

**Order of the  
Inter-American Court of Human Rights**

**of September 2, 2010**

**Provisional Measures  
Regarding Honduras**

**Matter of Gladys Lanza Ochoa**

**HAVING SEEN:**

1. The brief of the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (hereinafter, the "Inter-American Commission" or the "Commission") of August 30, 2010, and its appendices, whereby it submitted to the Inter-American Court of Human Rights (hereinafter, the "Inter-American Court", the "Court" or the "Tribunal") a request for provisional measures, pursuant to the terms of articles 63(2) of the American Convention on Human Rights (hereinafter, the "American Convention" or the "Convention") and 27 of the Court's Rules of Procedure (hereinafter, the "Rules of Procedure"), in order for Honduras (hereinafter, the "State" or "Honduras") to protect the life and physical integrity of Mrs. Gladys Lanza Ochoa.

2. The alleged facts on which the request for provisional measures filed by the Commission is based, to wit:

a) The overthrow of the democratically elected Honduran President and the break-down of the democratic and constitutional order in Honduras of June 28, 2009, which led the Commission, before the submission of hundreds of complaints about serious human rights violations, to request information on the situation of risk of numerous people and, considering the extent of the complaints, to order precautionary measures 196/08 of June 28, 2009, which have been expanded on different occasions;

b) On July 20, 2009, the Commission received information in relation to threats and acts of harassment committed to the detriment of various people, including Mrs. Lanza Ochoa;

c) The representatives of the beneficiary stated that on June 26, 2009, two days before the coup d'état, Mrs. Lanza received messages in which she was told to "take care after June 28." Afterwards, she was visited by a non-identified woman who told her that Billy Joya—who would have been the leader of Battalion 3-16 and who was charged before the Honduran courts of justice with grave human rights violation allegedly committed during the 1980s- was "a great person" and that Mrs. Lanza was always "telling bad things about him." Said non-identified woman told her to be careful since Billy Joya lived near her house. It was also mentioned that the press would have reported the existence of threats against Mrs. Lanza issued by an "advisor minister" of Mr. Micheletti, making reference to the same Mr. Billy Joya;

d) On July 24, 2009, the Commission expanded the precautionary measures to protect, among other people, Mrs. Gladys Lanza Ochoa – spokeswoman and activist in demonstrations and activities

against the coup d'état in Honduras and Coordinator of the *Comité por la Paz Visitación Padilla* (Committee for Peace 'Visitación Padilla');

e) On July 30, 2009, Mrs. Lanza Ochoa would have been adopting measures in defense of "the women of the Committee who were repressed in a demonstration to protest against the coup d'état" and, on that same day, between 11.30 p.m. and midnight, "unknown individuals were shooting" in front of the house of Mrs. Lanza;

f) In response to the request for expansion of the precautionary measures, on October 21, 2009, the Secretariat of the Foreign Affairs of Honduras indicated that it reached an agreement regarding the protective measures in favor of five beneficiaries, including Mrs. Lanza. It further alleged that a settlement agreement was entered into in which it was ordered that the National Police would provide telephone numbers of the police authorities to communicate in case of emergency; and specific police officials were appointed as liaison in Comagagüela and Tegucigalpa;

g) On December 10, 2009, the Secretariat of Foreign Affairs of Honduras informed that it devised protection schemes for various beneficiaries, including Mrs. Lanza Ochoa. In addition, it informed that the body in charge of providing the protection so ordered to the beneficiaries is the Secretary of State in the Security Division and that the Office of the Public Prosecutor was entrusted with the investigation into the facts that gave rise to the adoption of the measures;

h) On December 14, 2009, Mrs. Lanza would have noted that an unknown individual "was watching her from a house located in front of her personal residence". Moreover, three days later, a red Hummer car, without license plate, was parked "for long hours in front of the house of Mrs. Lanza; when she went out, the car started at great speed. To take precautions, the beneficiaries went into her house and went out again twenty minutes later; however, she then noted that the same vehicle was parked in the area";

