

Press Release

Inter-American Court of Human Rights

I/A Court H.R._PR-14/2023 English

Should you have any trouble viewing this message, please click [HERE](#)



I/A Court H.R. Protecting Rights

INTER-AMERICAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS HOLDS ITS 155TH REGULAR SESSION



San José, Costa Rica, February 16, 2023. The Inter-American Court of Human Rights held its 155th Regular Session between January 23 and February 7, 2023.

During the Session, eight Public Hearings of Contentious Cases were held, three Judgments were deliberated, and one public order was made. Hearings were also held to Monitor Compliance with Judgments and Provisional Measures.

I. Opening of the Inter-American Judicial Year 2023



On February 7, the Opening Ceremony of the Inter-American Judicial Year 2023 took place.

The plenary of Judges of the Inter-American Court participated in the Ceremony. During the opening of the Inter-American Judicial Year, the President of the Court, Judge Ricardo Pérez Manrique, the First Vice President of the Republic of Costa Rica, Stephan Neibig, and the President of the Superior Court of Justice of Brazil, Minister Maria Thereza Rocha, gave presentations along with the former president and former judge of the Inter-American Court, Sergio García Ramírez. Diplomatic representatives, State authorities, representatives of international organizations and social leaders, among others, also attended the event at the Court's headquarters.

The First Vice President of the Republic of Costa Rica, Mr. Stephan Neibig, highlighted the Inter-American Court's outstanding work in the defense and protection of human rights in the hemisphere and called on the States to continue the process of strengthening the Court.

The President of the Superior Court of Justice of Brazil, Minister María Thereza Rocha, highlighted the "ties of cooperation and strengthening of the relationship" between the Judiciary of Brazil and the case law of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights. "Democratic systems require that the judiciary exercises the ultimate authority over the legality of the actions of the other branches. They are essential checks and balances for the preservation of the rule of law. It is judicial independence that empowers the Judiciary to interpret and apply the laws issued by the Legislative Branch and to review the administrative acts of the Executive Branch. In this sense, it ensures the rule of law itself", highlighted the President of the Superior Court of Justice of Brazil. She also mentioned the case law that the Inter-American Court has generated on Brazil regarding judicial independence and stressed that the "Inter-American Court has a fundamental role in this essential mission of disseminating, protecting and promoting human rights in our region, in addition to providing reparation measures for victims of violations, acting even when national judicial systems fail. It is up to the judges of the region to improve the culture of control of conventionality, since ignorance of the jurisprudential framework of the Inter-American Court contributes to perpetuation of violations, substantially weakening our democracies".

Former President of the Court, Sergio García Ramírez, reviewed the impact of the Court's work in its 45 years of existence. "American navigation has its origin at a point and at a time when there was no basic respect for human rights, and it has as its destination point the exercise of human rights in practice. We have not yet reached that point, but the Inter-American Court has been the driving force to navigate towards that point," said García Ramírez.

The President of the Court, Judge Ricardo C. Pérez Manrique, reviewed the Court's work for the year 2022. "The results are categorical: the Court held full sessions for a total of 24 weeks. 42 public hearings and three evidentiary proceedings on Contentious Cases were held. 25 Judgments on the Merits and nine Judgments of Interpretation were issued, as well as an Advisory Opinion. The processing average has remained at 24 months. There were also 58 orders issued, both for Monitoring Compliance and Provisional Measures", highlighted the President of the Court. He also underlined that "during 2022, 18 training courses were held, training more than 1800 people, the vast majority coming from judicial institutions and state bodies for the protection of human rights from 12 States, as well as 17 meetings informing journalists of the Court's work".

The President of the Court also referred to the Court's efforts to become sustainable. "This vision of sustainable justice means reducing the use of paper, reducing the carbon footprint and using technologies that seek to make their jurisdictional work sustainable and inclusive. The change to sustainable energy includes the implementation of solar panels at our headquarters and the exclusive use of electric vehicles.

