

THE PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE OF THE INTER-AMERICAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS

Second Edition

In this thoroughly revised second edition that incorporates the major changes made in the procedures and practice of the Inter-American Court since the original publication of this book, Jo M. Pasqualucci provides a comprehensive critique that is at once scholarly yet practical. She analyzes all aspects of the Court's advisory jurisdiction, contentious jurisdiction, and provisional measures orders through June 2012. She compares the practice and procedure of the Inter-American Court with that of the European Court of Human Rights, the International Court of Justice, and the United Nations Human Rights Committee. She discusses changes in the Rules of Procedure of the Inter-American Court that entered into force on January 1, 2010, and that substantially change the role of the Inter-American Commission in contentious cases before the Court. She also evaluates the challenges and means of State compliance with the Court's innovative reparations orders and describes several instances of State compliance and noncompliance.

Featuring revisions to every chapter to address the numerous new judgments, provisional measures, and orders adopted by the Court, this book will provide an important and updated resource for scholars, practitioners, and students of international human rights law.

Jo M. Pasqualucci is Professor of Law at the University of South Dakota. She earned an SJD in International and Comparative Law from George Washington University Law School and was affiliated with the Inter-American Court of Human Rights as a Fulbright scholar in Costa Rica. She lived in Central America for several years. Pasqualucci's articles on the Inter-American Court have been published in journals such as the Stanford Journal of International Law, Michigan Journal of International Law, Virginia Journal of International Law, Wisconsin International Law Journal, and the Human Rights Law Review.





The Practice and Procedure of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights

SECOND EDITION

JO M. PASQUALUCCI





CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, São Paulo, Delhi, Mexico City

Cambridge University Press 32 Avenue of the Americas, New York, NY 10013-2473, USA

www.cambridge.org Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781107006584

© Jo M. Pasqualucci 2003, 2013

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2003 Second edition published 2013

Printed in the United States of America

A catalog record for this publication is available from the British Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Pasqualucci, Jo M.

The practice and procedure of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights / Jo M. Pasqualucci, University of South Dakota, School of Law. – Second Edition.

pages cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-1-107-00658-4 (hardback)

Inter-American Court of Human Rights – Rules and practice.
 International courts – Rules and practice.
 Human rights – America.
 Title.

KDZ579.I58P37 2013

347.27[']05-DC23 2012014235

ISBN 978-1-107-00658-4 Hardback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of urls for external or third-party Internet Web sites referred to in this publication and does not guarantee that any content on such Web sites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.



To my father,

Lorenzo Pasqualucci,
who sparked and nurtured my love of learning





Contents

Foreword by Thomas Buergenthal	þage xv
Preface to the Second Edition	xvii
Preface	xxi
Acknowledgments	XXV
Table of Cases	xxvii
Table of Articles of the American Convention on Human Rights	xliii
Table of Rules of Procedure of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights	xlv
Table of Rules of Procedure of the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights	xlvii
Table of Other Legal Instruments and Documents	xlix
1 Introduction	1
The Inter-American Human Rights System	2
A Concise History of the Inter-American Court	6
Composition of the Court	8
Overview of Jurisdiction	10
The Court's Interpretation of the American Convention	12
An Illustrative Contentious Case	14
Facts	14
Procedures before the Commission	15
Jurisdiction of the Court	15
Initial Procedures before the Court	15
Provisional Measures	16
Partial Acceptance of International Responsibility	16



viii

Proceedings on the Merits

INTER-AMERICAN COURT

Cambridge University Press
978-1-107-00658-4 - The Practice and Procedure of the Inter-American Court of Human
Rights: Second Edition
Jo M. Pasqualucci
Frontmatter
More information

Contents

Decision on the Merits 16 Reparations 17 State Compliance 17 Past Procedural Advances Made by the Court and the Commission 17 More Recent Procedural Changes 19 Limitations Influencing the Effectiveness of the Inter-American System 24 Inadequate Funding of the Court and the Commission 24 Lack of Universality 26 Domestic Implementation Failure of the Political Organs to Exert Political Pressure 28 Quality Control of Judges Elected to the Court 30 Continuting Proposals to Alter the Inter-American System 32 Conclusion 34 PART I THE ADVISORY JURISDICTION OF THE

2	Advisory Practice and Procedure	37
	Character and Scope of the Inter-American Court's Advisory	
	Jurisdiction	38
	Jurisdiction Ratione Personae (Standing)	40
	Standing of Member States	41
	Standing of OAS Organs	42
	Jurisdiction Ratione Materiae (Subject Matter Jurisdiction)	46
	Jurisdiction to Issue Advisory Opinions Interpreting the	
	American Convention	47
	Interpretation of the Substantive Provisions of the American	
	Convention	48

Interpretation of the Procedural Provisions of the American

Jurisdiction to Issue Advisory Opinions Interpreting Other	
Treaties	54
Other Inter-American Treaties	56
Nonregional Treaties	57
Jurisdiction to Issue Advisory Opinions on the Compatibility of	
Domestic Laws of a Member State	5-