i) On March 8, 2010, within the framework of the celebration of the International Women's Day, the tires of the organization's vehicle were slashed while it was parked outside the office;

j) On March 29, 2010, while the beneficiary was working in her garden, a black car with polarized windows and without license plate would have approached to her house. The person, who was driving the car, would have opened the window and Mrs. Lanza quickly went into her house. The car was parked there for approximately ten minutes and, an hour later, the beneficiary noted that the car was parked half-block from her residence;

m) Since June 15, 2010, Mrs. Lanza would have been receiving "strange calls to her mobile phone, every day, at approximately 10:00 a.m.; every time she answers the phone, she only hears a gasping. The telephone from which the calls would be made is 89 99 99 99";

l) On July 14, 2010, the *Comité por la Paz Visitación Padilla* issued a document by which it "condemned the presence of North-American bases in Honduras" and on that night, Mrs. Lanza Ochoa would have noted "the presence of several cars in front of her house, which were parked there for more than half hour."

n) On July 17, 2010, Mrs. Lanza took part in the radio program produced by the Committee of Relatives of the Disappeared in Honduras (Comité de Familiares de Detenidos Desaparecidos en Honduras, COFADEH), where she condemned the resurgence of militarism in Honduras and its reinforcement in Honduras and Latin America. During the program, a text message was sent to the program: "You communists are the ones who deserve a kicking for being liars." (Ustedes comunistas son los que kieren (sic) patadas por mentirosos). The telephone number from which the message would be sent is 94 74 45 45.

ñ) On that same day, at 10:52 p.m., Mrs. Lanza would have received a message in her electronic mail which read:

"Have you forgotten about the money you stole from STENEE WITH THE ROLL ROIZ RUSH which now have a NGO stolen from Callejas and have you forgotten about the people you sent to kill in San Pedro Sula when "you controlled the guerrillas of the Communist Party in Padilla Fush? Have you forgotten that old woman? Do you believe that we do not remember?  
Now we will bring you down, old fool!!!"  
Irmita Becerra with Billy Joya Amendola renewed!!!"

The email was accompanied by six photographs: two of the beneficiary, one of Billy Joya, one of a "sniper", one of a casket guarded by men wearing prisoner's uniforms and the last one, a clock with the

time 10:12. According to the representatives, "Mr. Billy Joya was one of the leaders of Battalion 3-16 , which [...] was a military body responsible for grave human rights violations committed during the '80s in Honduras, specially acts of torture and forced disappearances and in addition, this battalion is responsible for the forced disappearance of Mrs. Lanza's partner;"

o) On July 23, 2010, the representatives of the beneficiary presented a brief whereby they indicated that the precautionary measures were never implemented, despite the existence of an agreement regarding the implementation of the protective measures of October 5, 2009, and that Mrs. Lanza continued being the target of threats and other acts of persecution. This had forced her to "keep a low profile regarding her defense work, as well as to adopt other provisional alternative measures to safeguard her life;"

q) On July 23, 2010, Mrs. Lanza Ochoa filed a complaint before the Office of the Public Prosecutor of Honduras;

r) On August 5, 2010, the State indicated before the Commission that a meeting was held on July 30 in which it was "agreed to conduct daily patrols, on car or motorbikes, at her work center 'Visitación Padilla' and at her house;" the State furnished a list with contact information so that "there is a fluid communication and immediate help can be provided in case of emergency, complaint or when the beneficiaries deem appropriate;" it was decided the conduct of daily meetings and the State undertook to give priority to the investigation into the facts;

t) On August 12, 2010, the representatives informed the Commission that the commitments undertaken by the State have not been implemented. They further alleged that on July 30 and August 8, 2010, when the sister of a member of Comité por la Paz Visitación Padilla was arriving at the premises, she would have received the same kind of telephone calls, made from the same telephone number from which it would come the phone calls Mrs. Lanza received. In addition, they pointed out that on August 8, 2010, a taxi driver, a person of trust of the beneficiary, was shot, after a car accident in which he run into a police car; that a police official from the institutions that participated in the meeting of October 5, 2009, would have shot him.

