

El Amparo v. Venezuela

ABSTRACT¹

This case is about the killing of a group of fishermen travelling on a boat on the Arauca River by a mixed unit of the police and army tasked with interdicting smuggling and cross border guerrilla infiltrations between Venezuela and Colombia. The State eventually admitted responsibility and the Court found violation of several articles of the American Convention to the detriment of fourteen fishermen who were killed and two survivors of the massacre.

I. FACTS

A. Chronology of Events

October 29, 1988: Fishermen from El Amparo, a town in the Páez municipality of the state Apure, Venezuela, sail on a boat toward the La Colorada Canal on the Arauca River.² Mr. José Indalecio Guerrero pilots the boat, which carries a total of sixteen men,³ all between the ages of nineteen and fifty-one.⁴ At the same time, a State police and a military unit under the command of Mr. José Antonio Páez, tasked with monitoring the Colombian-Venezuelan border in an effort to combat smuggling, drug trafficking, and other criminal activities by Colombian guerrillas, patrols the river and its banks. The unit claims to have intelligence connecting recent killings, extortion of Venezuelan ranchers, and attacks on local oil installations with a boat traveling along the Arauca River.⁵ The twenty-man military-police unit takes position along

1. Björn Roos, Author; Sean Lask, Editor; Hayley Garscia, Chief IACHR Editor; Cesare Romano, Faculty Advisor.

2. *El Amparo v. Venezuela*, Merits, Judgment, Inter-Am. Ct. H.R. (ser. C) No. 19, ¶ 10 (Jan. 19, 1995).

3. The sixteen fishermen are named Mr. Wollmer Gregorio Pinilla, Mr. José Augusto Arias, Mr. José R. Araujo, Mr. Luis A. Berríos, Mr. Moisés A. Blanco, Mr. Julio P. Ceballos, Mr. Antonio Eregua, Mr. Rafael M. Moreno, Mr. José Indalecio Guerrero, Mr. Arín O. Maldonado, Mr. Justo Mercado, Mr. Pedro Mosquera, Mr. José Puerta, Mr. Marino Torrealba, Mr. José Torrealba, and Mr. Marino Rivas. *Id.* ¶¶ 2-3.

4. *Id.*

5. *Id.*

the bank of the La Colorada Canal where they suspect armed guerrillas are arriving.⁶ At approximately 11:20 a.m., the fishermen attempt to dock the boat but are met with gunfire by the military-police unit, the attack claims the lives of fourteen of the sixteen men aboard the boat.⁷

Two of the men, Mr. Wollmer Gregorio Pinilla and Mr. José Augusto Arias, manage to evade the gunfire by jumping into the water and swimming across the La Colorada Canal.⁸ The two take refuge at the Buena Vista farm, approximately fifteen kilometers from the bank of the Arauca River.⁹ Another version of events, purported by members of the military-police unit, is that the unit defended itself when confronted with Colombian guerrillas and exchanged gunfire for fifteen to twenty minutes.¹⁰ Although the military police-unit claims that they exchanged gunfire at a distance of twenty to thirty meters and were attacked by grenades, no member of the unit was injured.¹¹

October 30, 1988: Mr. Gregorio Pinilla and Mr. Augusto Arias surrender themselves to El Amparo's Chief of the Police, Mr. Adán de Jesús Tovar Araque.¹² Chief Tovar Araque, along with other police officials in the area, offer Mr. Gregorio Pinilla and Mr. Augusto Arias protection.¹³ Nevertheless, police and military officials from the neighboring city of San Cristóbal put pressure on Chief Tovar Araque to give up the two survivors, claiming that they are members of a Colombian guerrilla unit that escaped capture.¹⁴ In the face of military and police force, Chief Tovar Araque and a number of people defend the police post and block an attempt to capture Mr. Gregorio Pinilla and Mr. Augusto Arias.¹⁵ Later in the day, relatives of several fishermen approach Chief Tovar Araque and inquire about the whereabouts of the fishermen.¹⁶ The media begins to report about an armed confrontation with Colombian guerrilla combatants.¹⁷

6. *Id.*

7. *Id.* ¶ 10.