Domestic Laws of a Member State 57

Jurisdiction *Ratione Temporis* Following the Attempted

Withdrawal of a Request for an Advisory Opinion 59

Convention

52

16



3

Advisory Jurisdiction Subject to the Court's Discretion	59
Discretion to Exercise Advisory Jurisdiction over a Case in	- 1
Dispute between Two States or between a State and an	
International Organization	62
Discretion to Exercise Advisory Jurisdiction over a Dispute that is	
before Another International Body	65
Court Procedures Applicable to an Advisory Opinion Request	66
Requirements of the Request	68
Admissibility	69
Notification of the Submission	7°
Written Proceedings	71
Amicus Briefs	71
Preliminary Objections to an Advisory Request	73
Oral Proceedings	74
Content, Delivery, and Publication of Advisory Opinions	76
Domestic and Institutional Implementation of the Court's Advisory	
Opinions	77
Conclusion	8c
INTER-AMERICAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS Proceedings before the Inter-American Commission	83
Initial Processing of Petitions	85
Technical Informational Requirements	87
Six-Month Rule	88
Petition Not Substantially the Same as One Previously Studied or	
Pending before Another International Body	89
•	
Exhaustion of Domestic Remedies	92
	92
Exhaustion of Domestic Remedies Domestic Remedies Must Be Available, Adequate, Appropriate, and Effective	ŕ
Domestic Remedies Must Be Available, Adequate, Appropriate,	94
Domestic Remedies Must Be Available, Adequate, Appropriate, and Effective	94 97
Domestic Remedies Must Be Available, Adequate, Appropriate, and Effective Exceptions to the Exhaustion of Domestic Remedies	94
Domestic Remedies Must Be Available, Adequate, Appropriate, and Effective Exceptions to the Exhaustion of Domestic Remedies Decision on Admissibility	94 97 98
Domestic Remedies Must Be Available, Adequate, Appropriate, and Effective Exceptions to the Exhaustion of Domestic Remedies Decision on Admissibility Fact-Finding before the Commission	94 97 98
Domestic Remedies Must Be Available, Adequate, Appropriate, and Effective Exceptions to the Exhaustion of Domestic Remedies Decision on Admissibility Fact-Finding before the Commission Hearings before the Commission Are Not Required	94 97 98 101
Domestic Remedies Must Be Available, Adequate, Appropriate, and Effective Exceptions to the Exhaustion of Domestic Remedies Decision on Admissibility Fact-Finding before the Commission Hearings before the Commission Are Not Required On-Site Investigations in the State Are Not Required Presumption of the Truth of the Allegations in the Petition Friendly Settlement	94 97 98 101 101
Domestic Remedies Must Be Available, Adequate, Appropriate, and Effective Exceptions to the Exhaustion of Domestic Remedies Decision on Admissibility Fact-Finding before the Commission Hearings before the Commission Are Not Required On-Site Investigations in the State Are Not Required Presumption of the Truth of the Allegations in the Petition	94 97 98 101 101 103
Domestic Remedies Must Be Available, Adequate, Appropriate, and Effective Exceptions to the Exhaustion of Domestic Remedies Decision on Admissibility Fact-Finding before the Commission Hearings before the Commission Are Not Required On-Site Investigations in the State Are Not Required Presumption of the Truth of the Allegations in the Petition Friendly Settlement Withdrawal and Archiving of Petitions and Cases Reporting Requirements	94 97 98 101 103 105 106
Domestic Remedies Must Be Available, Adequate, Appropriate, and Effective Exceptions to the Exhaustion of Domestic Remedies Decision on Admissibility Fact-Finding before the Commission Hearings before the Commission Are Not Required On-Site Investigations in the State Are Not Required Presumption of the Truth of the Allegations in the Petition Friendly Settlement Withdrawal and Archiving of Petitions and Cases	94 97 98 101 103 105 106



x Contents

Extension of the Time Period for Submission of a Case Interstate Cases	
Jurisdiction of the Inter-American Court	
, Compétence de la compétence	
Scope of the Jurisdiction of the Inter-American Court	
Manner in which a State May Accept the Jurisdiction of the	
Inter-American Court	
Jurisdiction Ratione Materiae	
The "Fourth Instance Formula"	
Manifestly Groundless Petitions	
State Reservations Modifying the Ratione Materiae of the	
Convention	
Jurisdiction Ratione Personae	
Jurisdiction Ratione Personae: Passive Legitimation	
Jurisdiction Ratione Personae: Active Legitimation	
Jurisdiction Ratione Personae: Standing to File a Complaint with	
the Commission	
Jurisdiction Ratione Personae to Consider Petitions Filed by Any	
Person or Group of Persons	
Jurisdiction Ratione Personae to Consider Concrete Cases	
Jurisdiction Ratione Personae to Consider Cases in which the	
Victim Is an Individual or Shareholder in a Business	
Entity	
Jurisdiction Ratione Personae to Consider State-Filed Complaints	
Jurisdiction Ratione Temporis	
Lack of Jurisdiction Ratione Temporis If the Violation Took Place	
before the State Accepted the Jurisdiction of the Court	
Jurisdiction Ratione Temporis over Continuing Violations	
Forced Disappearance as a Continuing Violation	
The Failure to Investigate, Prosecute, and Punish May	
Constitute a Continuing Violation	
Violation of Property Rights May be a Continuing Violation	
Continuing Violations of Other Treaties	
State Acceptance of Jurisdiction with a Temporal Condition	
Jurisdiction Ratione Temporis over States that Denounce the	
Convention	
Jurisdiction Ratione Temporis over States that Attempt to	
Withdraw Acceptance of the Jurisdiction of the	
Court	
Jurisdiction Ratione Loci	



