

Order of the
Inter-American Court of Human Rights
of January 31, 2008
Case of Gutiérrez Soler V. Colombia
(Monitoring Compliance with Judgment)

HAVING SEEN:

1. The Judgment on the merits, reparations and costs delivered by the Inter-American Court of Human Rights (hereinafter, the "Court", "the Inter-American Court" or the "Tribunal") on September 12, 2005, in this case, by which it was ruled that:

1. The State must comply with the measures ordered with regard to its duty to investigate the events reported, as well as to identify, try, and punish the perpetrators, as set forth in paragraphs 96 to 100 of [...] Judgment.

2. The State must provide, free of charge, at the health-care facilities the State itself may indicate, psychological and psychiatric treatment to María Elena Soler de Gutiérrez, Ricardo Gutiérrez-Soler, Yaqueline Reyes, Luisa Fernanda Gutiérrez-Reyes, Paula Camila Gutiérrez-Reyes, Leonardo Gutiérrez-Rubiano, Leydi Caterin Gutiérrez-Peña, Sulma Tatiana Gutiérrez-Rubiano, Ricardo Alberto Gutiérrez-Rubiano, and Carlos Andrés Gutiérrez-Rubiano, as set forth in paragraph 102 of [...] Judgment. In the case of medical care and psychological treatment for Mr. Wilson Gutiérrez-Soler, and of the psychological care for his son Kevin Daniel Gutiérrez-Niño, the State shall pay the amount fixed in paragraph 103 to Mr. Wilson Gutiérrez-Soler to cover his reasonable expenses in that respect.

3. The State must publish within six months from the date the notice of [...] judgment is served upon it at least once in the official gazette and in another national daily newspaper, the Sections entitled Proven Facts, without the corresponding footnotes, paragraphs 51 to 59 of the Section entitled Merits, as well as the operative paragraphs, as set forth in paragraph 105 [...].

4. The State must implement in the training courses for military criminal court staff for police staff a program aimed at analyzing the Inter-American System for Human Rights Protection precedents, as set forth in paragraphs 106 to 108 of [...] Judgment.

5. The State must adopt a training program that takes into account the international standards set in the Istanbul Protocol, as set forth pursuant to paragraph 110 of [...] Judgment.

6. The State shall adopt the necessary measures to strengthen existing control mechanisms in state arrest centers, as set forth in paragraph 112 of [...] Judgment.

7. The State must pay the amounts established in paragraph 76 and 78 of [...] Judgment as compensation for pecuniary damages, as set forth in paragraphs 70, 118, 119 and 121 to 125 thereof.

8. The State must pay the amounts fixed in paragraph 85 of [...] Judgment as non-pecuniary damage, as set forth in paragraphs 70, 118, 119 and 121 to 125 thereof.

9. The State must pay amount fixed in paragraph 117 of [...] Judgment as costs and expenses, as set forth in paragraphs 118 and 120 to 125 thereof.

10. The State must exercise special care to safeguard the life, integrity and safety of Messrs. Wilson and Ricardo Gutiérrez-Soler and of their next of kin, and must afford them the necessary protection from any persons, bearing in mind the events of the instant case and in accordance with the protective measures Order made by this Court on March 11, 2005.

[...]

2. The reports of November 27th, 2006 and September 5th, 2007 and their exhibits, by which the State of Colombia (hereinafter, the "State" or "Colombia"), established the adopted measures in order to comply with the Judgment delivered by this Tribunal on the matter.

3. The briefs of June 20th, 2007 and October 24, 2007, by victims' representatives (hereinafter, the "representatives") submitted their observations to the State's reports (*supra* Having Seen clause 2).

4. The briefs of January 17th and November 20th, 2007 by which the Inter-American Commission of Human Rights (hereinafter, the "Commission" or the "Inter-American Commission") submitted the observations to the reports presented by the State (*supra*, Having Seen clause 2).

CONSIDERING:

1. It is an inherent power of the judicial functions of the Court to monitor compliance with its decisions.

2. That Colombia has been a State Party to the American Convention on Human Rights (hereinafter, the "American Convention") since May 31, 1973, and that it accepted the binding jurisdiction of the Court on June 21, 1985.