8. *Id.* ¶ 11.

9. *Id.*

10. C. C. RÖHDE, J. FELLNER, & C. G. BROWN, HUMAN RIGHTS IN VENEZUELA 20 (Human Rights Watch, 1993), available at <http://www.hrw.org/sites/default/files/reports/Venez93O.pdf>.

11. *Id.*

12. *El Amparo v. Venezuela*, Merits, ¶ 11.

13. *Id.*

14. *Id.* ¶ 12.

15. *Id.* ¶ 11.

16. *Id.* ¶ 12.

17. *Id.*

October 30, 1988: Relatives of the fisherman again approach Chief Tovar Araque and question him about the men who had gone fishing on October 29, 1988.¹⁸

II. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

A. Before the Commission

August 10, 1990: A petition is filed with the Commission on behalf of the victims.¹⁹

October 12, 1993: The Commission issues Report No. 29/93 which makes the following recommendations to the State: (1) to punish those responsible for the commission and covering up of the homicides of the fishermen; (2) to compensate the victims' next of kin; (3) to reform legislation in accordance with constitutional and legal procedures; and (4) to inform the Commission of the measures taken to comply with these recommendations.²⁰

B. Before the Court

January 14, 1994: The Commission submits the case to the Court after the State failed to adopt its recommendations.²¹

1. Violations Alleged by Commission²²

Article 2 (Obligation to Give Domestic Legal Effect to Rights)

Article 4 (Right to Life)

Article 5 (Right to Humane Treatment)

Article 8(1) (Right to a Hearing Within Reasonable Time by a Competent and Independent Tribunal)

Article 24 (Right to Equal Protection)

Article 25 (Right to Judicial Protection)

all in relation to:

Article 1(1) (Obligation to Respect Rights) of the American Convention.

18. *Id.*

19. *Id.* ¶ 1.

20. *Id.* ¶ 14.

21. *Id.* ¶ 2.

22. *Id.*

2. Violations Alleged by Representatives of the Victims²³

Same Violations Alleged by Commission.

October 28, 1994: The Secretariat receives a copy of the judgment of the Venezuelan Ad Hoc Military Court on the present case, dated June 12, 1994.²⁴ The judgment concludes that irregularities noted by the Supreme Court in its judgment dated November 9, 1993 had been corrected and that it had overruled the judgment and acquitted the accused.²⁵

January 11, 1995: The State informed the President that the State does not contest the facts referred to in the complaint and accepts international responsibility for human rights violations committed on October 29, 1988.²⁶ The State requests that the Court ask the Commission to come together to a non-litigious procedure for determining reparations and costs.²⁷

III. MERITS

A. *Composition of the Court*²⁸

Héctor Fix-Zamudio, President
Hernán Salgado Pesantes, Vice President
Alejandro Montiel Argüello, Judge
Máximo Pacheco Gómez, Judge

23. Mr. Pedro Nikken and Ms. Ligia Bolívar of the Venezuelan Program of Education-Action on Human Rights (*Programa Venezolano de Educación-Acción en Derechos Humanos*, "PROVEA"), Mr. Juan Méndez of Americas Watch, and Mr. José Miguel Vivanco of the Center for Justice and International Law ("CEJIL") serve as representatives of the victims. *Id.* ¶ 6.

24. *Id.* ¶ 18. While this suggests that there has been some effort by the State to investigate and prosecute, there is no domestic procedural history provided in the Merits Judgment. However, in the Interpretation of the Judgment on Reparations and Costs, the Court implies that no information regarding the domestic proceedings was provided to the Court. *El Amparo v. Venezuela*, Interpretation of the Judgment of Reparations and Costs, Judgment, Inter-Am. Ct. H.R. (ser. C) No. 46, "Considering" ¶ 5 (Apr. 16, 1997).