	Contents	xi
	Jurisdiction Ratione Loci Not Limited to a State's Physical	
	Territory Limitation of Jurisdiction <i>Ratione Loci</i> Must Be Expressly	147
	Permitted by Treaty	148
5	Proceedings on the Merits: Fact-Finding and Attribution	
	of State Responsibility	150
	The Scope of the Court's Fact-Finding Powers	151
	Submission of Evidence	152
	The Court's Authority to Admit Evidence on Its Own Motion	153
	Expert Witnesses	154
	Declarants	156
	Amicus Curiae	158
	Oral Proceedings	159
	Structure of Hearings	161
	Testimonial Evidence	163
	Objections to Witnesses and Alleged Victims	164
	Documentary Evidence	165
	Demonstrative Evidence	168
	Presumptions and Circumstantial Evidence	168
	Circumstantial Evidence	168
	Presumptions	169
	Burden of Proof	171
	Standard of Proof	173
	Judicial Notice	174
	Written Closing Arguments	175
	Discontinuance, Acquiescence, and Friendly Settlement	175
	Deliberations and Judgment	178
	Interpretation of Judgment	179
	Revision of Judgment on the Basis of Newly Discovered Facts or	0
	Fraudulent Evidence	181
	Attribution of State Responsibility	182
	Failure to Investigate and Punish Violations by Persons Not Acting on Behalf of the State	184
6	Victim Reparations	188
	Scope of the Inter-American Court's Authority to Order Reparations	189
	The Goal of Full Restitution (restitutio in integrum)	190
	The Injured Party	193
	Types of Reparations Ordered by the Inter-American Court	196
	Restitution	196



xii Contents

Restoration of Liberty to Persons Who Were Illegally Detained	197
The Return of Illegally Seized Property	197
Protection for Displaced Victims to Return to Their Homes	198
Reinstatement of Employment	198
Expungement of Public Records	199
Return, Demarcation, and Award of Title to the Ancestral Lands of	
Indigenous Communities	201
Miscellaneous Measures of Restitution to Restore the Status	
Quo Ante	201
Rehabilitation	202
Satisfaction	204
Public Act to Acknowledge Responsibility	204
State Apology	205
Publication or Dissemination of the Judgment of the	
Inter-American Court	205
Measures to Commemorate the Victims or the Events	206
Locating and Identifying the Victims	207
Educational Expenses and Training	208
Refrain from Execution	208
Community-Based Reparations	209
Miscellaneous Measures of Satisfaction	212
Guarantees of Nonrepetition	212
Capacity Building	212
Legislative Reform	214
Amend, Annul, or Repeal Incompatible Domestic Laws	214
Declaration that Domestic Law Lacks Legal Effect	217
Authority to Rule after the State Accepts International	
Responsibility	219
No Ruling If the Domestic Law Is No Longer in Effect	220
Court Order to Annul or Execute a Domestic Judgment or Ruling	220
Adopting Other Measures to Guarantee the Nonrepetition of	
Violations	222
Obligation to Investigate, Prosecute, and Punish	223
Investigation	224
Prosecution and Punishment	226
Judgment per se a Form of Reparations	228
Compensation	229
Pecuniary Damages	229
Loss of Earnings and Benefits	230
Beneficiaries of Lost Earnings of Deceased Victims	233
Consequential Damages	234



	Contents	xiii
	Nonpecuniary Damages	235
	Determination of Amount of Nonpecuniary Damages	238
	Beneficiaries of Deceased or Disappeared Victim's	
	Nonpecuniary Damages	239
	Costs and Expenses	240
	Attorneys Fees	241
	Costs and Expenses Based in Equity	243
	Terms of Payment	² 43
	Legal Assistance Fund	244
	No Reparations for Injury to the Victim's Life Plan	²⁴⁷
	Reparations Agreements between States and Victims	24 5
	Method of Compliance	²⁴ 7
	medica of complained	-+ /
7	Provisional Measures	251
	Statutory Authority	253
	Statutory Requirements	257
	Extreme Gravity	257
	Urgency	258
	Irreparable Damage	259
	Irreparable Damage to Persons	263
	Prima Facie Situation	265
	Inherent Authority to Order Provisional Measures	267
	Precautionary Measures Ordered by the Commission	268
	Entities Authorized to Request Provisional Measures	269
	Temporal Jurisdiction to Order Provisional Measures	270
	Expedited Procedures	272
	The President's Adoption of Urgent Measures When the Court Is	
	Not in Session	272
	Plenary Court's Consideration of Provisional Measures Requests	273
	Discretion to Order Provisional Measures	274
	Court Orders	275
	Beneficiaries of Provisional Measures	276
	Witnesses before Domestic and Inter-American Authorities	276
	Human Rights Advocates and Organizations	278
	Persons Deprived of Their Freedom	279
	Persons on Death Row	280
	Persons Dislocated during Internal Armed Conflicts	281
	Indigenous Communities	282
	Means of Protection	283
	Maintenance of Provisional Measures	285
	Lifting (Terminating) Provisional Measures	287



XIV	Contents	
	Binding Nature of Provisional Measures	291
	Monitoring Provisional Measures	293
	Domestic Implementation of Provisional Measures	294
	Conclusion	297
8	State Compliance with Court-Ordered Reparations	299
	Conventionality Control	300
	Monitoring State Compliance with Judgments	303
	State Acceptance of International Responsibility	306
	Voluntary Apology and Dissemination of the Truth	307
	Anticipatory Remedial State Action	308
	Implementation of Inter-American Court Orders to Pay	
	Compensatory Damages	309
	Prior Payment Authorized by States	310
	Implementation of Measures of Restitution	311
	Implementation of Measures of Rehabilitation	314
	Implementation of Measures of Satisfaction	315
	Implementation of Measures of Nonrepetition	320
	Capacitation Programs	320
	Legislative Reform	321
	Annul or Execute Domestic Court Rulings	3 ² 5
	Implementation of Orders to Investigate, Prosecute, and Punish	325
	Alternative Forms of Reparations	328
	Efforts to Improve Compliance with Court Orders	330
	Conclusion	334
Арр	oendix 1: American Convention on Human Rights	335
	pendix 2: Rules of Procedure of the Inter-American Court of Human	
	Rights	361
Bibi	liography	389
Inde	2X	401