"As part of the Court's Open Doors strategy, the Court was able to resume visits to the States, a key aspect in the relationship between judicial bodies, in order to maintain an active dialogue with the different institutional and social stakeholders. The judicial bodies must be open and not afraid of relations and dialogue with countries, which allows judges to have a first-hand view of the continent's challenges." The Court held a Regular Session in Brazil and another in Uruguay.

Regarding the activities for the year 2023, the President of the Court announced "the creation of the Judicial Training Center of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights. The Court considers that the first defense of human rights is always with the national judicial officers, who are those who must intervene immediately and in a timely manner when faced with violations of individuals' human rights."

"At the same time, I want to announce the creation of the I/A Court H.R. TV Channel. The Court not only actively communicates its case law through traditional mechanisms, it now goes one step further", said the President.

In addition, the President of the Court announced the adoption of two protocols. One for victim support where "when deemed necessary, an alleged victim can have adequate psychological care and be accompanied during their appearance before the Court". The second protocol will be the participation of children, which will allow, "the guiding principle of the best interests of the children to be taken into account, to participate and become true parties to the proceedings before the Court and assert their legal interests in an autonomous manner", the President highlighted.

In terms of cooperation, the President of the Court announced that the Caribbean Scholarship, aimed at young lawyers from the English-speaking Caribbean, would be resumed. "This area of training also demonstrates the commitment to the Caribbean", highlighted the President.

View the live broadcast of the Opening Ceremony of the Inter-American Judicial Year 2023 [here](#).

II. Public Hearings of Contentious Cases

The Court held public hearings in the following contentious cases.

1. Case of López Sosa v. Paraguay

This case relates to the State's international responsibility for the alleged illegal detention, torture, and violation of judicial guarantees and judicial protection, with respect to Jorge Luis López Sosa, who at the time of the events (the year 2000) was a Police Inspector. According to

the petitioner, the alleged victim's detention occurred in the context of a state of emergency. The Commission concluded that the State is responsible for the violation of the rights to humane treatment, personal liberty, judicial guarantees and judicial protection, established in Articles 5(1), 5(2), 7(1), 7(2), 7(4), 7(5), 8(1), and 25(1) of the American Convention on Human Rights in relation to Articles 1(1) and 2 of the same instrument, to the detriment of Jorge López Sosa. The Commission also concluded that the State is responsible for the violation of Articles 1, 6, and 8 of the Inter-American Convention to Prevent and Punish Torture.

Learn more about the case [here](#).

The public hearing was held on Friday January 27, 2023. View the broadcast of the hearing [here](#).

2. Case of Guzmán Medina v. Colombia¹

This case refers to the alleged forced disappearance of Arles Edisson Guzmán Medina in Medellín, Colombia, on November 30, 2002. The Commission indicated that the events occurred within the context of the execution of Operation Orion, which took place weeks before Mr. Guzmán Medina's disappearance. It also stressed the existence of a link between paramilitary groups and members of the security forces in Colombia, in the specific context of collaboration in Municipality 13 where the events occurred, as well as a link to the actions of the prosecutor's office and state agents. It is further alleged that the State did not undertake an ex officio investigation until complaints were filed by the Ombudsman's Office and after a complaint made by the alleged victim's brother, Mr. Guzmán Medina. Consequently, the violation of the right to juridical personality, life, humane treatment, and personal liberty is alleged in relation to Article 1(1) of the American Convention and Article 1(a) of the Inter-American Convention on Forced Disappearance of Persons. Similarly, the violation of guarantee to a fair trial and judicial protection is also alleged, in relation to Article 1(1) of the American Convention and Article I(b) of the Inter-American Convention on Forced Disappearance of Persons, due to the lack of diligence in the investigation.

Learn more about the case [here](#).

The public hearing was held on Tuesday, January 31, 2023. View the broadcast of the hearing [here](#).