25. *El Amparo v. Venezuela*, Merits, ¶ 18.

26. *Id.* ¶ 19.

27. *Id.*

28. Judge Oliver H. Jackman abstained from participating in the deliberation and signing of this Judgment due to his previous participation in several stages of the case while it was being examined before the Commission. *Id.* at n.(*). While there are typically seven judges presiding over the Court, only the five judges listed here participated in and signed this Judgment. *See generally* *El Amparo v. Venezuela*, Merits, 1.

Antônio Augusto Cançado Trindade, Judge

Manuel E. Ventura Robles, Secretary

Ana María Reina, Deputy Secretary

B. Decision on the Merits

January 18, 1995: The Court issues its Judgment on Merits.²⁹

The Court found unanimously that Venezuela had violated:

Articles 2 (Obligation to Give Domestic Legal Effect to Rights), 4 (Right to Life), 5 (Right to Humane Treatment), 8(1) (Right to a Hearing Within Reasonable Time by a Competent and Independent Tribunal), 24 (Right to Equal Protection), and 25 (Right to Judicial Protection) in relation to Article 1(1) of the Convention, to the detriment of the fourteen fishermen who were killed, and Articles 5 (Right to Humane Treatment), 8(1) (Right to a Hearing Within Reasonable Time by a Competent and Independent Tribunal), 24 (Right to Equal Protection), and 25 (Right to Judicial Protection) of the Convention, to the detriment of the two fishermen who survived,³⁰ because:

The Court took note of the State's recognition of responsibility and held that the controversy concerning the facts in the instant case has ceased.³¹ Further, the Court held that the State is liable for payment of damages and a fair indemnification to the two surviving victims and next of kin of the deceased.³² Next, the State and Commission must determine the reparations and the form and amount of indemnification by mutual agreement within six months of the judgment.³³ Finally, the Court reserves the right to review and approve the agreement, and determine the scope of the reparations and costs if an agreement is not reached.³⁴

29. *El Amparo v. Venezuela*, Merits.

30. *Id.* ¶¶ 2, 3, 20. While the Court does not explicitly find the State responsible for the violation of these articles, it takes note of the State's acknowledgment of international responsibility for the facts and violations alleged by the Commission. *Id.* ¶ 19.

31. *Id.* ¶ 20.

32. *Id.* ¶ 21.

33. *Id.* "Therefore" ¶ 3.

34. *Id.* "Therefore" ¶ 4.

C. Dissenting and Concurring Opinions

1. Concurring Opinion of Judge Antônio Augusto Cançado Trindade

In a separate opinion, Judge Cançado Trindade stated that an enumerated clarification should be added to the Judgment, allowing the Court the right to review and approve any agreement between the State and Commission to determine the compatibility or incompatibility of Article 54(2) and (3) of the Code of Military Justice of Venezuela with the object and purpose of the American Convention on Human Rights.³⁵

IV. REPARATIONS

July 19, 1995: The six-month time period stipulated in the Judgment on the Merits passed with no indication that an agreement had been reached between the Commission and State.³⁶

January 27, 1996: The Court holds a public hearing to allow the parties to voice their opinion on the reparations, indemnities, and costs.³⁷ The Commission suggests that costs and expenses incurred by the victims' families should include attempts to obtain information about missing family members and attempts to locate corpses in their dealings with Venezuelan authorities.³⁸ The total amount requested by the Commission is \$240,000 to be divided equally between the fourteen families and two survivors.³⁹ The State describes the sum as "astronomical" and "disproportionate."⁴⁰

September 14, 1996: The Court calculated the indemnity granted to each of the deceased victims or next of kin based on their age at the time of death and the years remaining before they would have reached normal life expectancy, and, for the surviving victims, the time during which the two fishermen remained unemployed.⁴¹ The Court used the base salary, a figure higher than the minimum rural wage at the time of

35. *El Amparo v. Venezuela, Merits, Concurring Opinion of Judge Antônio Augusto Cançado Trindade*, Inter-Am. Ct. H.R. (ser. C) No. 19, ¶ 1 (Jan. 19, 1995).