Foreword

In 1978, when the American Convention on Human Rights entered into force, much of Central America and South America was ruled by dictatorships of either the right or the left. Of the eleven States whose ratifications had brought the Convention into force, fewer than one-half had democratically elected governments at the time. The remainder ratified for a variety of political reasons, including the pressure brought to bear by the Carter administration and the fact that some of these States were convinced that ratification posed no serious risks to them because the system established by the Convention would never be implemented. Effective human rights institutions were not something many governments in the region believed in at the time, but they were not opposed to a little window dressing for propaganda purposes. The attitude of these regimes toward human rights was graphically demonstrated when, shortly after the Convention entered into force, the General Assembly of the Organization of American States (OAS) failed to adopt a budget for the newly created Inter-American Court of Human Rights. Had it not been for funds provided by Costa Rica, the Court would have been paralyzed even before it began to perform its functions.

Over the years, however, the political climate in the Americas changed gradually, making it possible for the Inter-American system for the protection of human rights to play an increasingly important role. The fact that today all Latin American governments in the region, with the exception of Cuba, have been democratically elected has produced significant improvements in the human rights situation in these countries. These states have now also ratified the Convention and accepted the jurisdiction of the Court. This leaves only a small number of OAS member states – some Commonwealth Caribbean countries as well as the United States and Canada – out of the system established by the Convention.

The increase in the number of ratifications of the Convention and acceptances of the Court's jurisdiction has made it possible for more and more cases to be referred to the Court. Today the Court can point to a significant body of law that



xvi Foreword

has evolved from its judgments in contentious cases, its advisory opinions, as well as its provisional measures. In her book, Professor Jo M. Pasqualucci provides the first truly comprehensive and up-to-date analysis of this practice. Here we have a book that needed to be written. It puts all of us interested in the work and role of the Inter-American Court in her debt for writing it and for the fine scholarship it represents.

Scholars and practitioners will find in this book a valuable review of all relevant elements of the Court's practice, including issues relating to admissibility, fact-finding, provisional measures, oral and written proceedings, and scope of judgments. Also discussed are those aspects of the practice of the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights that bear on the work of the Court. The author discusses the new Rules of Procedure of the Court and the Commission and the legal consequences they have for the interrelationship between these two institutions. In addition to providing the reader with a practical guide to the Court's procedure and modus operandi that practitioners should find particularly useful, Professor Pasqualucci succeeds in carefully analyzing the Court's practice in a creative and sound critical manner

There is a great deal of material in these pages that scholars will find of value in seeking to understand the Court's jurisprudence and how it has evolved over the years. The book contains important insights about the Court's methodology and its transformation of the American Convention into an effective tool for the protection of human rights in the Americas, as well as various examples of the Court's contribution to international human rights law in general. No one trying to understand the manner in which the Court functions can afford to be without this book.

Professor Pasqualucci had been working on this book, which started as a doctoral dissertation, on and off for more than a decade. This led me and my successors as her dissertation supervisors to become increasingly concerned that the book would never see the light of day. Now it is clear, however, that at the time when we encouraged her to get on with the job, the Court's practice had not reached the level of judicial maturity or ripeness that would have enabled her to produce the truly valuable work she has now published. An impatient former professor herewith admits his error and expresses his delight with his former student's wisdom and patient scholarship that have resulted in the publication of this outstanding work.

Thomas Buergenthal Former President of the Inter-American Court and Judge, International Court of Justice



Preface to the Second Edition

Since the first edition of this book was published in 2003, the Inter-American Court of Human Rights has made major changes in its procedure and practice. In November 2009, as a result of a participatory and transparent communication process among all Inter-American human rights system participants, including Inter-American Court judges, commissioners, States, and civil society, the Inter-American Commission and the Inter-American Court modified their procedures relating to individual cases. The revised procedures make the Inter-American human rights system more efficient and transparent and further enhance the role of the victim. This second edition of the book incorporates the changes made in the procedures and practice of the Inter-American Court from 2003 through May 2012. During that time period, that Court has issued more than 135 new judgments, more than 300 provisional measures orders, and approximately 285 orders monitoring compliance with its judgments, which have allowed the Court to further develop its procedures in dealing with individual cases.

Chapter 1 provides a background of the Inter-American Court and introduces the changes made by the Commission and the Court since they redrafted their Rules of Procedure effective as of 2001. It also sets forth the stages of a sample case that was processed under the new procedures. The chapter concludes with a breakdown of the limitations and threats currently confronting the Inter-American Court in particular and the Inter-American human rights system in general.

Chapter 2 on Advisory Procedures needed little updating. The Court has issued only three advisory opinions since the first edition of this book was published in 2003. Most of the Court's activity has been in the area of its contentious jurisdiction and orders of provisional measures.

The former Chapter 3 on Preliminary Objections, which included jurisdictional challenges to the Court and complaints that the Commission had not followed the American Convention's admissibility procedures, has been divided into two chapters. The current Chapter 3 deals with proceedings before the Commission.

xvii



xviii

Preface to the Second Edition

All contentious cases must first be dealt with by the Commission before they can be referred to the Court. For those States that are not parties to the American Convention or have not accepted the jurisdiction of the Court, the proceeding before the Commission is the final stage in the Inter-American system. This chapter is relevant in that it sets forth the procedures with which the petitioners and the Commission are to comply if the Court is to reach the merits of the case. It is also the chapter that is most relevant for complaints brought against the United States, Canada, Belize, and some English-speaking Caribbean States because those complaints are handled solely by the Commission.