3. Case of Vega González et al. v. Chile²

This case refers to the alleged international responsibility of the Chilean State for the application of the partial statute of limitations rule ("*media prescripción*" or "*prescripción gradual*") applied to criminal proceedings of 14 petitions related to crimes against humanity perpetrated against 48 people during the Chilean civil-military dictatorship. It is alleged that, with respect to these 14 petitions, by intervening as a court of criminal cassation, the Supreme Court of Justice decided to mitigate the judgments issued to those responsible for the events by applying, for the first time, the mitigating circumstance of the partial statute of limitations, provided for in article 103 of the Chilean Criminal Code. It is indicated that said rule is applicable when the person responsible for the crime appears or is found after half the allocated time for the statute of limitations of a criminal action has elapsed, which, in the case of the crimes of kidnapping and homicide applied in the aforementioned criminal proceedings, were 5 years and 7 and a half years, respectively. The rulings of the Supreme Court of Justice, according to the information provided, were issued between 2007 and 2010.

Learn more about the case [here](#).

The public hearing was held on Wednesday February 1, 2023. View the broadcast of the hearing [here](#).

4. Case of the Rama and Kriol Peoples, the Monkey Point Community and the Black Creole Indigenous Community of Bluefields and their members v. Nicaragua

This case relates to the State's international responsibility for the alleged violation of various rights of the Rama and Kriol peoples, including the nine communities that make up their territory, as well as the Black Creole Indigenous Community of Bluefields, and their members. The Rama and Kriol people are made up of nine indigenous communities, six from the Rama peoples and three from the Kriol peoples, who live in the Autonomous Region of the South Caribbean Coast (RACCS) and in the Department of Río San Juan, southeast Nicaragua. Similarly, the Black Creole Indigenous Community of Bluefields (CNCIB or Bluefields Community) is the largest Afro-descendant community in Nicaragua, and its historical development is linked to the syncretism of indigenous and Afro-descendant societies on the Caribbean Coast. Historically, such indigenous and Afro-descendant peoples and communities have claimed recognition, title, and demarcation of their traditional territory, seeking to protect it against initiatives that put their physical and cultural integrity at risk. However, in 2013, the South Atlantic Autonomous Regional Council (CRAAS) approved the State of Nicaragua's authorization of the megaproject the "Great Inter-oceanic Canal of Nicaragua", and in 2014, the Government announced that the route of the interoceanic canal would cross Rama and Kriol territory. In light of this, the Rama and Kriol peoples requested information about the project and asked to hold a dialogue prior to the consultation process. In response to this, a consultation plan was drawn up, and the government committed not to expropriate their lands or confiscate their natural resources. However, in 2016, the Territorial Assembly of the Rama and Kriol People reportedly approved a Consent Agreement to lease 263 km² of the communities' territory for an indefinite period in favor of the Government Commission in charge of the GICN. In this regard, some members of the Rama and Kriol Peoples' government publicly reported that they had been pressured to sign the approval of the agreement.

Learn more about the case [here](#).

The public hearing was held on Thursday, February 2, 2023. View the broadcast of the hearing [here](#).

5. Case of Núñez Naranjo et al. v. Ecuador

This case refers to the alleged forced disappearance of Fredy Marcelo Núñez Naranjo. It is also alleged that the State violated the rights to judicial guarantees and judicial protection, given the lack of due diligence in the investigation of the events, since it failed to undertake the minimal level of action to locate the alleged victim's whereabouts and identify those responsible. In addition, it is argued that the process filed failed to comply with the guarantee of a reasonable time, since, at the time the merits report was adopted, more than 17 years had elapsed since the State had become aware of the facts.

Learn more about the case [here](#).

The public hearing was held on Friday, February 3, 2023. View the broadcast of the hearing [here](#).