3. That article 68.1 of the American Convention stipulates that "[t]he States Parties to the Convention undertake to comply with the judgment of the Court in any case to which they are parties". Therefore, the States must ensure that the rulings set out in the decisions of the Court are implemented at the domestic level.¹

4. That, in consideration of section 67 of the American Convention, which stipulates that the judgment of the Court shall be final and shall not be subject to appeal, such judgment shall be fully and promptly complied with by the State.

5. That the obligation to comply with the rulings of the Court conforms to a basic principle of the law on the international responsibility of States, under which States are required to fulfill their international treaty obligations in good faith (*pacta sunt servanda*)² and, as previously held by the Court and provided for in Article 27 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties of 1969, States cannot invoke their municipal

¹ Cf. *Case of Baena Ricardo et al.* Competence. Judgment of November 28, 2003. Series C No. 104, para 131; *Case of García Asto and Ramírez Rojas*. Monitoring Compliance with Judgment Order of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights of July 12, 2007, Having Seen Clause four; and *Case of Molina Theissen*. Monitoring Compliance with Judgment Order of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights of July 10, 2007, Considering Clause two.

² Cf. *International Responsibility for the Promulgation and Enforcement of Laws in Violation of the Convention* (articles 1 and 2 American Convention on Human Rights). Advisory Opinion OC-14/94 of September 9, 1994, Series A N°.14, para. 35; *Case of García Asto and Ramírez Rojas v. Peru*. Monitoring Compliance with Judgment. *Supra* 1; Sixth Having Seen Clause and *Case of Molina Theissen*, Monitoring Compliance with Judgment, *supra* note 1, Having Seen Clause Three.

laws to escape from their pre-established international responsibility.³ The treaty obligations of States Parties are binding on all State powers and organs.⁴

6. That the States Parties to the Convention must ensure compliance with its provisions and their inherent effects (*effet utile*) within their respective domestic legal systems. This principle applies not only in connection with the substantive provisions of human rights treaties (*i.e.* those dealing with provisions on protected rights) but also in connection with procedural rules, such as the ones concerning compliance with the decisions of the Court. Such obligations are intended to be interpreted and enforced in a manner such that the protected guarantee is truly practical and effective, taking into account the special nature of human rights treaties.⁵

*

* *

7. That, as to the obligation to investigate the facts of the instant case, identify and if applicable, try and punish the responsible, the State informed that the Attorney General's Office, by means of a brief of August 25, 2006, filed an appeal for review with the Supreme Court of Justice. The State pointed out that the appeal for review filed with the Court due to the torture to which the victim, Mr. Wilson Gutiérrez Soler, was subjected, has been admitted by the Supreme Court of Justice by means of a court order of July 16, 2007 and that at the moment, is being processed according to Articles 223 to 227 of the Penal Code. To such regard, the State informed that it is aware of the fact that "the measures already taken do not imply that this obligation has been complied with"; notwithstanding, it considered that the measures adopted constitute an "important progress to identify, try and punish the responsible and accordingly, it [requested] that such measures [be] assessed by the parties".

8. That the Inter-American Commission deemed pertinent the information provided by the State and it was waiting for information on the progress of the appeal for review filed with the domestic courts. Accordingly, the representatives pointed out that "even though it is true that the appeal for review [...] constitutes an important progress within the domestic legal system, as a way of enforcing the decisions delivered by international bodies within the justice domain, it is not less true that such must be implemented within a reasonable time". According to the representatives, the appeal for review of this case "has not been expedited straightforward as the Court established and yet, two years

³ Cf. *Case of García Asto and Ramírez Rojas*. Monitoring Compliance with the Judgment, *supra*, note 1; Considering Clause six; *Case of Molina Theissen*. Monitoring Compliance with Judgment, *supra* note 1, Having Seen Clause three.

⁴ Cf. *Case of Baena Ricardo et al.* Competence, *supra* note 1, para.60; *Case of Gomez Palomino*. Monitoring Compliance with Judgment Order of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights of October 18, 2007; Considering Clause seven; *Case of García Asto and Ramírez Rojas*. Monitoring Compliance with Judgment, *supra* note 1, Having Seen Clause six.

⁵ Cf. *Case of Ivcher Bronstein*. Competence. Judgment of September 24, 1999. Series C No. 54, para. 37; *Case of Gómez Palomino*. Monitoring Compliance with Judgment, *supra* note 4; Considering clause four; *Case of García Asto and Ramírez Rojas*. Monitoring Compliance with the Judgment, *supra*, note 1; Considering Clause seven; *Case of Molina Theissen*. Monitoring Compliance with Judgment, *supra* note 1, Having Seen Clause four.

later, the appeal was admitted [...]". Based on the foregoing, the representatives pointed out that the State has not complied with this obligation, inasmuch as the State has not exhausted all the measures at its disposal to expedite the corresponding legal proceedings.

