

**ORDER OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE
INTER-AMERICAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS**

DECEMBER 20, 2012

CASE OF GUTIÉRREZ AND FAMILY v. ARGENTINA

HAVING SEEN:

1. The brief submitting the case presented by the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (hereinafter “the Inter-American Commission” or “the Commission”) before the Inter-American Court of Human Rights (hereinafter “the Inter-American Court” or “the Court”) on August 19, 2011, in which it offered one expert opinion. The Commission indicated the object of the expert opinion without naming the expert witness who would render it.
2. The note of September 7, 2011, in which the Secretariat of the Court (hereinafter the “Secretariat”) informed the Commission that it would await information on the name of the expert witness not identified, together with the submission of his curriculum vitae.
3. The communication of September 9, 2011, in which the Commission provided the name of the expert witness offered and forwarded his curriculum vitae.
4. The brief of pleadings, motions and evidence (hereinafter “brief of pleadings and motions”) submitted by the representatives of the alleged victims (hereinafter “the representatives”)¹ on March 26, 2012, in which they offered the statements of one witness, six alleged victims and ten expert opinions.
5. The brief of July 27, 2012, in which the Argentine Republic (hereinafter, “the State” or “Argentina”) presented its answer to the submission of the case and its observations to the brief of pleadings, motions and evidence (hereinafter, “answer brief”). The State expressed its willingness to “accept the conclusions contained in the Report on the Merits adopted by the Inter-American Commission, in accordance with Article 50 of the American Convention [on Human Rights], as well as the legal consequences stemming therefrom.” The State did not offer testimonial or expert evidence.

¹ The alleged victims appointed the Center for Legal and Social Studies (CELS) and the Center for Justice and International Law (CEJIL/ Argentina) as their representatives.

6. The note of November 16, 2012, in which the Secretariat, following the instructions of the President, and in accordance with Article 46(1) of the Court's Rules of Procedure² (hereinafter "the Rules"), asked the Commission and the representatives to submit their respective definitive lists of deponents (hereinafter "definitive lists") no later than November 30, 2012, and, for reasons of procedural economy, to indicate which deponents could render their statements by affidavit and which should be summoned to testify at a public hearing.

7. The briefs of November 30, 2012, in which the Inter-American Commission and the representatives submitted, respectively, their definitive lists of deponents and indicated which deponents could render their statements by affidavit and which deponents should be summoned to testify at a public hearing.

8. The note of December 4, 2012, in which the Secretariat, following the instructions of the President of the Court, granted the parties a period of 10 days to submit any observations deemed pertinent to the definitive lists of deponents presented by the Commission and the representatives.

9. The brief of December 12, 2012, in which the State requested an extension of the deadline to present its observations to the definitive lists of deponents of the representatives and of the Inter-American Commission (*supra* Having Seen 7). In the note of December 13, 2012, the Secretariat, following the instructions of the President of the Court, granted the State's request and extended the deadline to December 17, 2012.

10. The communication of December 12, 2012, in which the Inter-American Commission stated that it had no observations to make to the definitive list of deponents submitted by the representatives and requested an opportunity to question six of the expert witnesses offered by them. Also, the brief of December 17, 2012, in which the State submitted its observations to the definitive list of deponents of the representatives and objected to Mrs. Laura Dolores Sobredo, the expert witness offered by them. Neither the State nor the representatives presented observations to the only expert opinion offered by the Inter-American Commission.

11. The note of the Secretariat of December 17, 2012, in which the expert witness Laura Dolores Sobredo was asked to submit her observations to the State's arguments regarding her disqualification (*supra* Having Seen 10), no later than December 19, 2012. Mrs. Sobredo did not submit any observations.

CONSIDERING THAT:

1. The offer and admission of evidence, as well as the formal summons of the alleged victims, witnesses and expert witnesses, are regulated under Articles 35(1)(f), 40(2)(c), 41(1) (c), 46, 48, 50, 57 and 60 of the Court's Rules of Procedure.

2. The Commission offered as evidence one expert opinion and the representatives offered the statements of one witness, six alleged victims and ten expert opinions. The evidence was offered at the proper procedural stage (*supra* Having Seen 1 and 4). For its part, the State did not offer any testimonial or expert evidence (*supra* Having Seen 5).