6. Case of Cajahuanca Vásquez v. Peru

This case relates to the alleged violations of rights under the convention that occurred during a punitive process ending in the dismissal of Mr. Humberto Cajahuanca Vásquez as magistrate of the Superior Court of Justice of Huánuco. It is alleged that the State violated the principle of legality and favorable treatment, because the grounds for dismissal applied were significant in breadth and did not refer to specific conduct that was reprehensible from a disciplinary point of view, and because the most severe sanction was imposed on Mr. Cajahuanca, despite the fact that another current regulation provided for a minor sanction. It is also alleged that in this case the principle of judicial independence and the right to have duly reasoned decisions were violated, because the punitive ruling did not offer a reasoning that clearly stated the reasons the

alleged victim's actions warranted the most severe sanction. Furthermore, it is argued that there was no administrative or judicial remedy designed to obtain a comprehensive review of the disciplinary ruling by a higher authority and that the content of the amparo decisions indicates that the relevant bodies did not carry out a comprehensive review of the decision to dismiss Mr. Cajahuanca. Finally, it is alleged that the State violated the right of judges to access public office under equal conditions.

Learn more about the case [here](#).

The public hearing was held on Monday, February 6, 2023. View the broadcast of the hearing [here](#).

7. Case of Gutiérrez Navas et al. v. Honduras

This case relates to the alleged international responsibility of the Honduran State for the dismissal, classified as arbitrary and illegal, of José Antonio Gutiérrez Navas, José Francisco Ruiz Gaekel, Gustavo Enrique Bustillo Palma and Rosalinda Cruz Sequeira from their positions as magistrates of the Constitutional Chamber of the Supreme Court of Justice of Honduras. According to the information provided, the facts of the case occurred between 2012 and 2014. It is argued that at the time the alleged victims were dismissed, there was no provision in Honduras regulating the competence of any authority and the disciplinary procedure of a political nature to which they were subjected."

Consequently, it is alleged that, in violation of the guarantees recognized in Article 8 of the American Convention on Human Rights, the National Congress created an ad hoc mechanism aimed at the removal of said judicial authorities. Similarly, Article 205, numeral 20, of the Honduran Constitution indicates that Congress has the power to approve or reject the administrative conduct of magistrates, which it is alleged establishes a norm of significant breadth that does not define specific conduct that is reprehensible from a disciplinary point of view. For this reason, it is argued that this lack of predictability allowed Congress excessive discretion, which was openly contrary to the principle of legality. In addition, it is alleged that the alleged victims did not have the opportunity to be heard and prepare an adequate defense, since they were not summoned to exercise their right nor were they previously notified of any accusation or initiation of a punitive process.

Learn more about the case [here](#).

The public hearing was held on Tuesday, February 7, 2023. View the broadcast of the hearing [here](#).

8. Case of Airtón Honorato et al. v. Brazil³

This case relates to the alleged State responsibility for the death of 12 former prisoners: José Airtón Honorato, José Maia Menezes, Aleksandro de Oliveira Araujo, Djalma Fernandes Andrade de Souza, Fábio Fernandes Andrade de Souza, Gerson Machado da Silva, Jeferson Leandro Andrade, José Cicero Pereira dos Santos, Laércio Antonio Luis, Luciano da Silva Barbosa, Sandro Rogerio da Silva and Silvio Bernardino do Carmo, who, presumably under instructions from the Group for the Repression and Analysis of Crimes of Intolerance (hereinafter "GRADI"), created by the Secretariat of Public Security of the State of São Paulo, acted as informants in criminal organizations. In this context, the Group for the Suppression and Analysis of Crimes of Intolerance acted with the military police intelligence service. On March 5, 2002, in the town of Castelinho, located near the city of Sorocaba, in São Paulo, GRADI and the military police carried out an operation known as "Castelinho" against the "Primeiro Comando da Capital" (First Command of the Capital, hereinafter "PCC"), allegedly the main criminal organization in the city of Sorocaba. In said operation, the Inter-American Commission (ICHR) alleged that GRADI instructed the 12 former prisoners to deceive the PCC about the alleged existence of a plane containing money that would arrive at the Sorocaba airport. The Military Police would have, presumably, surrounded the place with approximately one hundred policemen. In addition, the

Commission alleges that more than 700 shots were fired, resulting in the wounding of a police officer with minor injuries and the death of the twelve alleged victims in this case.