9. That the measures adopted by the State must be deemed pertinent so that the Attorney General's Office can file an appeal for review regarding the final decisions delivered by the domestic courts on this matter. This Tribunal takes notes that the Supreme Court of Justice admitted said appeal on July 16, 2007, thus the corresponding legal procedure is being followed. To such regard, the Tribunal considers it is necessary that Colombia informs on the processing and results achieved after such decision was made and also, submits detailed and complete information on the other measures that are being adopted in order to investigate the facts of the case.

*

* *

10. That, with regard to the medical care and psychological treatment ordered by the Court in its Judgment, the State informed that such care and treatment could not be provided as suggested in the Judgment, since the next-of-kin of Mr. Wilson Gutiérrez Soler do no longer reside in the country due to security reasons. In the brief of September 5, 2007, the State suggested that, despite the fact that it was requested on two occasions, the representatives could not provide information regarding the beneficiaries that still live in the country and want to receive the service in order to make an "offer to other State's entities through which they c[ould] receive medical care and psychological treatment". As to the medical care and psychological treatment for Mr. Gutiérrez Soler and his son, the State informed that it had already paid in full the amount determined by the Court to such end.

11. That the representatives pointed out that the sum of money ordered by the Tribunal in order to provide medical and psychological treatment to Mr. Wilson Gutiérrez Soler and his son "was actually settled by the State", for they considered that "there is no issue pending discussion" in such respect. Moreover, the representatives expressed that even if it is true that "some of the people who were impaired [...] had the urgent need to leave the country and that that precludes the compliance with this measure", during the time that those persons were in the country, they had not received the appropriate treatment. In view of this situation, the representatives requested the Court to issue a ruling regarding "an alternate measure to satisfy the State's obligation to compensate the people who are abroad". Furthermore, they repeated that this measure "also protects some of the persons who are living in the country, namely: María Elena Soler de Gutiérrez, Leydi Caterín Gutiérrez Peña and Carlos Andrés Gutiérrez Rubiano, for whom this obligation has not been complied with".

12. That the Commission considered it is vital that the State devotes its best efforts to contact those beneficiaries residing in the country, either directly or through their representatives, so that the medical treatment is provided as soon as possible.

13. That according to the argument of the State and the representatives, Colombia delivered the sum of money determined by the Tribunal to cover all reasonable expenses

for the medical and psychological treatment of Mr. Wilson Gutiérrez Soler and the psychological treatment of his son, Kevin Daniel Gutiérrez Niño.

14. That the Inter-American Court ordered the State to “provide, free of charge, at the health-care facilities the State itself may indicate psychological and psychiatric treatment to [the victims named in operative paragraph two of the Judgment] require”. In accordance to the terms of paragraph 91.i) of the Judgment, the victims’ representatives requested this type of reparation.

15. That even if this measure aims at contributing to the reparation of the physical and psychological damage that derived from the violations committed, the method ordered for its compliance cannot be modified during the stage of monitoring compliance with the Judgment. Therefore, as long as some of the beneficiaries live abroad, the State will be precluded from providing the medical and psychological treatment so ordered in that respect.

16. That, as is evident from the information provided, the victims’ next- of-kin that reside in Colombia have not yet received the medical and psychological treatment ordered due to failure of communication between the parties. The Court repeats that, in order to properly fulfill this measure, the State should manage the concerns of the next-of-kin. The representatives should cooperate so that this can be possible.

*

* *

17. That, on April 2 and September 11, 2006, the State published in the national weekly newspaper, called “El Espectador” and in the official gazette, respectively, the corresponding paragraphs of the Judgment delivered by this Tribunal in this matter. The State submitted copies of said publications.