v) On August 17, 2010, the representatives indicated that the agreements reached in the meetings with the state authorities "are not been complied with," that the beneficiary continues receiving threats against her life and personal integrity and that there is no investigation being conducted regarding the facts that gave rise to the adoption of the precautionary measures. They pointed out that on August 12, 2010, unknown individuals "fired gunshots in front of the house of the Coordinator of the Campaign against Femicides which the Committee promotes" and that, according to one of her children who was arriving home at that precise moment, somebody pointed a gun at him. He run in his car and was followed by a motorbike, though "he managed to escape." Before this situation, several police patrols showed up at her residence when those persons were still there who later on "allegedly identified themselves as police officials who were investigating a robbery;"

e) On August 17, 2010, the representatives informed the Commission that before the "absolute lack of implementation of the measures", it was necessary to request the Court to adopt the following provisional measures:

- i. To install a system of closed-circuit television at the offices of the Comité por la Paz Visitación Padilla and at the beneficiary's home to allow permanent surveillance in both places. This system should be monitored by people appointed by the beneficiary and should have resources to respond in case of emergency.
- ii. To pay for personal security services to accompany the beneficiary in her transfers and meetings from her home and from her place of work, this will be exclusively hired by Mrs. Lanza.
- iii. To appoint an investigator to conduct a serious and effective investigation into all the facts that gave rise to the protective measures.
- iii. To coordinate with the beneficiary and her representatives the provisional measures to be implemented.

3. The arguments of the Commission to base its request for provisional measures, among other arguments:

- a) That the gravity of the acts of harassment to which Mrs. Gladys Lanza was subjected, presumably originates from retaliation for her work to promote and protect human rights as Coordinator of the "Comité por la Paz Visitación Padilla". During the enforcement of the precautionary measures ordered by the Commission and despite them, the beneficiary continued being subjected to acts of harassment, which

have increased in the last months. The foregoing is coupled with the fact that the adoption of the precautionary measures was requested on July 24, 2009; that, at least, on two occasions, the State would have made commitments to protect the life and personal integrity of the beneficiary which are not been implemented; and that, since the coup d'état, Honduras has been in a context of intimidation, threats and persecution against human rights defenders;

- b) The nature of the legal interests threatened, that is, the right to life and humane treatment of Mrs. Lanza Ochoa, as well as her capacity to continue working in defense of human rights, constitute an aspect of irreparability of the consequences that this request for provisional measures seeks to avoid,
- c) The ongoing acts of intimidation, persecution and harassment, as well as the lack of information regarding the clearing up of the facts that gave rise to the precautionary measures are translated, up to date, into the fact that Mrs. Lanza Ochoa is in a situation of extreme vulnerability, defenselessness and lack of protection, while her life and physical integrity are at risk of imminent damage;
- d) The situation of Mrs. Lanza complies with the aspect of extreme gravity given that the petitioners have "presented a list of threatening and intimidating acts against the beneficiary which have occurred during a time and got worse in the last two months." The electronic mail that Mrs. Lanza received on July 17, 2010, shows a threat against her life and physical integrity, not only because of its content but also for the intimidating message that the attached photographs transmit. Many of the acts of harassment and threats described by the representatives of the beneficiary would demonstrate that the people behind those acts know about the place of residence, place of work and all her movements; as well as the permanent follow-up and monitor of the activities in defense of human rights she organizes. They would also demonstrate they know about her personal history, considering that Billy Joya was mentioned, of Battalion 3-16;
- e) The information presented "suggest that the risk of causing damage to the beneficiary could be imminent." The fact that the State is not guaranteeing adequate protection in favor of the people who are in a situation of extreme gravity, who are, at the same time, beneficiaries of precautionary measures, plus the fact that the State has not adopted any measures to investigate into the threats or circumstances, creates a risk situation for the beneficiary and,
- f) In this specific case, the State of Honduras has been aware of the facts that gave rise to the expansion of the precautionary measures in favor of Mrs. Lanza since, at least, July 2009. Furthermore, some of the acts of harassment and threats already described would have been reported before the Office of the Public Prosecutor; however, it is unknown whether the authorities have taken steps to shed light on the facts denounced, which could have the effect of fostering the repetition and worsening of the threats instead of preventing them. The ongoing threats allow assuming that the precautionary measures ordered by the Commission were not enforced, despite the State informed that it provided protection to the beneficiary. It seems that the risk factors that gave rise to the precautionary measures were not eliminated either, presumably making the risk situation of the beneficiary worse.