Learn more about the case [here](#).

The public hearing was held on Wednesday, February 8 and Thursday February 9, 2023. View the broadcast of the hearing [here](#).

III. Proceedings in the Case of Baptiste Willer et al. v. Haiti

The Court held proceedings in this case to receive the statement of an alleged victim. The proceedings were held on Thursday, January 26, 2023.

This case is related to the alleged international responsibility of the State for the lack of protection of the rights of Mr. Baptiste Willer and his family in the face of alleged threats and assassination attempts to which they were subjected between 2007 and 2009. Added to this is the alleged lack of due diligence in the investigation, and the impunity surrounding the death of his brother.

View the proceedings [here](#).

IV. Judgments

The Court deliberated the following contentious cases, which will be notified and will be available [here](#):

1. Case of García Rodríguez et al. v. Mexico⁴

The case concerns Mexico's alleged international responsibility for torture, violations of due process and personal liberty against Daniel García Rodríguez and Reyes Alpízar Ortíz, who remained in preventive detention for more than 17 years.

In its merits report, the Commission noted that the alleged victims were detained without being presented with a court order issued prior to their detention and without compliance with the conditions established in the Code of Criminal Procedure. In this regard, the Commission concluded that Daniel García and Reyes Alpízar were only formally informed of the reasons for their detention and the charges filed when they were brought before a judge, 45 and 34 days after their imprisonment, a period during which they were detained under preventative detention (*arraigo*). In this case, the Commission established that the application of the concept of *arraigo* constituted a punitive and not a precautionary measure and, therefore, an arbitrary deprivation of liberty and a violation of the principle of presumption of innocence. Additionally, it concluded that the preventive detention following the *arraigo* ordered, which lasted 17 years, was arbitrary. It also concluded that the right to defense had been violated given that, among other things, the alleged victims were unable to present the exculpatory evidence given as essential during the criminal proceedings and the judge in the case did not take measures to ensure that information was sent.

Learn more about the case [here](#).

2. Case of Aguinaga Aillón v. Ecuador

This case is related to a series of alleged violations of the human rights of Mr. Carlos Julio Aguinaga Aillón in the framework of the disciplinary process conducted by the Congress of the Republic, which culminated in his dismissal as member of the Supreme Electoral Court of Ecuador. It is alleged that the alleged victim was removed from his position by means of an *ad*

hoc mechanism not provided for by the Constitution or the law, and without fulfilling previously established measures. Therefore, it is argued that the State violated the right to have access to a competent authority through previously established procedures, the principle of legality, and the principle of judicial independence. It is also alleged that Ecuador violated the right to know in advance and in detail the accusation made and to have adequate time and means for a defense, as there is no evidence that the alleged victim was notified about the initiation of a procedure that could lead to his dismissal, nor did it grant him any possibility of a hearing and to build a defense prior to his dismissal. Similarly, violations of the rights to appeal the ruling and to judicial protection are alleged, since the alleged victim did not have any mechanism to challenge the decision given that the dismissal procedure was not provided for in domestic regulations. In addition, it is alleged that the State issued a resolution to hinder the possibility of filing an amparo remedy against the resolution of Congress.

Learn more about the case [here](#).