18. That the representatives expressed their dissent from the publication made in the weekly newspaper “El Espectador” of the Judgment delivered in this matter since the “letter, size and placement of such Judgment in the newspaper do not comply with the purpose of the measure ordered by the Court”. Accordingly, the State expressed that “it is more than willing to fulfill the judgments delivered by the Inter-American Court, not just from a formal point of view”, so that it offered a new publication of this case. The State informed that on August 27, 2007 it held a meeting with the representatives, in which the National Police Department submitted a proposal of the new publication. Said proposal would have been rejected by the representatives after considering that that means of communication is not good enough to broadcast the information. The State informed that it agreed on examining other possibilities in order to publish a shorter text in order to facilitate the budgetary processing of the Police. Notwithstanding the foregoing, it requested the Court to declare that this measure is fulfilled, even though the steps “that in good faith the State is taking in order to carry out the publication of the Judgment for the second time”. The representatives pointed out there still are some restraints in such regard, for that such compliance would only be pending within the domestic venue.

19. That the Commission acknowledged the compliance with this aspect of the Judgment. Nevertheless, it deemed appropriate the will expressed by the State when considering of good faith the possibility of carrying out a new publication of the pertinent parts of the Judgment in a national daily newspaper.

20. That the State has complied with its obligation to publish the pertinent parts of the Judgment delivered by this Tribunal in this matter in the official gazette and in a national daily newspaper, in view of what has been determined therein. In relation to the observations made by the representatives as to the publication of the pertinent parts of the Judgment in a national daily newspaper, the Tribunal looks favorably to the fact that, in spite of having published said paragraphs in the weekly newspaper, *el Espectador*, the State has made a commitment to arrange a second publication of a shorter length of the Judgment, to which the representatives would have agreed.

*

* *

21. That the State informed that the law enforcement personnel and other public servants are at the moment receiving training on the case-law of the Inter-American system. The State pointed out that the Santander General National School of Police [*Escuela Nacional de Policía General Santander*] is at the moment teaching training courses on human rights at different levels to the staff of the National Police, and the case of Mr. Wilson Gutiérrez Soler is included in the syllabus as a "lesson learned". The State noted that the Bureau of the Judicial Police [*Dirección de Policía Judicial*] is also studying the cases of the Inter-American system of human rights. As to the inclusion of Mr. Gutiérrez Soler's case as a "learn lesson", the State informed that it showed the representatives the way the case is being taught in order to receive more information and comments and that the observations made by the representatives would have been put under the consideration of the learning body. Moreover, Colombia pointed out that the Ministry of National Defense included a training course on the analysis of the case-law of the Inter-American system for the staff of the Air Force and training programs on the subject-matter for the National Army. Finally, it informed that the Executive Bureau of Military Criminal Courts [*Dirección Ejecutiva de la Justicia Penal Militar*] hold, between June 19 and 22, 2007, a "Seminar on Case-Law of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights" [*Seminario sobre Jurisprudencia de la Corte Interamericana de Derechos Humanos*] in the city of Bogotá. During July 12 and 13, 2007, that same training course was conducted in the city of Cali. The State contributed with some documents on the training some officers of law enforcement agencies receive regarding the Judgment delivered in the case of Gutiérrez Soler, as well as other decisions adopted by this Court in cases against the Colombian State.

22. To such end, the representatives pointed out that they consider positive the implementation of permanent training programs for the personnel of law enforcement agencies and Military Criminal Courts, and that they should include the study of the precedents of the instant case as a "learned lesson". Nevertheless, they added that this "is not enough" since this measure must "be permanent and, as a consequence, must be open to improvement". The representatives requested the Court to declare the non-compliance with this measure of reparation in view of the fact that its purpose "is fulfilled not only with the implementation of training programs but also with the adoption of some measures to enforce such precedents".

23. That the Commission took note and valued the information provided by the State with regard to the training program for the staff of the Military Criminal Courts and law enforcement agencies regarding the case-law of the Inter-American System of Human Rights and, specially, the use of the case of Gutiérrez Soler as a "learned lesson" within the framework of such training.

24. That the measures adopted by the State for the implementation of the training courses for the staff of the National Police, Air Force, National Army and Bureau of Judicial Police, as well as for the personnel of the military criminal jurisdiction, on a program aimed at analyzing the case-law of the Inter-American system of human rights evidence that the State has complied with the obligation ordered by the Inter-American Court (*supra* Having Seen clause 1). Specially, the Tribunal considers it is positive that the case of Mr. Gutiérrez Soler has been included in the reference training programs, in view of the requirements of the Judgment delivered in this case.