36. *El Amparo v. Venezuela, Reparations and Costs, Judgment*, Inter-Am. Ct. H.R. (ser. C) No. 28, ¶ 7 (Sept. 14, 1996).

37. *Id.* ¶ 9.

38. *Id.* ¶ 17.

39. *Id.* ¶ 18.

40. *Id.*

41. *Id.* ¶ 28.

the event.⁴² Once the calculation was made, twenty-five percent was deducted for personal expenses.⁴³

The Court ruled unanimously that the State had the following obligations:

A. Specific Performance (Measures of Satisfaction and Non-Repetition Guarantee)

1. Investigate, Prosecute, and Punish Those Responsible

The State must continue investigating the facts and punishing those responsible for the murders at El Amparo.⁴⁴ It is an obligation incumbent upon the State that whenever there has been a human rights violation, the State must earnestly investigate the crime and bring justice to the victims and the obligation must be discharged seriously and not as a mere formality.⁴⁵

B. Compensation

The Court awarded the following amounts:

1. Pecuniary Damages

The State must compensate the families of the deceased victims and the survivors for expenses incurred in various representations to national authorities in the amount of \$2,000 each.⁴⁶

The State must make a compensatory payment of \$23,953.79 for the loss of earnings of Mr. Julio Pastor Ceballos; \$28,303.94 for the loss of earnings of Mr. Moisés A. Blanco; \$23,139.44 for the loss of earnings of Mr. José I. Guerrero; \$26,838 for the loss of earnings of Mr. Marino E. Vivas; \$28,535.66 for the loss of earnings of Mr. José G. Torrealba; \$23,139.44 for the loss of earnings of Mr. José Mariano Torrealba; \$27,416.52 for the loss of earnings of Mr. José Ramón Puerta; \$23,558.79 for the loss of earnings of Mr. Arín Ovadía Maldonado; \$26,145.70 for the loss of earnings of Mr. Rigo J. Araujo; \$27,235.10

42. *Id.*

43. *Id.*

44. *Id.* ¶ 61.

45. *Id.*

46. *Id.* ¶ 21.

for the loss of earnings of Mr. Pedro I. Mosquera; \$25,006.34 for the loss of earnings of Mr. Luis A. Berrío; \$23,139.44 for the loss of earnings of Mr. Rafael Magín Moreno; \$28,641.52 for the loss of earnings of Mr. Carlos A. Eregua; and \$26,145.70 for the loss of earnings of Mr. Justo Mercado.⁴⁷

The State must make a compensatory payment of \$4,566.41 for the loss of earnings of Mr. Wolmer Gregorio Pinilla and \$4,566.41 for the loss of earnings of Mr. José Augusto Arias.⁴⁸

The State must make a compensatory payment for moral damages inflicted upon the victims and their families in the amount of \$20,000 to each of the families of the deceased and to each of the survivors.⁴⁹

2. Non-Pecuniary Damages

[None]

3. Costs and Expenses

[None]

4. Total Compensation (including Costs and Expenses ordered):

\$ 722,332.20

C. Deadlines

The State must pay pecuniary damages within six months of notification of the Judgment on Reparations and Costs.⁵⁰

D. Dissenting and Concurring Opinions

1. Dissenting Opinion of Judge Antônio Augusto Cançado Trindade

In a separate opinion, Judge Cançado Trindade remarks that the Court fails to give adequate reparations when it declines to impose a duty to reform Article 54(2) and (3) of the Code of Military Justice on

47. *Id.* ¶ 29.

48. *Id.* ¶ 30.

49. *Id.* ¶ 37.

