Barrera in order to enable compliance with the requirement for the succession procedures. The State did not refer to this proposal.

17. In relation to the deposit of the compensation established in favor of minors, the State advised that: (a) it had handed over to their respective representatives the revenue generated in favor of Juan Carlos Calle Fernández, Deysi Tatiana Calle Fernández, Johan Daniel Calle Fernández, Cristian de Jesús Calle Fernández and Juan Felipe Zuleta Cossio; (b) regarding Nelson Adrián Palacio Jaramillo, Francisco Daniel Córdoba, Eliana Julliet Gutiérrez Jiménez and Juliana Andrea Gutiérrez Jiménez, at this date, they have the capital deposited in their favor and the interest earned, and (c) it had handed over the amounts decided in favor of William Alejandro Villa Henao, Omar Alveiro Calle Fenández, Carlos Adrian Zuleta Cossio and Julio Eliver Pérez Areiza, since they had all attained their majority. The representatives made no specific reference to the information provided by the State.

18. Furthermore, the State, the representatives and the Commission made no reference to the contents of the Order of December 22, 2010 (*supra* tenth having seen paragraph), in relation to the State's request to proceed immediately, as agreed, to complete the acquisition of the house in the name of the minors Deisy Tatiana, Johan Daniel and Cristian de Jesús Calle Fernández. Consequently, the Court understands that an agreement had been reached in this regard and that this aspect has been fulfilled.

19. The Court observes that the State has made the payments owed. Nevertheless, the Court takes note of the pending matter concerning the issue of inheritance so that Mercedes Barrera's heirs can access the amount deposited, and therefore asks the State and the representatives to present information in this regard. In these terms, the State has complied with the provisions of the twenty-third and twenty-fourth operative paragraphs of the judgment, with the said exception, regarding which the Court requires prompt information. The Court asks that the State, in its reports on this

issue, refer to the proposal made by the representatives (*supra* seventeenth considering paragraph).

d) *Regarding the twentieth operative paragraph of the judgment*

20. With regard to the obligation to erect a plaque in an appropriate public place in La Granja and in El Aro, the State indicated that “through the Superior Council of the Judicature it had carried out the internal administrative actions required to contract the elaboration of the plaques with the text suggested by the State.” In this regard, the State clarified that, when it implemented this measure, it had not received the representatives’ response. The State “regret[ed] that it had not reached agreement on the matter with the victims’ representatives” and indicated that it hoped “to have their collaboration for the erection of the plaques and the participation of the victims in that event.” During the private hearing, the State indicated that “the Court [...] had endorsed the measures taken by the State and [the] plaques have been made and are ready to be taken to the solemn act” with the text that it had advised to the Court; therefore, it continued to await the agreement with the victims in order to erect them.

21. The representatives clarified that the reason why they “had not responded in writing to the State’s proposal” was because they had approached “the matter [...] erroneously [...] as [a measure of reparation compliance with which was] connected to the public act” of acknowledgement of State responsibility. Regarding the texts that the State proposed for the plaques, they indicated that they “find them inadmissible, because they do not reflect what the Court declared proven in the judgment in the case; particularly, the direct participation of members of the Army in the events of El Aro and the participation of paramilitaries acting in connivance with law enforcement personnel in the case of La Granja.” In addition, they proposed a text that, in their opinion, should be inscribed on the plaques. The representatives acknowledged and appreciated that “the State had abstained from imposing its criteria unilaterally,” and asked the Court whether “the State may – in this particular case and following agreement on the text – come to an agreement with the victims and next of kin, through their representatives, on the best time and place to erect the commemorative plaques, without it being understood that the State had failed to comply with this aspect of the judgment.” During the hearing, they emphasized that the text “is inadmissible” and that they “will not approve it”; consequently, they asked the State to “open up the possibility of [negotiating] the text.”

22. The Court recalls that, the Order of July 7, 2009 (*supra* second having seen paragraph), clearly indicated that, if the representatives did not present observations on the State’s proposal within three months, it would be understood that they agreed to it, and consequently the State could proceed to implement it. The representatives delayed one year in sending their comments on the text proposed by the State for the elaboration of the plaques, and this was after the said time limit had expired. The Court observes that, during the hearing, the State put on record its willingness to negotiate the placement of the plaques, while the representatives stated that they were also open to discuss the text. Consequently, the Court asked the State, the Commission and the representatives to advise whether they can reach an agreement on the content of the plaques, respecting the terms of the judgment, as well as the way in which they will be erected

e) *Regarding the other operative paragraphs of the judgment*

23. Regarding the other operative paragraphs pending compliance (*supra* second having seen paragraph), during the hearing, the State presented updated information on: the progress in the investigations and the proceedings opened to determine and eventually punish the authors of the facts; the measures adopted to guarantee the conditions for the return to the districts of El Aro and La Granja; the State programs to provide socio-economic support to the displaced victims, even with regard to the decisions taken by the National Housing Fund (FONVIVIENDA) authorities to comply with the agreements reached between the State and the victims concerning the implementation of a housing program, and certain requirements for the public act of acknowledgement of international responsibility.

24. For their part, the representatives expressed their points of view and made proposals on the ways of complying with the above-mentioned State obligations. The Commission referred to some aspects of how it considered the facts should be investigated, and recognized and encouraged the spirit of cooperation between the State and the representatives for the remaining measures pending compliance.

25. The Court assesses positively the willingness of the State to dialogue and coordinate with the representatives in order to comply with the obligations established in the judgment that remain pending, even though it observes that there are discrepancies about the way in which they should be carried out. In accordance with the statements made during the hearing by the State and the representatives, as well as the willingness they expressed to reach agreement on the required coordination measures, the Court awaits specific, accurate and updated information in this regard.

26. While monitoring compliance with the pending aspects of this case, the Court assesses the usefulness of the respective hearing, which is reflected in the good will and spirit of cooperation that has been shown. The Court will consider the general status of compliance with the pending aspects of the judgment handed down in the instant case, when it has received the pertinent information.

**THEREFORE:**

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

in exercise of the powers of the Court to monitor compliance with its decisions, and in accordance with Articles 33 and 68(1) of the American Convention on Human Rights, Article 30 of the Court's Statute, and Articles 31 and 69 of its Rules of Procedure,

**DECLARES THAT:**

1. As indicated in the ninth and nineteenth considering paragraphs of this Order, the State has complied with the obligation to:

- a) Publish once, in the official gazette the chapter on the proven facts in the judgment, without the corresponding footnotes, and the operative paragraphs of the judgment (*twenty-second operative paragraph of the judgment*), and

- b) Pay the persons indicated in Appendixes I, II and III of the judgment the compensation for pecuniary and non-pecuniary damage (*twenty-third and twenty-fourth operative paragraphs of the judgment*), in the terms of the twelfth to nineteenth considering paragraphs of this Order.

2. As indicated in the eighth considering paragraph of this Order, the Court will monitor the State's obligation to provide the appropriate treatment required by the next of kin of the victims who were executed by monitoring jointly compliance with the measure of reparation concerning medical and psychological care ordered in eight Colombian cases (*sixteenth operative paragraph of the judgment*).

3. As indicated in the twenty-third to twenty-sixth considering paragraphs of this Order, the following obligations are pending compliance:

- a) Take the necessary measures to provide justice in this case (*fifteenth operative paragraph of the judgment*);
- b) Provide, free of charge, the appropriate treatment required by the next of kin of the victims executed in this case (*sixteenth operative paragraph of the judgment*);
- c) Take the necessary measures to guarantee safe conditions for the former inhabitants of El Aro and La Granja, who were forced to displace, to be able to return to El Aro or La Granja, as applicable and if they so desire (*seventeenth operative paragraph of the judgment*);
- d) Organize a public act to acknowledge international responsibility for the facts of this case in the presence of senior authorities (*eighteenth operative paragraph of the judgment*);
- e) Implement a housing program, to provide appropriate housing to the surviving victims who lost their homes and who require this (*nineteenth operative paragraph of the judgment*), and
- f) Erect a plaque in an appropriate public place in La Granja and in El Aro, so that the new generations know about the events that resulted in this case (*twentieth operative paragraph of the judgment*);

#### **AND DECIDES:**

1. To require the State of Colombia to adopt all necessary measures to comply promptly and effectively with the pending matters indicated in the third declarative paragraph *supra*, as stipulated in Article 68(1) of the American Convention on Human Rights.

2. To request the State of Colombia to submit to the Inter-American Court of Human Rights, by April 19, 2011, at the latest, a report indicating all the measures adopted to comply with the reparations ordered by this Court that are pending fulfillment, as indicated in considering paragraphs 19 and 23 to 26, and in the third declarative paragraph of this Order.

3. To request the representatives and the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights to present observations on the State's report mentioned in the preceding operative paragraph, as well as any other relevant information, within two and four weeks, respectively, of notification of the said report.

4. To require the Secretariat of the Court to notify this Order to the State, the Inter-American Commission and the representatives of the victims.

Diego García-Sayán  
President

Leonardo A. Franco

Manuel E. Ventura Robles

Margarette May Macaulay

Rhadys Abreu Blondet

Alberto Pérez Pérez

Eduardo Vio Grossi

Pablo Saavedra Alessandri  
Secretary

So ordered,

Diego García-Sayán  
President

Pablo Saavedra Alessandri  
Secretary