The Court Chapter 4 deals with jurisdictional issues before the American Court. The Court must have jurisdiction *ratione materiae*, *personae*, *temporis*, and *loci* to consider a case. The Court has particularly refined its jurisprudence in the area of jurisdiction *ratione temporis* for continuing violations, which are those violations that began before the State was subject to the Court's jurisdiction but that continued thereafter.

Chapter 5 describes and analyzes changes to the Court's procedures in contentious cases, particularly the revised role of the Inter-American Commission, which no longer represents victims before the Court. The Commission now represents the Inter-American public order of human rights. An Inter-American public defender is assigned to represent alleged victims who cannot afford legal representation, and the Victims' Legal Assistance Fund may pay for the production of evidence. The Court has also established expedited procedures to deal with the increased number of cases forwarded to it by the Commission, and it has further developed its evidentiary criteria.

Chapter 6 on Reparations has been completely reorganized to reflect the Court's well-developed jurisprudence in the area of reparations. In the last decade, the Court has honed its sweeping orders of victim-centered and community-centered equitable remedies, including measures of restitution, satisfaction, rehabilitation, and guarantees of nonrepetition. The Court has dealt with many multi-victim cases, some involving hundreds of victims who have been affected by massacres. These cases have required innovative forms of reparations. The Court has also rendered decisions in indigenous land rights cases in which it has ordered States to return ancestral lands to the indigenous people or to demarcate and grant them title to the lands on which they live. The Court's remedial orders may require compliance not only by the executive branch of the domestic government but also by the legislative and judicial branches.

Chapter 7 on Provisional Measures includes the modified grounds and procedures developed by the Court in ordering provisional measures. It evaluates the Court's standards for gravity, urgency, and irreparable damage to persons and sets forth the types of conditions in which the Court is likely to order or maintain provisional measures and when it is likely to terminate them. The chapter also analyzes State compliance and noncompliance with various orders of provisional measures.



Preface to the Second Edition

xix

Chapter 8 on State compliance sets forth those areas of Court-ordered reparations with which States have high, medium, and low rates of compliance. It focuses on the Court's monitoring of its reparations orders, evaluates the reasons that States do not comply with specific types of reparations, analyzes difficulties hindering State compliance, offers some resolutions, and provides examples of State compliance with every type of reparations ordered by the Court.





Preface

This work is the culmination of fifteen years of study of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights. I did not set out to study the Inter-American Court. In 1986, during my final year of law school, I was in the office of Professor Richard Bilder at the University of Wisconsin. I had decided to apply for a Fulbright fellowship, and he was helping me formulate my proposal. At that moment, Professor Bilder received a telephone call from his longtime friend Thomas Buergenthal, a judge on the Inter-American Court of Human Rights. In their conversation Professor Bilder mentioned that there was a student in his office who spoke Spanish and who was applying for a Fulbright to Central America. Judge Buergenthal immediately saw the possibility of having assistance with legal research. He offered to write a letter to the Fulbright Commission inviting me to be affiliated with the Court. That serendipitous telephone call led to my long-term relationship with the Inter-American Court and to the focus of my subsequent scholarship.

I began my tenure at the Court in 1986 when it was considering its first contentious cases, the *Honduran Disappearance Cases*. The experience opened my eyes to the realities of human rights abuse. I cried over letters in the file from the father of Francisco Fairén Garbi, a Costa Rican youth who disappeared on a trip through Central America. I vacillated between despair at the cruelty reflected in the facts of the cases, and excitement and awe at being present and involved in this historic stage of the Court's evolution. The Court was only beginning to set its jurisdictional parameters and to establish its rules on practice and procedure. It was like clerking for the U.S. Supreme Court in the days of John Marshall.

I remember long talks with Judge Buergenthal in which he expressed his absolute faith that we were slowly, step by step, building a system that would some day function effectively to protect human rights in the Western hemisphere. At that time there was little evidence that his faith would be fulfilled. Even the mention of human rights in many Latin American countries could result in the speaker being labeled a "communist." The Inter-American system was not functioning optimally.



xxii Preface

The Commission, which had been in existence since 1960, did not refer contentious cases to the Court for several years after the Court's formation. As a result, in the Court's first seven years of existence, the Court handed down only advisory opinions. Judge Buergenthal's quiet optimism and his belief in a positive future had a profound influence on my outlook. He explained the basis for his attitude in a speech that he delivered in 1986, when he, a Jewish survivor of Auschwitz and Sachsenhausen, accepted an honorary doctorate from the University of Heidelberg Faculty of Law in Germany. In it he asked,

Who would have thought in 1939, for example, that I would be standing here today; who would have believed in 1940 that there would exist a European Community composed of democratic nations, a European Parliament and a European Commission and Court of Human Rights, and that a new Germany would be a very important part of it all? Who would have believed then that at least a part of the Europe of old, with its nationalistic animosities and military rivalries, would undergo this transformation? Certainly no realist, and probably not even your average idealist. For an international lawyer who works in the field of human rights, these developments and the many others I could cite are a strong medicine against the loss of faith and a strong incentive for believing that what may appear impossible today may well come true tomorrow or the day after.

In every State, even those that appear to be the most recalcitrant human rights offenders, there are those who are attempting to enforce the rule of law. Those persons and organizations take great risks promoting democracy and human rights. Most others, although not active out of fear or malaise, would prefer to live in a State where human rights are observed. When the domestic institutions do not have the will or are not capable of prosecuting human rights violations and bringing human rights violators to justice, resort to international enforcement organs, such as the Inter-American Commission and Court, may be the only avenue to strengthen and support those on the domestic plane who are fighting for justice.

