URUGUAY

Follow-up - Jurisprudence Action by Treaty Bodies

CCPR A/51/40, vol. I (1996)

VIII. FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES UNDER THE OPTIONAL PROTOCOL
429. A country-by-country breakdown of follow-up replies received or requested and outstanding as at 26 July 1996 provides the following picture:

Uruguay: Forty-five views finding violations; 43 follow-up replies received. During consultations on 5 July 1996, a State party representative promised a satisfactory solution of the two outstanding cases for which no follow-up replies had been received (see para. 454).

...

Overview of the Special Rapporteur's follow up consultations

...

454. Finally, on 5 July 1996, the Special Rapporteur met with a representative of the Government of Uruguay, to discuss, <u>inter alia</u>, issues of follow-up on views adopted by the Committee in respect of Uruguay. On two views on which no follow-up replies had so far been received from the Government, the Special Rapporteur suggested that the State party might consider awarding ex gratia compensation to the victims. The State party representative replied that he would endeavour to seek an equitable solution for the victims in those cases.

...

Concern over instances of non-cooperation under the follow-up mandate

463. In spite of the progress in collecting follow-up information since the adoption of the last annual report, the Committee and the Special Rapporteur note with concern that a number of countries did not provide any follow-up information within the deadlines established by the Committee or have not replied to reminders or requests for information from the Special Rapporteur. The States that have not replied to requests for follow-up information are the following:

...

Uruguay (no reply in respect of two cases);

...

464. The Special Rapporteur urges these States parties to reply to his requests for follow-up information within the imparted deadlines.

CCPR A/52/40, vol. I (1997)

VIII.	FOLLOW-UP ACT	TIVITIES UNDER	THE OPTIONAL	L PROTOCOL

524. A country-by-country breakdown of follow-up replies received or requested and outstanding as of 30 June 1997 provides the following picture (Views in which the deadline for receipt of follow-up information had not yet expired have not been included):

...

Uruguay: 45 Views finding violations: 43 follow-up replies, dated 17 October 1991, received but unpublished. Follow-up replies on two Views remain outstanding: <u>159/1983 - Cariboni</u> (Selected decisions, vol. 2);<u>13</u>/ <u>322/1988 - Rodriquez</u> (1994 Report);<u>9</u>/ see also 1996 Report,<u>10</u>/ para. 454.

...

Concern over instances of non-cooperation under the follow-mandate

...

554. In spite of some progress in collecting follow-up information since the adoption of its 1996 Report, the Committee and the Special Rapporteur note with concern that a number of countries did not provide any follow-up information within the deadlines established by the Committee or have not replied to reminders or requests for information from the Special Rapporteur. Those States which have not replied to requests for follow-up information are the following (in alphabetical order):

...

Uruguay: two cases;

..

555. The Committee urges those States parties to reply to the Special Rapporteur's requests for follow-up information within the deadlines that have been set.

<u>13</u>/ [International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Human Rights Committee. <u>Selected decisions under the Optional Protocol</u>], (CCPR/C/OP/2) (United Nations publication, Sales No. 89.XIV.1), vol. 2.

^{9/} Official Records of the General Assembly, forty-ninth Session, Supplement No. 40 (A/49/40).

^{10/} Ibid., Fifty-first Session, Supplement No. 40 (A/51/40).

CCPR A/53/40, vol. I (1998)

VIII. FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES UNDER THE OPTIONAL PROTOCOL

...

486. The Committee's previous report (A/52/40) contained a detailed country-by-country breakdown of follow-up replies received or requested and outstanding as of 30 June 1997. The list that follows shows the additional cases in respect of which follow-up information has been requested from States (Views in which the deadline for receipt of follow-up information had not yet expired have not been included). It also indicates those cases in which replies are outstanding. In many of these cases there has been no change since the previous report. This is because the resources available for the Committee's work were considerably reduced in the current year, preventing it from undertaking a comprehensive systematic follow-up programme.

...

Uruguay: 45 Views finding violations: 43 follow-up replies received, dated 17 October 1991, unpublished. Follow-up replies on two Views remain outstanding: <u>159/1983 - Cariboni (Selected decisions</u>, vol. 2);<u>1</u>/ <u>322/1988 - Rodriquez</u> (1994 Report (A/49/40)); see also 1996 Report (A/51/40), para. 454.

...

Concern over the follow-up mandate

• • •

510. The Committee again expresses its regret that its recommendations, formulated in its 1995, 1996 and 1997 Reports, to the effect that at least one follow-up mission per year be budgeted by the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, have still not been implemented. Similarly, the Committee considers that staff resources to service the follow-up mandate remain inadequate, despite the Committee's repeated requests, and that this prevents the proper and timely conduct of follow-up activities, including follow-up missions. In this context, the Committee expresses serious concern that, because of the lack of staff, no follow-up consultations could be organized during its sixty-second session or at its sixty-third session. It is for this reason that the Committee is unable to include in the present report a complete list of States which have failed to cooperate under the follow-up procedure. States listed in the previous year's report for which replies are still outstanding are: ... Uruguay ...