*

* *

25. That, with regard to the obligation to implement training programs regarding the *Manual on the Effective Investigation and Documentation of Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment* ("the Istanbul Protocol"), the State informed on the beginning of the activities in such regard. In the first place, it pointed out that the Ministry of Foreign Affairs gathered in different schools of the State to investigate how familiar with the Istanbul Protocol people are. In the second place, it informed that it was found during previous inquiries that Colombia did not count with skilled personnel to carry out a proper broadcasting and training over the subject matter. To such end, the State would have asked the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights sitting in Colombia for cooperation; such cooperation was provided in June, 2007, according to the information given by the State. Colombia expressed that the training was planned and provided through different public training schools in order to gain support for the programs and adequate broadcasting at national level. According to information and documentation provided by the State, on June 25 and 30, 2007, the first international seminar on the Istanbul Protocol was conducted in Colombia, in order to circulate this manual. The training was under the charge of different international experts. The seminar was divided into two target populations. The first training counted with the participation of officers from the Prosecutor's Office, the Attorney General's Office, the Supreme Judiciary Council [*Consejo Superior de la Judicatura*], the Domestic and Justice Ministry, the National Legal Medicine Institute [*Instituto Nacional de Medicina Legal*], the Ombudsman and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, with a total of 70 qualified officers. The second part of the seminar was conducted at the *Santander General National School of Police* and was addressed to the members of the National Police, National Army, National Navy, Air Force, Military Criminal Courts, the Administrative Department of Security and the National Correctional and Prison Institute, with a total of 60 qualified officers, approximately. Colombia pointed out that, at the moment, is organizing workshops or seminars inside each entity, which are being delivered by already trained officers with the cooperation of the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights. Moreover, it informed that the study of the Istanbul Protocol has been included "in the syllabus of Human Rights-International Humanitarian Rights of the Training and Learning Schools as ordered by the Command of the Army" and that such document was added to the reference library of the Army units.

26. That to such end, the representatives stated that the publication of the Istanbul Protocol demands its implementation as an international standard for the proper investigation of cases regarding the violation of human rights. The publication constitutes an important step to guarantee the non-repetition of such acts, however, such publication is carried out through the implementation of such document. Moreover, they pointed out that the training of officers must be constant and permanent and thus, the obligation cannot be considered as fulfilled when only near 100 officers of the State are receiving training. Based on the foregoing, they requested the Court to declare that the State has not complied with that obligation.

27. That the Commission looked favorably to what the State has informed. In accordance with the statement made by the Commission, this measure constitutes the first important step towards the guarantee of non-repetition of acts as the ones committed in the instant case.

28. That the State has complied with its duty to adopt a training program taking into account the rules established in the Istanbul Protocol (*supra* Having Seen clause 1). The Tribunal deems pertinent the efforts made by the State when adopting this program and, considering the observations made by the representatives, it hopes that the program continues in the future as a contribution to the non-repetition of the facts of the instant case.

*

* *

29. That, in relation to the adoption of measures in order to strengthen the existing control mechanisms in state arrest centers, the State informed that the Colombian National Prison Institute (hereinafter, the "INPEC") provides the following benefits in the arrest centers: Human rights defenders, daily medical examinations for inmates, medical care and psychological treatment to INPEC's officials, psychosocial workshops and training programs on human rights in collaboration with the Colombian Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights. The State informed that the INPEC is the only state institution having arrest centers; the other institutions as the National Police or the Attorney General's Office have rooms where a person can stay 36 hours waiting to be taken before a competent authority or to be released.

30. That the representatives pointed out that this obligation should be declared unfulfilled until those control mechanisms are also activated in the waiting rooms, since the standard of the Inter-American Court does not identify to which type of centers the guarantees are applicable, making it clear that the control and register activities adopted by the State so far are deemed pertinent.

31. That to such respect, the Commission pointed out that even though the prison facilities would be the main addressee of these measures, in practice, it is essential to adopt these measures in provisional detention facilities or police departments, among others, where a violation of human rights such as the one committed in this case could also happened.

32. That, it is necessary for Colombia to submit precise information on the steps that are being taken towards the compliance with this aspect of the Judgment, in view of the

observations submitted by the representatives and the Inter-American Commission. The State shall be able to submit all documentation it considers useful in order to demonstrate the full compliance with this obligation.