It is my hope that this study of the practice and procedure of the Inter-American Court will contribute to making possible the effective protection of human rights in the Americas. Procedural transparency, effectiveness, and efficiency are essential to the enforcement of substantive human rights. As such, the procedural evolution and the practice of the Inter-American Court have direct bearing on the fulfillment of individual human rights in the Americas.

This book includes, when relevant, an analysis of the cases and opinions rendered by the Court through May 2012, and of the Rules of Procedure of the Court and Commission that came into effect in 2010. Portions of earlier versions of chapters of this book have been published as "Advisory Practice of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights: Contributing to the Evolution of International Human Rights Law," 38 Stanford Journal of International Law, 241 (2002); "Preliminary Objections Before the Inter-American Court of Human Rights," 40 Virginia Journal of International



Preface xxiii

Law, 1 (1999); "Victim Reparations in the Inter-American Human Rights System: A Critical Assessment of Current Practice and Procedure," 18 Michigan Journal of International Law, 1 (1996); "The Inter-American Human Rights System: Establishing Precedents and Procedure in Human Rights Law," 26 University of Miami Inter-American Law Review, 297 (1994–1995); "The Whole Truth and Nothing But the Truth: Truth Commissions, Impunity and the Inter-American Human Rights System," 12 Boston University International Law Journal, 321 (1994); "Provisional Measures in the Inter-American Human Rights System: An Innovative Development in International Law," 26 Vanderbilt Journal of Transnational Law, 803 (1993); and "The Evolution of International Indigenous Rights in the Inter-American Human Rights System," 6 Human Rights Law Review 281 (2006).





Acknowledgments

It seems to me and to most people who know me that I have been writing this book for my entire professional life. No sooner did I finish a chapter than the Inter-American Court would render a judgment or update its Rules of Procedure that would necessitate rewriting and updating it. Throughout this ordeal, my friends and colleagues have remained supportive, always asking the obligatory question, "How is your book coming along?" and then listening to the recital of my latest insight or frustration. I would like to thank them for their interest and understanding.

I am especially grateful to Thomas Buergenthal, who has been my inspiration since 1986. Without his suggestion and encouragement I never would have undertaken this study of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights. His comments on drafts of the initial chapters, before he was elected Judge on the International Court of Justice, were invaluable. I also wish to thank Professor Louis B. Sohn, who unfailingly gave of his precious time to inspire me and encourage me, and Professors Ralph G. Steinhardt and Sean Murphy who served on my dissertation committee and advised me.

I must also express my gratitude to Christina Cerna, David Padilla, Veronica Gomez, Manuel Ventura Robles, and the other attorneys and staff members of the Secretariats of the Court and Commission who patiently answered my questions, located documents for me, and published their own articles that clarified the law in action. All opinions and analysis herein are my own.





Table of Cases

INTER-AMERICAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS ADVISORY OPINIONS

- Article 55 of the American Convention on Human Rights, IACtHR, Advisory Opinion OC-20/2009 of 29 September 2009, Ser. A, No. 20, 54, 159
- Certain Attributes of the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (Arts. 41, 42, 44, 46, 47, 50 and 51 of the American Convention on Human Rights), IACtHR, Advisory Opinion OC-13/93 of 16 July 1993, Ser. A, No. 13, 53, 54, 110, 113
- Compatibility of Draft Legislation with Art. 8(2)(h) of the American Convention on Human Rights, IACtHR, Advisory Opinion OC-12/91 of 6 December 1991, Ser. A, No. 12, 57, 58, 61, 65
- Compulsory Membership in an Association Prescribed by Law for the Practice of Journalism (Arts. 13 and 29 of the American Convention on Human Rights), IACtHR, Advisory Opinion OC-5/85 of 13 November 1985, Ser. A, No. 5, 45, 49, 60, 61, 75, 77
- Control of Legality in the Practice of Authorities of the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (Arts. 41 & 44 to 51 of the American Convention on Human Rights), IACtHR, Advisory Opinion OC-19/05 of November 28, 2005, Ser. A, No. 19, 74, 84, 85, 100
- Effect of Reservations on the Entry into Force of the American Convention on Human Rights (Arts. 74 and 75), IACtHR, Advisory Opinion OC-2/82 of 24 September 1982, Ser. A, No. 2, 12, 43, 44, 56, 119, 129
- Exceptions to the Exhaustion of Domestic Remedies (Arts. 46(1), 46(2)(a) and 46(2)(b) of the American Convention on Human Rights), IACtHR, Advisory Opinion OC-11/90 of 10 August 1990, Ser. A, No. 11, 52, 53, 98, 133
- Habeas Corpus in Emergency Situations (Arts. 27(2) and 7(6) of the American Convention on Human Rights), IACtHR, Advisory Opinion OC-8/87 of 30 January 1987, Ser. A, No. 8, 49, 61
- International Responsibility for the Promulgation and Enforcement of Laws in Violation of the Convention (Arts. 1 and 2 of the American Convention on Human Rights), IACtHR, Advisory Opinion OC-14/94 of 9 December 1994, Ser. A, No. 14, 39, 41, 42, 75, 133, 134
- Interpretation of the American Declaration of the Rights and Duties of Man Within the Framework of Art. 64 of the American Convention on Human Rights, IACtHR, Advisory Opinion OC-10/89 of 14 July 1989, Ser. A, No. 10, 55, 56, 69, 74