^{1/} The mandate is spelled out in the Committee's 1990 Report to the General Assembly. See Official Records of the General Assembly, Forty-fifth session, Supplement No. 40 (A/45/40), annex XI.

CCPR A/54/40, vol. I (1999)

VII. FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES UNDER THE OPTIONAL PROTOCOL

...

461. The Committee's previous report (A/53/40) contained a detailed country-by-country breakdown of follow-up replies received or requested and outstanding as of 30 June 1998. The list that follows shows the additional cases in respect of which follow-up information has been requested from States (Views in which the deadline for receipt of follow-up information had not yet expired have not been included). It also indicates those cases in which replies are outstanding. In many of these cases there has been no change since the last report. This is because the resources available for the Committee's work have been considerably reduced preventing it from undertaking a comprehensive systematic follow-up programme.

...

Uruguay: Forty-five Views finding violations: 43 follow-up replies received, dated 17 October 1991, unpublished. Follow-up replies on two Views remain outstanding: 159/1983 - <u>Cariboni</u> (in <u>Selected Decisions</u>, vol. 2) and 322/1988 -<u>Rodríquez</u> (A/49/40); see also A/51/40, para. 454.

CCPR A/55/40, vol. I (2000)

VI. FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES UNDER THE OPTIONAL PROTOCOL

...

596. The Committee's previous report (A/54/40) contained a detailed country-by-country breakdown of follow-up replies received or requested and outstanding as of 30 June 1999. The list that follows shows the additional cases in respect of which follow-up information has been requested from States. (Views in which the deadline for receipt of follow-up information had not yet expired have not been included.) It also indicates those cases in which replies are outstanding. In many of these cases there has been no change since the last report. This is because the limited resources available for the Committee's work prevent it from undertaking a comprehensive or systematic follow-up programme.

...

Uruguay: Forty-five Views finding violations: 43 follow-up replies received, dated 17 October 1991, unpublished. Follow-up replies on two Views remain outstanding: 159/1983 - <u>Cariboni</u> (in <u>Selected Decisions</u>, vol. 2) and 322/1988 - <u>Rodríquez</u> (A/49/40); see also A/51/40, para. 454.

CCPR A/56/40, vol. I (2001)

Chapter IV. Follow-up Activities under the Optional Protocol

•••

180. The Committee's previous annual report (A/55/40, vol. I, chap. VI) contained a detailed country-by-country survey on follow-up replies received or requested and outstanding as of 30 June 2000. The list that follows updates that survey, indicating those cases in which replies are outstanding, but does not take into account the Committee's Views adopted during the seventy-second session, for which follow-up replies are not yet due. In many cases there has been no change since the previous report.

...

Uruguay: Forty-five Views finding violations: 43 follow-up replies received, dated 17 October 1991, unpublished. Follow-up reply, dated 31 May 2000, concerning case No. 110/1981 <u>Viana Acosta</u>, granting payment of US\$ 120,000 to Mr. Viana. Follow-up replies on two Views remain outstanding: 159/1983 - <u>Cariboni</u> (in <u>Selected Decisions</u>, vol. 2) and 322/1988 - <u>Rodríguez</u> (A/49/40); see also A/51/40, paragraph 454.

CCPR A/57/40, vol. I (2002)

Chapter VI. Follow-up activities under the optional protocol

•••

228. The previous annual report of the Committee (A/56/40, vol. I, chap. VI) contained a detailed country-by-country survey of follow-up replies received or requested and outstanding as of 30 June 2001. The list that follows updates that survey, indicating those cases in which replies are outstanding, but does not include responses concerning the Committee's Views adopted during the seventy-fourth and seventy-fifth sessions, for which follow-up replies are not yet due. In many cases there has been no change since the previous report.

...

Uruguay: Views in 45 cases with findings of violations:

43 follow-up replies received, dated 17 October 1991, unpublished. Follow-up reply, dated 31 May 2000, concerning case No. 110/1981 <u>Viana Acosta</u>, granting payment of US\$ 120,000 to Mr. Viana. Follow-up replies on two Views remain outstanding: 159/1983 - <u>Cariboni</u> (in <u>Selected Decisions</u>, vol. 2) and 322/1988 - <u>Rodríguez</u> (A/49/40); see also A/51/40, paragraph 454.

...

229. For further information on the status of all the Views in which follow-up information remains outstanding or in respect of which follow-up consultations have been or will be scheduled, reference is made to the follow-up progress report prepared for the seventy-fourth session of the Committee (CCPR/C/74/R.7/Rev.1, dated 28 March 2002), discussed in public session at the Committee's 2009th meeting on 4 April 2002 (CCPR/C/SR.2009). Reference is also made to the Committee's previous reports, in particular A/56/40, paragraphs 182 to 200.