² Rules of Procedure approved by the Court during its Eighty-fifth Regular Period of Sessions held on November 16 to 28, 2009.

3. The Court guaranteed the parties the right to defense in respect of the offers of evidence contained in their briefs submitting the case and in the brief of pleadings and motions, as well as in the definitive lists of deponents (*supra* Having Seen 8 to 12). The Commission did not present any observations to the definitive list of deponents of the representatives. The State only presented observations to the expert opinions offered by the representatives and objected to one of these. Neither the representatives nor the State presented observations to the expert evidence offered by the Inter-American Commission.

4. The President notes that neither the Commission nor the State submitted observations to the statements of Nilda Maldonado de Gutiérrez, Nilda Gutiérrez, Francisco Virgilio Gutiérrez, Jorge Gabriel Gutiérrez, David Gutiérrez and Marilín Gutiérrez, alleged victims, offered by the representatives. The President considers it appropriate to obtain the statements of those persons, given their relationship to the instant case. The Court shall assess their value at the proper procedural moment, within the context of the existing body of evidence and according to the rules of sound judgment. The object of these statements and the manner in which they will be received shall be determined by the President in this Order (*infra* Operative paragraphs 1 and 5).

5. Furthermore, the President notes that in the brief of pleadings and motions the representatives offered testimonial evidence from journalist Daniel Otero (*supra* Having Seen 4). However, when submitting their definitive list of deponents, the representatives did not mention that evidence. According to Article of the Court's Rules of Procedure, the proper procedural moment for the representatives to confirm or withdraw the statements offered in the brief of pleadings and motions is in the definitive list requested by the Court³. Therefore, by not confirming that testimony in their definitive list, the President considers that the representatives tacitly withdrew it.

6. Bearing in mind the foregoing, the following points will be addressed in this Order: a) the expert evidence offered by the Inter-American Commission and its request to interrogate six expert witnesses offered by the representatives; b) the expert evidence offered by the representatives; c) the manner in which the statements of the alleged victims and the expert opinions shall be rendered, and d) the final oral and written arguments and observations.

A. *Expert evidence offered by the Inter-American Commission and request to interrogate six expert witnesses offered by the representatives*

7. Article 35(1) (f) of the Rules provides for the "possible appointment of expert witnesses" by the Inter-American Commission, with due justification of the grounds and object of such appointment "when the Inter-American public order of human rights is affected in a significant manner." The implication of this provision is that the appointment of expert witnesses by the Commission is an exceptional circumstance, subject to that requirement, which is not satisfied by the mere fact that the evidence to be produced is related to an alleged human rights violation. The "Inter-American public order of human rights" must be "affected in a significant manner," and it is up to the Commission to justify that situation."⁴

³ Cf. *Case Vera Vera et al. v. Ecuador*. Order of the President of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights of December 23, 2010, Considering para. 8, and *Case of Castillo González v. Venezuela*. Order of the President of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights of January 31, 2012, Considering para. 7.

⁴ Cf. *Case of Pedro Miguel Vera Vera et al. v. Ecuador*. Order of the President of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights of December 23, 2010, Considering para. 9, and *Case of Artavia Murillo et al.* (*In-vitro*

8. The Inter-American Commission offered as evidence the expert opinion of Mr. Pedro Díaz who would render a statement on “the duty of the State to provide an effective response not only regarding the violent death of a person, but also regarding the specific duty to investigate evident signs of a cover-up and derailing of investigations carried out by State authorities.” In confirming said offer (*supra* Having Seen 7), the Commission stated that “the expert opinion offered refers to matters of inter-American public order raised in this case”, which will provide the Inter-American Court “with further elements to develop its case law regarding the State’s obligation to guarantee the right to life by means of a thorough, impartial and effective investigation, especially when State agents are involved and there is also a cover-up by the authorities themselves.”

9. The representatives made no objection to the offer of this expert opinion. Likewise, in its answer brief, the State argued that “as a clear reflection of the willingness already shown [...], it consider [ed] that the rendering [of the expert opinion offered by the Commission] would be of interest, inasmuch as the proposal comes from the very Organ which, after examining the case, found irregularities in the investigation of the case and a failure to produce conclusive results and identify those responsible.”