50. *Id.* ¶ 43.

Venezuela.⁵¹ Those sections of the Code of Military Justice state in pertinent part: “[t]he President of the Republic, as a functionary of military justice, is empowered . . . 2) To order that a military trial not be held in certain cases, when he deems it in the national interest; 3) To order the discontinuance of military trials, when he deems it advisable, in any circumstances.”⁵² Although the Court finds that the State did not invoke Article 54 powers when conducting trials against the perpetrators of the October 29, 1988 massacre, Judge Caçado Trindade departs from the Court’s reasoning and claims that it is not necessary to wait for the occurrence of material or moral damage for a law to be incompatible with and in violation of the American Convention.⁵³ Judge Caçado Trindade purports that an individual may claim to be a victim of a human rights violation simply by the existence of measures permitted by illegal legislations, even without having such measures directly applied to the individual.⁵⁴

V. INTERPRETATION AND REVISION OF JUDGMENT

February 11, 1997: The Court receives a request for an Interpretation of the Judgment on Reparations and Costs from the Commission, endorsing the request of the representatives of the victims, indicating that despite the Judgment indicating otherwise, Venezuelan President Carlos Andrés Pérez applied Article 54 of the Code of Military Justice to this case.⁵⁵

A. *Composition of the Court*⁵⁶

Héctor Fix-Zamudio, President
Hernán Salgado Pesantes, Vice President
Alejandro Montiel Argüello, Judge
Máximo Pacheco Gómez, Judge

51. *El Amparo v. Venezuela, Reparations and Costs, Dissenting Opinion of Judge Antônio Augusto Caçado Trindade, Inter-Am. Ct. H.R. (ser. C) No. 28, ¶ 1 (Sept. 14, 1996).*

52. *El Amparo v. Venezuela, Reparations and Costs, ¶ 52.*

53. *El Amparo v. Venezuela, Reparations and Costs, Dissenting Opinion of Judge Antônio Augusto Caçado Trindade, ¶ 3.*

54. *Id.* ¶ 5.

55. *El Amparo v. Venezuela, Interpretation of the Judgment of Reparations and Costs, Judgment, Inter-Am. Ct. H.R. (ser. C) No. 46, ¶ 2 (Apr. 16, 1997).*

56. While there are typically seven judges presiding over the proceedings, only these six are listed as participating in the deliberation and signing of the Interpretation of the Judgment on Reparations and Costs. *See generally* *El Amparo v. Venezuela, Interpretation of the Judgment of Reparations and Costs, 1.*

Alirio Abreu Burelli, Judge
Antônio Augusto Cançado Trindade, Judge

Manuel E. Ventura Robles, Secretary

B. Merits

The Court responded to clarify that, based on the events of the proceedings and evidence presented, it has been established that Article 54 of the Code of Military Justice was not applied in the El Amparo proceedings.⁵⁷ In support, the Court states that evidence from the proceedings does not suggest that the State admitted using Article 54 of the Code of Military Justice, but rather that the Venezuelan Government expressly denied it.⁵⁸

C. Dissenting and Concurring Opinions

1. Dissenting Opinion of Judge Antônio Augusto Cançado Trindade

In a separate opinion, Judge Cancado Trindade continued that he does not find convincing evidence to conclude that Article 54(2) and (3) of the Code of Military Justice were not applied in the El Amparo case.⁵⁹ Judge Cançado Trindade expanded on his previous dissenting and concurring opinions, adding that, although obligations on states were historically understood to establish only negative duties, requiring that states simply not interfere with individual rights, this characterization is inappropriate in modern international law.⁶⁰ A modern understanding of the international protection of human rights construes that states have both negative and positive duties, including the duty of prevention and due diligence.⁶¹ Here, positive duties impose affirmative obligations on states to safeguard rights enumerated in the Convention; to avoid human rights violations both by acts as well as omissions imputable to them.⁶² Accordingly, a State may have its international responsibility engaged by the promulgation of a law in conflict with the

57. *Id.* ¶ 6.