4. The request of the Inter-American Commission so that the Court based on Article 63(2) of the American Convention, orders the State:

- a) To adopt forthwith all the measures that are necessary to guarantee the right to life and humane treatment of the beneficiary;
- b) To adopt all the measures that are necessary to guarantee that the beneficiary is able to continue working in defense and promotion of human rights in Honduras;
- c) To agree with the beneficiary and her representatives on the more appropriate mechanisms for the implementation of the protective measures, in a manner to ensure their effectiveness and relevance;
- d) To conduct an investigation into the facts that gave rise to the request for provisional measures, as a preventive mechanism to impede the occurrence of new threats against the life and integrity of the beneficiary, and
- e) To inform on the measures adopted in light of the above mentioned paragraphs.

**CONSIDERING THAT:**

1. The Republic of Honduras ratified the American Convention on Human Rights on September 8, 1977 and it has accepted the binding jurisdiction of the Court on September 9, 1981, in keeping with Article 62 of the Convention.
2. Article 63(2) of the American Convention establishes that, “[i]n cases of extreme gravity and urgency, and when necessary to avoid irreparable damage to persons, the Court shall adopt such provisional measures as it deems pertinent in matters it has under consideration. With respect to a case not yet submitted to the Court, it may act at the request of the Commission.” This provision is also included in article 27 of the Court's Rules of Procedure.
3. According to the provision established in Article 63(2) of the Convention, provisional measures ordered by this Tribunal are binding on the State in conformity to a basic principle of international law, as supported by international case law, under which States are required to comply with international treaty obligations in good faith (*pacta sunt servanda*).<sup>1</sup>
4. On July 4, 2009, the Extraordinary General Assembly of the Organization of American States (hereinafter, “OAS”) approved resolution AG/RES. 2 (XXXVII-E/09) by which it decided to suspend the right of the Republic of Honduras to participate in the OAS . To that end, in said resolution, the Extraordinary General Assembly emphasized the importance of full respect for human rights and decided

To reaffirm that the Republic of Honduras must continue to fulfill its obligations as a member of the Organization, in particular with regard to human rights; and to urge the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights to continue to take all necessary measures to protect and defend human rights and fundamental freedoms in Honduras;<sup>2</sup>

5. According to the provisions of article 9(e) of the OAS Charter, as well as the provisions of the Preamble and articles 8 and 21 of the Inter-American Democratic Charter, the international obligations in relation to human rights which derived from the American Convention are kept in light of the principle *pacta sunt servanda*, as well as the principles that inspire the mechanism of collective security established in the OAS Charter and the Convention; therefore, such obligations are not suspended, not even when there has been an alteration of the institutional order in one Member State or in the event that took place in Honduras.
6. According to the International Human Rights Law, the provisional measures are not only precautionary in the sense that they preserve a legal situation, but they are also mainly protective since they protect human rights, insofar as they avoid irreparable damage to people. The order to adopt measures is applicable provided the basic requirements of extreme gravity and urgency and the prevention of irreparable damage to persons are met. In this sense, provisional measures become a real jurisdictional guarantee of a preventive nature.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> See *Matter of James et al.* Provisional Measures regarding Trinidad and Tobago. Order of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights of June 14, 1998, Considering Clause six. *Matter of Guerrero Larez*. Provisional Measures regarding Venezuela. Order of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights of November 17, 2009, Considering Clause five and *Case of Rosendo Cantú et al.* Provisional Measures regarding Mexico. Order of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights of February 2, 2010, Considering Clause six.