3. Case of Olivera Fuentes v. Peru

This case relates to the alleged violation of Mr. Olivera Fuentes' rights to equality and non-discrimination, a private life, judicial guarantees and judicial protection, as a consequence of discrimination resulting from an expression of his sexual orientation in a supermarket. In particular, on August 11, 2004, Mr. Olivera and his same-sex partner were reprimanded by staff at the "Dulces y Salados" cafeteria of the "Santa Isabel de San Miguel" supermarket for publicly displaying affection. On October 1, 2004, Mr. Olivera filed a discrimination complaint with INDECOPI (National Institute for the Defense of Competition and the Protection of Intellectual Property), which was rejected, obtaining a final unfavorable appeal court decision on April 11, 2011. The Commission concluded that the State violated the guarantee of reasonable time due to the time that each authority took to resolve the appeals filed, without the State having provided reasons that justify the time elapsed for the decision of each appeal. In view of the above, it concluded that the Peruvian State is responsible for the violation of the rights to a fair trial, private life, equality before the law, and judicial protection enshrined in Articles 8(1), 11, 24, and 25(1) of the American Convention, in relation to the obligations established in article 1(1) of the same instrument.

Learn more about the case [here](#).

V. Hearings on Monitoring Compliance with Judgments

The Court held hearings on Monitoring Compliance with Judgments in the following Cases:

- a) Case of the Gómez Paquiyauri Brothers v. Peru⁵
- b) Case of Azul Rojas Marín et al. v. Peru⁶
- c) Case of "Five Pensioners" v. Peru⁷
- d) Case of López Lone et al. v. Honduras⁸

VI. Orders on Monitoring Compliance with Judgments

The Court issued orders on the Monitoring of Compliance with Judgments in the following cases:

- a) Case of Gorioitía v. Argentina
- b) Case of the Indigenous Communities of the Lhaka Honhat Association (Our Land) v. Argentina
- c) Case of Bedoya Lima et al. v. Colombia
- d) Case of Rodríguez Vera et al. (The Disappeared from the Palace of Justice) v. Colombia
- e) Case of Grijalva Bueno v. Ecuador
- f) Case of García and family v. Guatemala
- g) Case of the Miguel Castro Castro Prison v. Peru

h) Case of Cuya Lavy et al. v. Peru

Following notification, the orders will be available [here](#).

VII. Orders on Provisional Measures

The Court deliberated orders on **Provisional Measures** in the following Cases and matters:

- a) Matter of Juan Sebastián Chamorro et al. regarding Nicaragua
- b) Case of Revilla Soto v. Venezuela
- c) Case of Tabares Toro v. Colombia
- d) Matter of the Socio-Educational Internment Facility regarding Brazil
- e) Matter of Castro Rodríguez regarding México

Following notification, the orders will be available [here](#).

VIII. Monitoring Compliance with Judgments, Provisional Measures and administrative issues

The Court also monitored compliance with various judgments and implementation of provisional measures under its remit, as well as proceedings in cases and provisional measures. It also addressed various administrative matters.

IX. Official Visits

During this Regular Session, the Court received various official visits:

a) Visit by the President of Costa Rica to meet with the I/A Court H.R. President and Registrar at the Court's headquarters.



The President of the Inter-American Court, Judge Ricardo C. Pérez Manrique, received His Excellency Mr. Rodrigo Chaves Robles, President of the Republic of Costa Rica, at the Court's headquarters. Mr. Arnoldo André Tinoco, Minister of Foreign and Religious Affairs, accompanied him on his visit. Registrar Pablo Saavedra Alessandri and the Deputy Registrar Romina Sijniensky represented the delegation of the Inter-American Court.

During the official visit, the President of the Court highlighted the historical ties of cooperation with the Government of Costa Rica, as the Court's host country. Pérez Manrique outlined the Inter-American Court's functions and way of working to the Head of State. The President of Costa Rica recalled the historical tradition of his country's relationship with the Court and declared that the State will continue to strengthen cooperation with the Inter-American Court.

b) Working Meeting between the President of the Caribbean Court of Justice and the Plenary of the Inter-American Court



Within this Session, the plenary of the Inter-American Court held a meeting with the President of the Caribbean Court of Justice, Judge Adrian Saunders. The President of the Inter-American Court, Judge Ricardo C. Pérez Manrique, highlighted the importance of strengthening knowledge of the Court's work in Caribbean countries and especially with the Caribbean Court of Justice.