*

* *

33. That, in relation to the payment of compensations for pecuniary and non-pecuniary damages, costs and expenses, in the reports of November 27, 2006 and September 5, 2007, the State pointed out that "by means of orders N° 0446 of October 4, 2006 and 0092 of February 16, 2007, the State complied in full with the payment of the compensations and costs ordered by the Inter-American Court and that the representatives so acknowledged it in their report of May, 2007. Therefore, the State request[ed] the Inter-American Court to declare this obligation to have been complied with and as a consequence, the operative paragraphs 7, 8 and 9 of the Judgment of October 11, 2005". The State annexed supporting documentation.

34. That the Inter-American Commission took note of the information provided by the State in relation to the payments made and observed that the "compliance with this aspect of the Judgment represents a very important step, even though it may be necessary to submit additional observations once the representatives of the victim and of his next-of-kin present their comments regarding the State's report". In addition, the representatives pointed out that the Colombian State complied with the payment of the compensations and costs, for what they understood that there was "no discussion regarding such aspect".

35. That, in view of the information provided by the State and the observations made by the representatives, Colombia has complied with its obligation to pay the sums of money fixed by the Tribunal as compensation for pecuniary and non-pecuniary damages (*supra* Having Seen clause 1), as well as with the amounts set by the Tribunal as costs and expenses (*supra* Having Seen clause 1).

THEREFORE:

THE INTER-AMERICAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS,

by virtue of its authority to monitor compliance with its own decisions pursuant to Articles 33, 62(1), 62(3), 67 and 68(1) of the American Convention on Human Rights, and Articles 25(1) and 30 of its Statute and 29(2) of its Rules of Procedure,

DECLARES:

1. That in accordance with the terms of Considering clauses 13, 20, 24, 28 and 35 of this Order, the State has fully complied with the following operative paragraphs of the Judgment delivered in the instant case:

a) The publication in the official gazette and in another national daily newspaper of the pertinent parts of the Judgment delivered by this Court in this case (*operative paragraph three of the Judgment*).

b) The duty to pay the amount fixed by the Tribunal to Mr. Wilson Gutiérrez-Soler to cover the reasonable expenses for his medical care and psychological treatment as well as the psychological care for his son Kevin Daniel Gutiérrez-Niño (*operative paragraph two of the Judgment*);

c) The implementation of training courses for law enforcement personnel in a program aimed at analyzing the Inter-American System for Human Rights Protection precedents (*operative paragraph four of the Judgment*);

d) The adoption of a training program that takes into account the international standards set in the Istanbul Protocol (*operative paragraph five of the Judgment*);

e) The payment of the amounts fixed by the Tribunal as compensation for pecuniary and non-pecuniary damage (*operative paragraphs seven and eight of the Judgment*) and,

f) The payment of the amount fixed by the Tribunal as costs and expenses (*operative paragraph nine of the Judgment*),

2. That the procedure to monitor compliance with the following pending aspects will remain open:

a) The compliance with the measures ordered with regard to the State's duty to investigate the events reported, as well as to identify, try, and punish the perpetrators (*operative paragraph one of the Judgment*);

b) The provision, free of charge, of psychological and psychiatric treatment at the health-care facilities the State itself may indicate (*operative paragraph two of the Judgment*) and,

c) The adoption of the necessary measures to strengthen existing control mechanisms in state arrest centers (*operative paragraph six of the Judgment*).

DECIDES:

1. Request the State of Colombia to adopt all measures necessary to effectively and promptly fulfill those aspects, which are still pending compliance, in accordance with the terms established in Article 68.1 of the American Convention on Human Rights.
2. To order the State of Colombia to submit to the Inter-American Court of Human Rights, not later than July 8, 2008, a report describing all the measures adopted to comply with the reparations so ordered by this Court, which are still pending compliance.
3. To call upon the representatives of the victims and the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights to submit their observations to the State's report referred to in the preceding operative paragraph, within a period of four and six weeks, respectively, as from the date of receipt of the report.
4. To continue monitoring the aspects of the Judgments on the merits, reparations and costs that are still pending compliance.
5. To notify this Order to the State of Colombia, the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights and the representatives of the victims.

Cecilia Medina Quiroga
President

Diego García-Sayán

Sergio García Ramírez

Manuel E. Ventura Robles

Leonardo A. Franco

Margarette May Macaulay

Rhadys Abreu Blondet

Pablo Saavedra Alessandri
Secretary

So ordered,

Cecilia Medina Quiroga
President

Pablo Saavedra Alessandri
Secretary