<sup>2</sup> OAS, Extraordinary General Assembly, Resolution AG/ RES 2 (XXXVII-E/09) of July 4, 2009, operative paragraphs 1 and 2. Available at <http://www.oas.org/CONSEJO/SP/AG/37SGA.asp#docs>.

7. By reason of its competence, within the framework of provisional measures, it falls upon the Court to consider only those arguments which relate strictly to the extreme gravity and urgency and the necessity to avoid irreparable damage to persons. Any other fact or argument can only be analyzed and decided during the consideration of the merits of a contentious case.<sup>4</sup>

8. This request for provisional measures is not related to a case being heard by the Court; instead, the request originated from a request for precautionary measures submitted before the Inter-American Commission. The Court does not have information as to whether the facts brought to the Tribunal's attention are part of a contentious proceeding before the Inter-American system or whether a petition on the merits related to this request has been filed with the Inter-American Commission.<sup>5</sup>

9. The three conditions contained in article 63(2) of the Convention must coexist and must be present in all the situations in which the intervention of the Tribunal is requested.<sup>6</sup>

10. According to information provided by the Commission, despite the fact that the Commission ordered precautionary measures in favor of Mrs. Lanza Ochoa (*supra* Having Seen clause 2), the State has not implemented effective measures to guarantee the protection of her life and integrity. On the contrary, according to what the Commission informs, Mrs. Lanza Ochoa has continued being subjected to acts of harassment, which have increased in the last months. In addition, the Commission pointed out that the context of vulnerability of the beneficiary is worse due to the activities in defense of human rights she organizes as "coordinator of the Comité por la Paz Visitación Padilla."

11. In the present matter, the information and background provided by the Commission suggests *prima facie*<sup>7</sup> the extreme magnitude and intensity of the situation of risk informed of Mrs. Lanza Ochoa, due to the context of harassment and threats she has been subjected to. Moreover, it is clear the situation of vulnerability that Mrs. Lanza Ochoa must face due to the activities she participates in defense of human rights in Honduras and as activist in demonstrations and activities against the coup d'état that took place last year.

---

<sup>3</sup> See *Case of "La Nación" Newspaper*. Provisional Measures regarding Costa Rica. Order of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights, of September 7, 2001; Considering clause four. *Matter of Natera Balboa*. Provisional Measures regarding Venezuela. Order of the President of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights of February 1, 2010; considering clause seven and *Case of Rosendo Cantú et al*, *supra* note 1, considering clause five.

<sup>4</sup> See *Matter of James et al*. Provisional Measures regarding Trinidad and Tobago. Order of the President of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights of August 29, 1998, considering clause six; *Matter of Guerrero Larez*, *supra* note 1, considering clause six and *Case of Rosendo Cantú et al*, *supra* note 1, considering clause fifteen.

<sup>5</sup> On previous occasions, this Court has interpreted that the phrase "a case not yet submitted to the Court" contained in Article 63(2), last paragraph, of the American Convention implies that there must be at least a slight possibility for the matter originating the request for provisional measures to be submitted to the contentious jurisdiction of the Court. The matter originating the request for provisional measures may only be submitted to the Court provided the proceeding set forth in Articles 44 and 46 to 48 of the American Convention has been initiated. See *Matter of García Uribe et al*. Request for Provisional Measures regarding Mexico. Order of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights of February 2, 2006, Considering clause three and four; *Matter of Natera Balboa*, *supra* note 5, Considering clause six and *Matter of Guerrero Larez*, *supra* note 6, Considering clause seven.