58. *Id.* ¶ 3.

59. El Amparo v. Venezuela, Interpretation of the Judgment of Reparations and Costs, Dissenting Opinion of Judge Antônio Augusto Cançado Trindade, Inter-Am. Ct. H.R. (ser. C) No. 46, ¶ 1 (Apr. 16, 1997).

60. *Id.* ¶ 16.

61. *Id.*

62. *Id.*

international obligations of protection or by the failure to harmonize domestic law with international human rights treaties.⁶³

2. Dissenting Opinion of Judge Alejandro Montiel Argüello

In a separate opinion, Judge Montiel Argüello concurs in approving the Judgment on Reparations and Costs, but claims that the request of the Commission for an Interpretation of the Judgment was blatantly inadmissible since it expresses no disagreement as to the meaning or scope of the Judgment as required by Article 67 of the Convention.⁶⁴

VI. COMPLIANCE AND FOLLOW-UP

November 28, 2002: The Court ordered the State to take necessary measures to comply with the Judgment of Reparations and Costs.⁶⁵ The Court resolves that the State must pay interest due on account of the delay in the payment of reparations in the amount of \$28,751.44 to the families of the victims and surviving victims.⁶⁶ The Court requires the State to submit to the Court a detailed report on the steps taken to comply with the order, to be delivered to the Court no later than March 30, 2003.⁶⁷

July 4, 2006: The Court determined that the State complied fully with the payment of interest demanded in the November 28, 2002 monitoring compliance order.⁶⁸ The Court submitted that if the next of kin of Mr. Julio Pastor Ceballos do not claim the amounts deposited in his favor within the next ten years, the amount shall be returned to the State.⁶⁹

December 18, 2009: The Court summoned the State, the victims or their representatives, and the Commission to a private hearing to be held on January 29, 2010 to obtain information from the State on the investiga-

63. *Id.* ¶ 22.

64. *El Amparo v. Venezuela*, Interpretation of the Judgment of Reparations and Costs, Concurring Opinion of Judge Alejandro Montiel Argüello, Inter-Am. Ct. H.R. (ser. C) No. 46, ¶ 1 (Apr. 16, 1997).

65. *El Amparo v. Venezuela*, Monitoring Compliance with Judgment, Order of the Court, Inter-Am. Ct. H.R. “Resuelve” ¶ 1 (Nov. 28, 2002).

66. *Id.* “Resuelve” ¶ 2.

67. *Id.* “Resuelve” ¶ 3.

68. *El Amparo v. Venezuela*, Monitoring Compliance with Judgment, Order of the Court, Inter-Am. Ct. H.R. “Declares” ¶ 1 (July 4, 2006).

69. *Id.* “Declares” ¶ 2.

tion and punishment of those responsible.⁷⁰

February 4, 2010: The Court found that the State had not complied with the obligation to investigate the incident and punish those responsible, or with its duty to submit clear and specific information.⁷¹ The Court reemphasized that it will continue to monitor compliance until full compliance has been reached.⁷²

February 20, 2012: The Court determined that the State had not complied with its obligation to investigate, prosecute, and punish those responsible or with its duty to submit clear and specific information in that regard.⁷³ The Court stated that it will continue to keep the monitoring proceeding open until full compliance has been reached and reiterated that the State must adopt all necessary measures to comply promptly and effectively with the order.⁷⁴ The Court ordered the State to submit, by July 15, 2012, an updated report indicated the measures it has taken to comply with the Judgment.⁷⁵

In a separate opinion, Judge Eduardo Vio Grossi concurred with the order, but expressed his recommendation that because the State has delayed significantly in complying with the Judgment on Reparations and Costs, the Court should advise the General Assembly of the Organization of American States of the situation.⁷⁶

VII. LIST OF DOCUMENTS

A. *Inter-American Court*

1. Preliminary Objections

[None]

70. El Amparo v. Venezuela, Monitoring Compliance with Judgment, Order of the President of the Court, Inter-Am. Ct. H.R. "Resuelve" ¶ 1 (Dec. 18, 2009).