xxvii



xxviii

Table of Cases

- Judicial Guarantees in States of Emergency (Arts. 27(2), 25 and 8 of the American Convention on Human Rights), IACtHR, Advisory Opinion OC-9/87 of 6 October 1987, Ser. A, No. 9, 49, 50, 61, 97, 189
- Juridical Condition and Rights of Undocumented Migrants, IACtHR, Advisory Opinion OC-18/03 of 17 September, 2003, Ser. A, No. 18, 39, 56, 69, 75
- Legal Status and Human Rights of the Child, IACtHR, Advisory Opinion OC-17/2002 of 28 August 2002, Ser. A, No. 7, 39, 51, 70, 72, 76
- "Other Treaties" Subject to the Consultative Jurisdiction of the Court (Art. 64 of the American Convention on Human Rights), IACtHR, Advisory Opinion OC-1/82 of 24 September 1982, Ser. A, No. 1, 11, 37, 39, 47, 55, 56, 57, 58, 60, 61, 62, 74
- Proposed Amendments to the Naturalization Provisions of the Constitution of Costa Rica, IACtHR, Advisory Opinion OC-4/84 of 19 January 1984, Ser. A, No. 4, 39, 41, 50, 51, 57, 58, 67, 70, 75, 301
- Reports of the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (Art. 51 of the American Convention on Human Rights), IACtHR, Advisory Opinion OC-15/97 of 14 November 1997, Ser. A, No. 15, 11, 12, 40, 53, 59, 62, 64, 65, 75
- Restrictions to the Death Penalty (Arts. 4(2) and 4(4) of the American Convention on Human Rights), IACtHR, Advisory Opinion OC-3/83 of 8 September 1983, Ser. A, No. 3, 10, 11, 37, 50, 59, 60, 62, 63, 73, 74, 75, 129, 130
- Right to Information on Consular Assistance Within the Framework of the Guarantees of Legal Due Process, IACtHR, Advisory Opinion OC-16/99 of 1 October 1999, Ser. A. No. 16, 11, 13, 39, 55, 56, 57, 60, 62, 63, 64, 65, 67, 70, 71, 72, 74, 75
- The Word "Laws" in Article 30 of the American Convention on Human Rights, IACtHR, Advisory Opinion OC-6/86 of 9 May 1986, Ser. A, No. 6, 48

INTER-AMERICAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS JUDGMENTS AND IN CONTENTIOUS CASES, SER. C

- 19 Tradesmen (Merchants) v. Colombia (Preliminary Objections), 12 June 2002, No. 93,
- Abrill Alosilla et al. v. Peru (Merits, Reparations, and Costs), 4 March 2011, No. 223, 155, 178, 306
- Acevedo Buendía et al. ("Discharged and Retired Employees of the Comptroller") v. Peru (Preliminary Objection, Merits, Reparations, and Costs), IACtHR, 1 July 2009, No. 198, 118, 133, 221
- Acevedo Buendía et al. ("Discharged and Retired Employees of the Comptroller") v. Peru (Interpretation of Judgment on Preliminary Objection, Merits, Reparations, and Costs), 24 November 2009, No. 210, 179
- Acevedo Jaramillo et al. v. Peru (Interpretation of Judgment on Preliminary Objections, Merits, Reparations, and Costs), 24 November 2006, No. 157, 92
- Acosta Calderón v. Ecuador (Merits, Reparations, and Costs), 24 June 2005, No. 129, 235 Albán Cornejo et al. v. Ecuador (Merits, Reparations, and Costs), 22 November 2007, No. 171, 213
- Almonacid Arellano et al. v. Chile (Preliminary Objections, Merits, Reparations, and Costs), 26 September 2006, No. 154, 118, 143, 155, 159, 191, 214, 217, 218, 219, 225, 226, 227, 301, 323, 327
- Aloeboetoe et al. v. Suriname (Reparations and Costs), 10 September 1993, No. 15, 192, 210, 232, 236, 237, 240, 241, 249



Table of Cases

xxix

Anzualdo Castro v. Peru (Preliminary Objection, Merits, Reparations, and Costs), 22 September 2009, No. 202, 123, 167, 203, 207, 216, 223, 224, 225, 226, 237, 238, 243, 248

Apitz-Barbera et al. ("First Court of Administrative Disputes") v. Venezuela (Preliminary Objection, Merits, Reparations, and Costs), 5 August 2008, No. 182, 93, 198

Atala Riffo and Daughters v. Chile (Merits, Reparations and Costs), 24 February 2012, No. 239, 157, 196

Baena Ricardo et al. v. Panama (Preliminary Objections), 18 November 1999, No. 61, 89, 90, 111, 112

Baena Ricardo et al. v. Panama (Merits, Reparations, and Costs), 2 February 2001, No. 72, 7, 123, 132, 168, 199, 220, 232, 233

Baena Ricardo et al. v. Panama (Competence), 28 November 2003, No. 104, 299, 300, 303, 305

Bámaca Velásquez v. Guatemala, Order of the IACtHR, 19 June 1998, reprinted in the IACtHR 1998 Annual Report, OAS/Ser.L/V/III.43 doc. 11, at 245–7, 153, 161

Bámaca Velásquez v. Guatemala (Merits), 25 November 2000, No. 70, 124, 125, 152, 155, 165, 166, 171, 172, 173, 193, 194, 223, 224, 225, 237

Bámaca Velásquez v. Guatemala (Reparations), 22 February 2002, No. 91, 229, 231, 233, 234, 235

Barreto Leiva v. Venezuela (Merits, Reparations, and Costs), 17 November 2009, No. 206,

Barrios Altos v. Peru (Merits), 14 March 2001, No. 75, 132, 217, 218, 219, 246, 247, 249, 323, 327

Barrios Altos v. Peru (Reparations and Costs), 30 November 2001, No. 87, 307, 309 Barrios Family v. Venezuela (Merits, Reparations, and Costs), 24 November, 2011, No. 237,

Benavides Cevallos v. Ecuador (Merits, Reparations, and Costs), 19 June 1998, No. 38, 159, 175, 246, 247, 308, 309