<sup>6</sup> See *Case of Carpio Nicolle et al*. Provisional Measures regarding Guatemala. Order of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights of July 6, 2009, Considering clause fourteen; *Matter of Natera Balboa*, *supra* note 5, Considering clause ten and *Matter of Guerrero Larez*, *supra* note 6, Considering clause ten.

<sup>7</sup> See, inter alia, *Matter of Monagas Judicial Confinement Center ("La Pica")*. Provisional Measures regarding Venezuela. Order of the President of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights of January 13, 2006, Considering clause sixteen; *Matter of Guerrero Larez*, *supra* note 6, Considering clause fourteen and *Matter of Natera Balboa*, *supra* note 5, Considering clause fifteen.

12. As the Commission confirmed in its on-site visits and upon the issuance of its "Report Honduras: Human Rights and the Coup d'état" of December 30, 2009, it is particularly relevant the generalized situation of insecurity that, at the moment, the human rights defenders who work in Honduras have to face. In this report, the Commission established that since June 28, a number of civil society organizations have openly expressed their opposition to the coup d'état and alleged the following:

171. These organizations have taken on an active role in protecting human rights as the number of complaints has increased. Some of them had to reorganize their daily routines in order to process complaints filed by those who reach them. Since the coup d'état in Honduras, the Commission has received information to the effect that numerous human rights defenders were in danger. Some human rights organizations filed complaints with the Commission about the means being used by the State to harass human rights defenders. These techniques included the institution of police and judicial inquiries, arbitrary detentions, assaults, intimidation, surveillance and stalking. It was also reported that some of these organizations had had the power cut to their offices, their communication systems disrupted, and their e-mail accounts interfered with. Some offices were fired upon by heavily armed individuals and explosive devices were thrown. Others were searched.<sup>8</sup>

13. Said report makes reference to Mrs. Gladys Lanza as one of the human rights defenders who was at risk. In addition, it was mentioned that "The Commission received information on the killing of at least 7 opponents of the *de facto* government, presumably attributable to agents of the state" and indicated that:

[t]he IACHR was able to confirm that since the coup d'état in Honduras, serious violations of the human rights of its inhabitants have occurred, including deaths, an arbitrary declaration of a state of emergency, suppression of public demonstrations through disproportionate use of force, criminalization of public protest, arbitrary detentions of thousands of persons, cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment and grossly inadequate conditions of detention, militarization of Honduran territory, a surge in the incidents of racial discrimination, violations of women's rights, serious and arbitrary restrictions on the right to freedom of expression, and grave violations of political rights. The IACHR also established that the judicial remedies were ineffective in protecting human rights.<sup>9</sup>

14. In its preliminary observations on its visit of May 2010, the Commission pointed out the following:

19. During the visit conducted in May 2010, the Commission expressed deep concern over the continuation of human rights violations in the context of the coup d'état. In 2010 thus far, the Commission has had to grant a number of precautionary measures on behalf of persons whose lives or personal integrity are at risk. In most cases, the risk is associated with their participation in activities against the coup d'état.

20. Despite the progress made toward restoring democratic institutions, the IACHR has received information on the murders of a number of people, among them journalists and human rights defenders. It has also received reports of a series of threats and harassment against human rights defenders, journalists, social communicators, teachers, union members and members of the resistance.

---

<sup>8</sup> IACHR, Honduras: Human Rights and Coup d'état, OEA/Ser.L/V/II, Doc.55, December 30, 2009, paras. 171 and 172; the footnotes were omitted.

<sup>9</sup> IACHR, Honduras: Human Rights and Coup d'état, OEA/Ser.L/V/II, Doc.55, December 30, 2009, paras. 166, 238-251 and 551.

In relation to the precautionary measures, the Commission expressed that:

[...] was able to establish that the efforts the State made to implement the precautionary measures have been few, late in coming, inadequate and in some cases nonexistent. [...] The Commission also received testimony to the effect that some beneficiaries of precautionary measures are afraid to receive any protection from the very persons they regard as the aggressors.<sup>10</sup>

15. The Tribunal considers that the adoption of provisional measures should not be deferred, as a mechanism of protection of human rights, in order to forestall the threats that loom over Mrs. Lanza Ochoa, given that the delay or lack of response would imply a danger to her. Lastly, it is evident the irreparable nature of the damage that may be caused to the rights to life and human treatment, which are in danger before such situation of risk.

16. The person indicated by the Inter-American Commission in its request for provisional measures would be *prima facie* in a situation of extreme gravity and urgency, given that her physical integrity and life are threatened and at great risk. As a result, the Inter-American Court deems it is necessary to protect said person by means of provisional measures, in light of the terms of the article 62(3) American Convention and 27 of the Tribunal's Rules of Procedure.

17. Moreover, the Court recalls that States have the specific duty to protect all people working in non-governmental organizations and give effective and adequate guarantees to human rights defenders so that they may perform their tasks freely, and to deplore acts that prevent or hamper their work since such work constitutes a positive contribution and supplements the efforts made by the State in its capacity of guarantor of the rights of individual under its jurisdiction.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> IACHR, Preliminary Observations of the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights on its visit to Honduras, May 15 to 18, 2010, OEA/Ser.L/V/II, Doc. 68, June 3, 2010, para. 71. See also paras. 72-76.

<sup>11</sup> See *Case of Monagas Judicial Confinement Center ("La Pica")*. Provisional Measures regarding Venezuela. Order of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights of February 9, 2006, considering clause fourteen. Case of Plan de Sanchez Massacre. Provisional Measures regarding Guatemala. Order of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights of November 25, 2006, Considering Clause twelve. Case of Gloria Giralt de García Prieto et al. Provisional Measures regarding El Salvador Order of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights of September 26, 2006, Considering Clause eight. Furthermore, see Organization of American States, "*Human Rights Defenders in the Americas*": Support for the individuals, groups, and organizations of civil society working to promote and protect human rights in the Americas, AG/Res. 1671 (XXIX-O/99) of June 7, 1999; AG/Res. 1711 (XXX-O/00) of June 5, 2000, and AG/Res. 2412 (XXXVIII-O/08) of June 3, 2008.



**THEREFORE:**

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

by virtue of the authority granted by Article 63(2) of the American Convention and Articles 27 and 31 of its Rules of Procedure,

**DECIDES:**

1. To order the State of Honduras to adopt, forthwith, the measures necessary to protect the right to life and humane treatment of Mrs. Gladys Lanza Ochoa.
2. To order the State to inform the Inter-American Court, no later than September 20, 2010, on the measures established in operative paragraph one of this Order.
3. To require the representatives of the beneficiary and the Inter-American Commission to submit to the Inter-American Court, within one week, the observations they deem pertinent to the report mentioned in operative paragraph two of this Order.
4. To require the State, in addition, to inform the Inter-American Court, every two months, as of September 20, 2010, on the provisional measures adopted according to this Order.
5. To call upon the representatives of the beneficiaries and the Inter-American Commission to submit their comments within the term of four and six weeks, respectively, as of notice of the State reports mentioned in operative paragraph four.
6. To require the Secretariat to notify this Order to the State, the Inter-American Commission and the beneficiary's representatives.

Diego García-Sayán  
President

Leonardo A. Franco

Manuel E. Ventura Robles

Margarette May Macaulay

Rhadys Abreu Blondet

Alberto Pérez Pérez

Eduardo Vio Grossi

Pablo Saavedra Alessandri  
Secretary

So ordered,

Diego García-Sayán  
President

Pablo Saavedra Alessandri  
Secretary