71. El Amparo v. Venezuela, Monitoring Compliance with Judgment, Order of the Court, Inter-Am. Ct. H.R. "Considering" ¶ 22 (Feb. 4, 2010).

72. *Id.* "Declares" ¶ 1.

73. El Amparo v. Venezuela, Monitoring Compliance with Judgment, Order of the Court, Inter-Am. Ct. H.R. "Declares That" ¶ 1 (Feb. 20, 2012).

74. *Id.* "Declares That" ¶ 2.

75. *Id.* "And Decides" ¶ 2.

76. El Amparo v. Venezuela, Monitoring Compliance with Judgment, Concurring Opinion of Judge Eduardo Vio Grossi, Inter-Am. Ct. H.R. (Feb. 20, 2012).

2. Decisions on Merits, Reparations and Costs

[El Amparo v. Venezuela, Merits, Judgment, Inter-Am Ct. H.R. \(ser. C\) No. 19 \(Jan. 18, 1995\).](#)

[El Amparo v. Venezuela, Merits, Concurring Opinion of Judge Antônio Augusto Cançado Trindade, Inter-Am Ct. H.R. \(ser. C\) No. 19 \(Jan. 18, 1995\).](#)

[El Amparo v. Venezuela, Reparations and Costs, Judgment, Inter-Am Ct. H.R. \(ser. C\) No. 28 \(Sept. 14, 1996\).](#)

[El Amparo v. Venezuela, Reparations and Costs, Dissenting Opinion of Judge Antônio Augusto Cançado Trindade, Inter-Am Ct. H.R. \(ser. C\) No. 28 \(Sept. 14, 1996\).](#)

3. Provisional Measures

[None]

4. Compliance Monitoring

[El Amparo v. Venezuela, Monitoring Compliance with Judgment, Concurring Opinion of Judge Eduardo Vio Grossi, Inter-Am. Ct. H.R. \(Feb. 20, 2012\).](#)

[El Amparo v. Venezuela, Monitoring Compliance with Judgment, Order of the Court, Inter-Am. Ct. H.R. \(Feb. 20, 2012\).](#)

[El Amparo v. Venezuela, Monitoring Compliance with Judgment, Order of the Court, Inter-Am. Ct. H.R.\(Feb. 4, 2010\).](#)

[El Amparo v. Venezuela, Monitoring Compliance with Judgment, Order of the President of the Court, Inter-Am. Ct. H.R. \(Dec. 18, 2009\). \(Available only in Spanish\).](#)

[El Amparo v. Venezuela, Monitoring Compliance with Judgment, Order of the Court, Inter-Am. Ct. H.R. \(July 4, 2006\).](#)

[El Amparo v. Venezuela, Monitoring Compliance with Judgment, Order](#)

[of the Court, Inter-Am. Ct. H.R. \(Nov. 28, 2002\). \(Available only in Spanish\).](#)

5. Review and Interpretation of Judgment

[El Amparo v. Venezuela, Interpretation of the Judgment of Reparations and Costs, Judgment, Inter-Am Ct. H.R. \(ser. C\) No. 46 \(Apr. 16, 1997\).](#)

B. Inter-American Commission

1. Petition to the Commission

[None]

2. Report on Admissibility

[None]

3. Provisional Measures

[None]

4. Report on Merits

[Not Available]

5. Application to the Court

[None]

VIII. BIBLIOGRAPHY

C. C. ROHDE, J. FELLNER, & C. G. BROWN, HUMAN RIGHTS IN VENEZUELA (Human Rights Watch, 1993), *available at* <http://www.hrw.org/sites/default/files/reports/Venez93O.pdf>.