c) Presentation of the Latin American Federation of Magistrates

During this Session, the plenary of the Inter-American Court held a meeting with the Latin American Federation of Magistrates, an opportunity with the participation of the President of the Superior Court of Justice of Brazil, Minister María Thereza Rocha. The President of the Court highlighted the important ties of cooperation maintained between the Inter-American Court and the Superior Court of Justice of Brazil, which hosted the Court's 150th Regular Session held in the country. "The Inter-American Court has been making a permanent effort to communicate in Portuguese with its new website, the translation of case law into Portuguese, among other actions," said the President of the Court.

d) Meeting between the I/A Court H.R. President, Judge Ricardo C. Pérez Manrique and Juan Carlos Larrea, Attorney General of the Republic of Ecuador

X. Signing of Agreements

During this Regular Session, the Inter-American Court signed cooperation agreements with the following institutions:

- a) The National Bar Association of Mexico
- b) The National Council of Public Prosecutors of Brazil
- c) Institute for the Reform of Relations between Business and the State of Brazil.

¹ Judge Humberto Antonio Sierra Porto did not participate in the Public Hearing of this case due to his Colombian nationality, in accordance with Art. 19 of the Court's Rules of Procedure.

² Judge Patricia Pérez Goldberg did not participate in the Public Hearing of this case due to her Chilean nationality, in accordance with Art. 19 of the Court's Rules of Procedure.

³ Judge Rodrigo Mudrovitsch did not participate in the Public Hearing of this case due to his Brazilian nationality, in accordance with Art. 19 of the Court's Rules of Procedure.

⁴ Judge Eduardo Ferrer MacGregor did not participate in the deliberation of the Judgment in this case due to his Mexican nationality, in accordance with Art. 19 of the Court's Rules of Procedure.

⁵ The Court delegated Judge Humberto Antonio Sierra Porto to conduct this hearing.

⁶ The Court delegated Judge Humberto Antonio Sierra Porto to conduct this hearing.

⁷ The Court delegated Judge Humberto Antonio Sierra Porto to conduct this hearing.

⁸ The Court delegated Judge Patricia Pérez Goldberg to conduct this hearing.

The composition of the Court for this Session was as follows: Judge Ricardo C. Pérez Manrique, President, (Uruguay), Judge Humberto Antonio Sierra Porto, Vice President, (Colombia), Judge Eduardo Ferrer MacGregor Poisot (Mexico), Judge Nancy Hernández López (Costa Rica), Judge Verónica Gómez (Argentina), Judge Patricia Pérez Goldberg (Chile) and Judge Rodrigo Mudrovitsch (Brazil).

This press release was produced by the Secretariat of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights, which is the only responsible for its content.

For the latest information please visit the website of the Inter-American Court, <http://www.corteidh.or.cr/index-en.cfm>, or send an email to Pablo Saavedra Alessandri, Secretary, at corteidh@corteidh.or.cr. For press inquiries please contact Matías Ponce at prensa@corteidh.or.cr.

You can subscribe to the information services of the Court [here](#). You can sign up for updates from the Court here or unsubscribe sending an email to comunicaciones@corteidh.or.cr. You can also follow the activities of the Court on [Facebook](#), [Twitter](#) (@CorteIDH for the Spanish account and @IACourtHR for the English account), [Instagram](#), [Flickr](#), [Vimeo](#) and [Soundcloud](#).

Inter-American Court of Human Rights. 2023. 

Esta obra está bajo una [Licencia Creative Commons Atribución-NoComercial-SinDerivadas 3.0 Unported](#)

Avenida 10, Calles 45 y 47 Los Yoses, San Pedro, San José, Costa Rica.



www.corteidh.or.cr
corteidh@corteidh.or.cr



(506) 2527-1600



10th Av, between street 45
and street 47, Los Yoses, San
Pedro, San Jose, Costa Rica.

Follow us:

