

CASES OF REVESNO, BIGNOSO, STIZ, MARCHIERO, AND FANTI

RALSTON, *Umpire*:

The above cases, all from Colonia Bolívar, came to the umpire on difference of opinion between the honorable Commissioners for Italy and Venezuela.

It is urged on behalf of Italy that the above cases come from a distance not greater than 30 miles from Caracas, that the takings were all by Matos revolutionists under command of General Rolando, and occurred during the months of May and October, 1902, and January, February, March, April, May, June, and July of 1903, happening at Custire, El Bautiamo, Chispita, and Colonia Bolívar; that by reason of their nearness to Caracas they could have been prevented by the exercise of proper diligence, and that therefore these cases are exceptions to the general rule laid down in the Sambiaggio case, No. 15,¹ and affirmed in the Guastini case, No. 225.²

A study of these cases will show that the burden of proving want of diligence

¹ See *supra*, p. 499.

² See *supra*, p. 561.

rests upon the claimants. In the "expedientes" now under consideration not a word of affirmative proof is furnished to show negligence on the part of the Government. The umpire is aware of the fact that for several months the revolutionists remained within a short distance of Caracas without being dislodged by the Government, or perhaps without a serious attempt being made to dislodge them. But he is also aware that during that time war was being actively prosecuted over large areas of the country, while the external relations of Venezuela were in a state of danger. He is unable, and if furnished with data would doubt his right, to judge as to the military or political considerations which made military activity or concentration more necessary in one portion of the country than another.

Furthermore, he knows nothing of the relative strength of the forces of General Rolando and of the Government in this neighborhood or their advantages of location. He only knows that when the tension was apparently released elsewhere the forces of Rolando were attacked and ultimately defeated.

The claimants, so far as the evidence shows, never made any appeal to the Government for protection, as it was their right to do if they desired to obtain it, and although such appeal, if made, might have had an important effect upon the question of liability.

In view of the foregoing an order dismissing said cases will be signed.