Benjamin et al. v. Trinidad and Tobago (Preliminary Objections), 1 September 2001, No. 81, 12, 113, 119, 121, 122, 143

Blake v. Guatemala (Preliminary Objections), 2 July 1996, No. 27, 139

Blake v. Guatemala (Merits), 4 January 1998, No. 36, 131, 163, 164, 169, 171

Blake v. Guatemala (Reparations and Costs), 22 January 1999, No. 48, 189, 194, 249

Bulacio v. Argentina (Merits, Reparations, and Costs), 18 September 2003, No. 100, 224

Caballero Delgado and Santana v. Colombia (Preliminary Objections), 21 January 1994, No. 17, 96, 108, 114

Caballero Delgado and Santana v. Colombia (Merits), 8 December 1995, No. 22, 241

Caballero Delgado and Santana v. Colombia (Reparations), 29 January 1997, No. 31, 249

Cabrera García and Montiel Flores v. Mexico (Preliminary Objection, Merits, Reparations, and Costs), 26 November 2010, No. 220, 126, 134, 193, 213, 215, 218, 227, 231, 301, 302, 324

Caesar v. Trinidad and Tobago (Merits, Reparations, and Costs), 1 March 2005, No. 123, 192, 215, 322

Cantoral Benavides v. Peru, Order of the IACtHR, 18 June 1998, reprinted in 1998 Annual Report of the IACtHR, at 223–5, 177

Cantoral Benavides v. Peru (Preliminary Objections), 3 September 1998, No. 40, 93

Cantoral Benavides v. Peru (Merits), 18 August 2000, No. 69, 10, 129, 151, 167, 170, 171, 175 Cantoral Benavides v. Peru (Reparations and Costs), 3 December 2001, No. 88, 7, 200, 208, 221, 234, 241

Cantoral Huamaní and García Santa Cruz v. Peru (Preliminary Objection, Merits, Reparations, and Costs), 10 July 2007, No. 167, 141, 147, 208, 239



XXX

Table of Cases

- Cantos v. Argentina (Preliminary Objections), 7 September 2001, No. 85, 118, 119, 134, 141
- Cantos v. Argentina (Merits, Reparations, and Costs), 28 November 2002, No. 97, 138, 200, 228, 301
- Carpio Nicolle et al. v. Guatemala (Merits, Reparations, and Costs), November 2004, No. 117, 224, 328
- Castañeda Gutman v. México (Preliminary Objections, Merits, Reparations, and Costs), 6 August 2008, No 184, 99, 112
- Castillo Páez v. Peru (Preliminary Objections), 30 January 1996, No. 24, 94
- Castillo Páez v. Peru (Reparations and Costs), 27 November 1998, No. 43, 151, 164, 173, 174, 188, 192, 193, 229
- Castillo Petruzzi et al. v. Peru (Preliminary Objections), 4 September 1998, No. 41, 93, 125, 127, 132
- Castillo Petruzzi et al. v. Peru (Merits, Reparations, and Costs), 30 May 1999, No. 52, 191, 215, 227, 322
- Castillo Petruzzi et al. v. Peru (Compliance with Judgment), 17 November 1999, No. 59,
- Cayara v. Peru (Preliminary Objections), 3 February 1993, No. 14, 113, 114, 115, 133
- Cesti Hurtado v. Peru (Preliminary Objections), 26 January 1999, No. 49, 126, 127
- Cesti Hurtado v. Peru (Merits), 29 September 1999, No. 56, 221, 242
- Cesti Hurtado v. Peru (Request for Interpretation of Judgment of 29 September 1999), 19 November 1999, No. 62, 180, 325
- Cesti Hurtado v. Peru (Reparations and Costs), 31 May 2001, No. 78, 7, 174, 181, 228, 232, 242
- Cesti Hurtado v. Peru (Interpretation of Judgment on Reparations), 27 November 2001, No. 86, 181
- Chaparro Álvarez and Lapo Íñiguez v. Ecuador (Preliminary Objections, Merits, Reparations, and Costs), 21 November 2007, No. 170, 126, 136, 199, 200, 233, 235, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244
- *Chitay Nech et al.* v. *Guatemala* (Preliminary Objections, Merits, Reparations, and Costs), 25 May 2010, No 212, 95, 107, 108, 170, 202, 203, 230, 236, 239, 243, 248
- Claude Reyes et al v. Chile (Merits, Reparations, and Costs), 19 September 2006, No. 151, 213, 214
- Constantine et al. v. Trinidad and Tobago (Preliminary Objections), 1 September 2001, No. 82, 121
- Constitutional Court v. Peru (Competence), 24 September 1999, No. 55, 11, 85, 119, 121, 145, 146
- Constitutional Court v. Peru (Merits, Reparations, and Costs), 31 January 2001, No. 71, 10, 96, 152, 168, 169, 189, 223, 230, 232, 249, 309
- Contreras et al v. El Salvador (Merits, Reparations, and Costs), 31 August 2011, No. 232, 177, 202, 207, 211, 244
- Dacosta Cadogan v. Barbados (Preliminary Objections, Merits, Reparations, and Costs), 24 September 2009, No. 204, 216, 240, 244
- Del Caracazo v. Venezuela (Reparations and Costs), 9 August 2002, No. 95, 170, 231, 233, 234
- De la Cruz Flores v. Peru (Merits, Reparations, and Costs), 18 November 2004, No. 115, 308
- Dismissed Congressional Employees (Aguado Alfaro et al.) v. Peru (Preliminary Objections, Merits, Reparations, and Costs), 24 November 2006, No. 158, 84, 85