10. The President considers that the expert opinion offered by the Inter-American Commission refers to judicial matters comprehensively addressed by the Court in its case law.⁵ The Commission did not explain how the expert opinion offered could provide new elements or develop the criteria already established by this Court regarding standards for the investigation of the alleged violent death of a person and the supposed cover-up by the authorities. Inasmuch as this expert opinion does not refer to matters that “significantly affect the inter-American public order”, the exceptional circumstances established in the Rules do not exist to allow the expert statement proposed by the Commission.

11. Moreover, the Inter-American Commission requested an opportunity to question Ignacio Cano, Luis María Chichizola, María Victoria Pita, Alberto Binder, Ricardo Favarotto and Gabriel Eduardo Pérez Barberá, expert witnesses proposed by the representatives, considering that some aspects of the objects of their expert opinions are related to the object of the expert opinion of Mr. Pedro Díaz, offered by the Inter-American Commission. In this regard, given that the offer of this last expert opinion is being rejected (*supra* Considering para. 10), the Commission’s request is not admissible.

B. Expert evidence offered by the representatives

12. In its answer brief, the State challenged the relevance of the ten expert opinions offered by the representatives, “according [to] Articles 48 and 48(2) of the Rules of the Court”, inasmuch as these would seek “[...] to provide a general overview, [which] would impair the scope and nature of the specific facts surrounding the Gutiérrez Case.” Subsequently the State, when presenting its observations to the definitive list of deponents

Fertilization) v. *Costa Rica*. Order of the President of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights of August 6, 2012, Considering para. 24.

⁵ For example, the cases of *Kawas Fernández v. Honduras. Merits, Reparations and Costs*. Judgment of April 3, 2009 Series C No. 196; *González et al. (“Cotton Field”) v. Mexico. Preliminary Objection, Merits, Reparations and Costs*. Judgment of November 16, 2009. Series C No. 205; *Case of the Massacre of Dos Erres Vs. Guatemala. Preliminary Objection, Merits, Reparations and Costs*. Judgment of November 24, 2009. Series C No. 211, and *Massacres of El Mozote and Surrounding Areas v. El Salvador. Merits, Reparations and Costs*. Judgment of October 25, 2012. Series C No. 252.

submitted by the representatives, did not reiterate its objection to the relevance of the totality of the expert evidence offered by the representatives (*supra* Having Seen 10). In that brief the State merely noted a “certain overlap in the points of expertise that various experts are being asked to issue an opinion.” Therefore, “in order to avoid procedural delays and an unnecessary increase in the costs of the proceeding,” the State considered that the representatives should be asked to “unify the questions on which the expert witnesses should issue an opinion.”

13. According to Article 46(2) of the Court’s Rules of Procedure, the proper procedural moment for submitting observations to the expert evidence offered by the parties after the definitive list of deponents has been presented. In this regard, the President notes that the State did not challenge the relevance of the object of the expert opinions offered by the representatives, nor did it object to the persons proposed to render them. The State’s arguments are aimed at avoiding supposed “procedural delays” or an “unnecessary increase in the costs of the proceeding,” which are not sufficient grounds to reject them. Therefore, considering that these expert opinions are related to the alleged facts of this case, the President deems it useful to receive them. The object and the manner in which they shall be rendered shall be determined in this Order.

14. Finally, when submitting its observations to the definitive list of deponents proposed by the representatives, pursuant to Article 48(1)(c) of the Court’s Rules of Procedure, the State objected to the expert witness Laura Dolores based on the fact that “she is a member of the mental health team of the CELS”, in other words, of one of the organizations representing the alleged victims. Therefore, the State considered that “her impartiality could be seriously affected.”

15. As mentioned previously (*supra* Having Seen 11), Mrs. Laura Dolores Sobredo did not submit observations to the objection made against her by the State.

16. In their brief of pleadings and motions, in offering the expert evidence of Mrs. Sobredo, the representatives indicated that she is a “member of the mental health team of the CELS.” Also, her curriculum vitae, in the section on “work experience”, states that since 2005 “until the present day” Mrs. Sobredo is a “Psychiatrist of the Mental Health Team of the CELS”, and provides “psycho-legal accompaniment in trials for crimes against humanity, expert assessments, [and participates] in research projects related to influencing public policies.”

17. Paragraph 1 of Article 48 of the Rules states that “[a]n expert witness may be disqualified based on the following grounds: [...] c. he or she currently has, or has had, close ties with the proposing party, or is or has been, a subordinate or the proposing party, and the Court considers that his or her impartiality may be affected.” As indicated in the preceding paragraph, Mrs. Sobredo works directly with the CELS, an organization which together with CEJIL/Argentina represents the alleged victims in this case. Therefore, the President considers that this working relationship may affect her impartiality when rendering her expert opinion.

18. Based on the foregoing considerations, the President considers valid the disqualification proposed by Argentina, and therefore decides not to admit the expert opinion of Mrs. Laura Dolores Sobredo.

C. Manner in which the statements of the alleged victims and the expert opinions shall be rendered

19. It is necessary to ensure knowledge of the truth and the most complete presentation of the facts and arguments by the parties, insofar as these are pertinent to resolving the matters in dispute, guaranteeing both the right of the parties to defend their respective positions and the Court's possibility of adequately examining the cases submitted to its consideration, bearing in mind that their number has grown considerably and is increasing constantly. It is also necessary to guarantee a reasonable term in the length of the proceeding, as required for effective access to justice. Accordingly, it is essential to receive the greatest possible number of testimonies and expert opinions through affidavits, and that the Court hear those alleged victims, witnesses and expert witnesses whose direct testimony is truly indispensable at a public hearing, taking into account the circumstances of the case and the object of the testimonies and expert opinions.

C.1. *Statements to be rendered by affidavit*

20. Bearing in mind the provisions of Article 50(1) of the Rules and the indications of the representatives in their definitive list of deponents (*supra* Having Seen 7), the object of the statements offered, as well as the principle of procedural economy, the President deems it appropriate to receive, through affidavits rendered before a notary public, the statements of the following alleged victims: Nilda Gutiérrez, Francisco Virgilio Gutiérrez, Jorge Gabriel Gutiérrez, David Gutiérrez and Marilín Gutiérrez, all offered by the representatives. Also, the President considers it pertinent to receive by affidavit the expert opinions of Mrs. María Victoria Pita and Mrs. Lila Caimari, and of Messrs. Ricardo Favarotto, Gabriel Eduardo Pérez Barberá, Alejandro Rúa, Luis María Chichizola, Julián Axat and Ignacio Cano, offered by the representatives.

21. In application of Article 50(5) of the Court's Rules of Procedure, the President proceeds to grant the State an opportunity to submit, if it so wishes, any questions considered pertinent to the deponents and expert witnesses offered by the representatives and mentioned in the preceding paragraph, as appropriate. Upon rendering their statements before a notary public, the deponents must respond to those questions, unless the President decides otherwise. The corresponding time limits shall be specified in Operative paragraph 2 of this Order. The aforementioned statements shall be transmitted to the Inter-American Commission, the representatives and the State. In turn, the State may present any observations deemed pertinent within the term indicated in this Order (*infra* Operative paragraph 4). The Court shall assess the evidentiary value of these statements in due course, taking into account the points of view, if any, expressed by the State in exercise of its right to defense.

C.2. *Statements to be received at a public hearing*

22. The Court records in the instant case are now ready for the opening of the oral proceedings regarding the merits and possible reparations and costs, and therefore the President deems it appropriate to convene a public hearing to receive the statement of Nilda Maldonado de Gutiérrez, alleged victim, and the expert opinion of Alberto Binder, both proposed by the representatives.

D. *Final oral and written arguments and observations*

23. The representatives and the State may present to the Court their final oral arguments regarding the merits and possible reparations and costs, once the statements of the alleged victim and the expert witness have been rendered at the public hearing. As established in Article 51(8) of the Rules, once the arguments of the representatives and the State have concluded, the Inter-American Commission shall present its final oral observations.

24. According to Article 56 of the Rules of Procedure, alleged victims or their representatives, the State and the Commission may submit their final written arguments and final written observations, respectively, regarding the merits and possible reparations and costs, within the period established in Operative paragraph 10 of this Order.

THEREFORE:

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

Pursuant to Articles 24(1) and 25(2) of the Statute of the Court and Articles 4, 15(1), 26, 31(2), 35(1), 40(2), 41(1), 45, 46, 48, 50 to 56 and 60 of its Rules of Procedure,

DECIDES:

1. To require, for the reasons stated in this Order, (*supra* Considering paras. 20 and 21), in accordance with the principle of procedural economy and in exercise of the authority granted under Article 50(1) of the Court's Rules of Procedure, the following persons to render their statements and expert opinions, as the case may be, by affidavit:

A) *Alleged victims proposed by the representatives:*

1) *Nilda Gutiérrez*, sister of Jorge Omar Gutiérrez, who will testify on her relationship with her brother and the life of the Gutiérrez family prior to his alleged murder. She will also testify on the supposed consequences of that event and the alleged "impunity regarding the physical and mental health of her parents and the relationships with them", on the actions taken by her and the family, and on how the actions of the police, prosecutors and judicial authorities supposedly affected her values and those of her family, as well as on the consequences that the alleged impunity of these events had, and has, on her life.

2) *Francisco Virgilio Gutiérrez*, brother of Jorge Omar Gutiérrez, who will testify on his relationship with his brother at the time of his alleged murder, on the efforts presumably made by him to cooperate with the justice system in the investigation of the facts and his role as National Deputy and Mayor of Quilmes, on his experience of the amicable settlement process, and ON the alleged reprisals and threats to which he and his family were subjected because of their commitment to seek justice for the alleged murder of his brother.

3) *Jorge Gabriel Gutiérrez and David Gutiérrez*, sons of Jorge Omar Gutiérrez, who will describe their lives at the time when their father was allegedly murdered and the alleged repercussions of his murder on their personal and professional lives, on the efforts made by them and their family to discover the truth regarding the events, the supposed consequences that the alleged cover-up and obstructive actions by the police, prosecutors and judicial authorities had on their lives, and the presumed consequences that the alleged impunity surrounding the facts had, and has, on their lives.

4) *Marilin Gutiérrez, daughter* of Jorge Omar Gutiérrez, who will describe her life at the time of the alleged murder of her father and the alleged consequences it had on their family life, the efforts made by her and the alleged implications of living, since her adolescence, with the presumed impunity surrounding the events of the case, and on the obstacles she and her family allegedly faced in their search for justice.

B) *Expert witnesses proposed by the representatives :*

1) *María Victoria Pita*, anthropologist, who will render an expert opinion on the consequences of the institutional attitudes, the use of violence and the autonomous operation of the Argentine police forces, both in the context of the alleged murder of Mr. Jorge Omar Gutiérrez and at present.

2) *Lila Caimari*, historian, who will render an expert opinion on the historical and institutional characteristics of the Argentine Federal Police.

3) *Ricardo Favarotto*, lawyer and former Judge of Buenos Aires Province, Argentina, who will render an expert opinion on the alleged deficiencies in the judicial proceedings in this case, identify which of those alleged problems supposedly constitute current structural failings and discuss institutional measures to overcome them.

4) *Gabriel Eduardo Pérez Barberá*, lawyer and former Head of the Judicial Police of Córdoba, Argentina, who will render an expert opinion on the need for the criminal justice system to have criminal investigation units independent from the police, especially in cases that involve members of the security forces.

5) *Alejandro Rúa*, lawyer and former Executive Secretary of the Special Investigations Unit of the attack against the headquarters of AMIA, of the Ministry of Justice and Human Rights of Argentina, who will render an expert opinion on the actions, both legal and administrative, in the present case, and on whether or not these were appropriate, on the how the administrative actions related to the alleged murder of Jorge Omar Gutiérrez were handled by the Argentine Federal Police and the Police of Buenos Aires Province, and on the institutional measures that should be taken to address the alleged conditions that made these events possible, the alleged institutional cover-up and the alleged administrative impunity.

6) Luis María Chichizola, lawyer and former General Prosecutor of the Judicial District of San Martín, Buenos Aires Province, Argentina, who will render an expert opinion on the structure and operation of the Public Prosecutor's Office of Buenos Aires Province, the supposed failings in the judicial investigation and how to improve the justice system of that Province in these types of cases, particularly in relation to the Public Prosecutor's Office.

7) Julián Axat, defender of the juvenile courts of La Plata, in Buenos Aires Province, Argentina, who will render an expert opinion on the supposed current failings of the disciplinary mechanisms in the Buenos Aires police force in cases of alleged human rights violations or operational irregularities by police agents.

8) Ignacio Cano, a sociologist, researcher and professor, who will render an expert opinion on the implementation of modern police oversight systems in different police forces around the world, the powers and authority necessary for their proper functioning, and on the current regulations of the Argentine Federal Police and the police of Buenos Aires.

2. To require the State to submit, if it so wishes, any questions deemed pertinent through the Inter-American Court to the alleged victims and expert witnesses indicated in Operative paragraph 1 of this Order. The State shall submit these questions within the non-renewable term that expires on January 10, 2013. The statements required in Operative paragraph 1 shall be submitted the representatives no later than January 28, 2013.

3. To require the representatives to coordinate and make the necessary arrangements so that, once the questions of the State have been received, the deponents and expert witnesses proposed may include the answers in their respective statements and expert opinions rendered by affidavit, in accordance with Considering paragraph 21 of this Order.

4. To require the Secretariat of the Court, once the statements and expert opinions required in Operative paragraph 1 have been received, to transmit them to the Inter-American Commission, the representatives and the State. If the State deems it necessary, it may submit its observations to those statements and expert opinions with its final written arguments, at latest.

5. To summon the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, the representatives and the Argentine Republic to a public hearing be held during the Court's 98th Regular Period of Sessions, at its seat in San Jose, Costa Rica, on February 5, 2013 from 15.00 to 18.30 hours, and on February 6, 2013 from 9.00 to 13.00 hours, to receive their final oral arguments and final oral observations, respectively, regarding the merits and possible reparations and costs, well as to receive the statements and expert opinion of the following persons:

Alleged victim proposed by the representatives:

1) Nilda Maldonado de Gutiérrez, wife of Jorge Omar Gutiérrez, who will describe her life at the time when her husband was allegedly murdered and will testify on the efforts she and her family made to discover the truth about the events

that occurred, the actions of the police, prosecutors and judicial authorities, the alleged obstacles faced by her family in the search for justice, and the supposed impact that her husband's death and the alleged impunity of this event had on her life and that of her family.

Expert witness proposed by the representatives:

1) ***Alberto Binder***, a lawyer and specialist in criminal law and criminal procedure, who will render an expert opinion on the workings of the justice system in the Province of Buenos Aires and on the Buenos Aires Police, in particular, the alleged failings that led to the judicial and police reforms of 1997 and 1998, and the purpose, content and main characteristics of this reform, and the degree of compliance seen in its current operation.

6. To require the Argentine Republic to facilitate the exit from and entrance into its territory of the deponents who reside or are present therein, and who have been summoned in this Order to render their statements and expert opinion at the public hearing regarding the merits and possible reparations and costs in this case, in accordance with Article 26(1) of the Court's Rules of Procedure.

7. To require the representatives to serve notice of this Order to the persons they have proposed and who have been summoned to render a statement and an expert opinion, in accordance with Article 50(2) and 50(4) of the Rules of Procedure.

8. To inform the representatives that that they must cover the costs incurred in providing or rendering the evidence they have offered, pursuant to Article 60 of the Rules of Procedure.

9. To require the representatives to inform the persons summoned by the Court to testify and render an expert opinion that, in accordance with Article 54 of the Rules, the Court shall bring to the State's attention the cases in which the persons summoned to appear or testify before this Court fail to do so, or refuse to testify without legitimate cause or who, in the opinion of the Court, have violated their oath or solemn declaration, so that appropriate action may be taken under the relevant domestic legislation.

10. To inform the representatives, the State and the Inter-American Commission that, once the statements and expert opinions have been rendered at the public hearing, they may present before the Court their final oral arguments and final oral observations, respectively, regarding the merits and possible reparations and costs in this case.

11. To order the Secretariat of the Court, in accordance with Article 55(3) of the Rules of Procedure, to provide the Inter-American Commission, the representatives and the State with the link to the recording of the public hearing in this case, as soon as possible.

12. To inform the Inter-American Commission, the representatives and the State that the time limit established for submitting their final written arguments and final written

observations, respectively, regarding the merits and possible reparations and costs in this case expires on March 7, 2013. This term is non-renewable.

13. To require the Secretariat of the Court to serve notice of this Order to the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, the representatives of the alleged victims and the Argentine Republic.

Diego García-Sayán
President

Pablo Saavedra Alessandri
Secretary

So ordered,

Diego García-Sayán
President

Pablo Saavedra Alessandri
Secretary