CCPR A/58/40, vol. I (2003)

CHAPTER VI. Follow-up activities under the Optional Protocol

•••

223. The previous annual report of the Committee¹ contained a detailed country-by-country survey of follow-up replies received or requested and outstanding as of 30 June 2002. The list that follows updates that survey, indicating those cases in which replies are outstanding, but does not include responses concerning the Committee's Views adopted during the seventy-seventh and seventy-eighth sessions, for which follow-up replies are not yet due in the majority of cases. In many cases there has been no change since the previous report.*

...

Uruguay: Views in 45 cases with findings of violations:

43 follow-up replies received, dated 17 October 1991, unpublished. Follow-up reply, dated 31 May 2000, concerning case No. 110/1981 (*Viana Acosta*), granting payment of US\$ 120,000 to Mr. Viana. Follow-up replies on two Views remain outstanding: 159/1983 - *Cariboni* (in *Selected Decisions*, vol. 2) and 322/1988 - *Rodríguez* (A/49/40); see also A/51/40, paragraph 454.

Notes

- 1. [Official Records of the General Assembly], Fifty-seventh Session, Supplement No. 40(A/57/40), vol. I, chap. VI.
- * The document symbol A/[Session No.] /40 refers to the *Official Record of the General Assembly* in which the case appears; annex VI refers to the present report, vol. II.

CCPR A/59/40 vol. I (2004)

CHAPTER VI. FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES UNDER THE OPTIONAL PROTOCOL

...

230. The previous annual report of the Committee¹ contained a detailed country-by-country survey of follow-up replies received or requested and outstanding as of 30 June 2003. The list that follows updates that survey, indicating those cases in which replies are outstanding, but does not include responses concerning the Committee's Views adopted during the eightieth and eighty-first sessions, for which follow-up replies are not yet due in the majority of cases. In many cases there has been no change since the previous report.*

...

Uruguay: Views in 45 cases with findings of violations:

43 follow-up replies received, dated 17 October 1991, unpublished. Follow-up reply, dated 31 May 2000, concerning case No. 110/1981 (*Viana Acosta*), granting payment of US\$ 120,000 to Mr. Viana.

Follow-up replies on two Views remain outstanding: 159/1983 - *Cariboni* (in *Selected Decisions*, vol. 2) and 322/1988 - *Rodríguez* (A/49/40); see

also A/51/40, paragraph 454.

Notes

1/ Ibid., Fifty-eighth Session, Supplement No. 40 (A/58/40), vol. I, chap. VI.

^{*} The document symbol A/[session No.]/40 refers to the *Official Records of the General Assembly* in which the case appears; annex IX refers to the present report, volume II.

CCPR, A/60/40 vol. I (2005)

...

CHAPTER VI. FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES UNDER THE OPTIONAL PROTOCOL

- 224. In July 1990, the Committee established a procedure for the monitoring of follow-up to its Views under article 5, paragraph 4, of the Optional Protocol, and created the mandate of the Special Rapporteur for the follow-up on Views to this effect. Mr. Ando has been the Special Rapporteur since March 2001 (seventy-first session).
- 225. In 1991, the Special Rapporteur began to request follow-up information from States parties. Such information has been systematically requested in respect of all Views with a finding of a violation of Covenant rights. A total of 391 Views out of the 503 Views adopted since 1979 concluded that there had been a violation of the Covenant.
- 228. In many cases, the Secretariat has also received information from complainants to the effect that the Committee's Views have not been implemented. Conversely, in rare instances, the petitioner has informed the Committee that the State party has in fact given effect to the Committee's recommendations, even though the State party did not itself provide that information.
- 229. The present annual report adopts a different format for the presentation of follow-up information compared to previous annual reports. The table below displays a complete picture of follow-up replies from States parties received as of 28 July 2005, in relation to Views in which the Committee found violations of the Covenant. Wherever possible, it indicates whether follow-up replies are or have been considered as satisfactory or unsatisfactory, in terms of complying with the Committee's Views, or whether the dialogue between the State party and the Special Rapporteur for follow-up on Views continues. The notes following a number of case entries convey an idea of the difficulties in categorizing follow-up replies.
- 230. Follow-up information provided by States parties and by petitioners or their representatives since the last annual report is set out in a new annex VII, contained in Volume II of the present annual report. This, more detailed, follow-up information also indicates action still outstanding in those cases that remain under review.

FOLLOW-UP RECEIVED TO DATE FOR ALL CASES OF VIOLATIONS OF THE COVENANT

State party and number of cases	Communication number, author and location ^a	Follow-up response received from State party and location	Satisfactory response	Unsatisfactory response	No follow-up response	Follow-up dialogue
with violation						ongoing
Uruguay (45)	A . [5/1977, Massera	X	X	X (relating to		X
	Seventh session	43 follow-up replies received in	(relating to cases D	cases A, B, C,		
	43/1979, Caldas	A/59/40*	and G)	E, F)		
	Nineteenth session					
	63/1979, Antonaccio					
	Fourteenth session					
	73/1980, <i>Izquierdo</i>					
	Fifteenth session					
	80/1980, Vasiliskis					
	Eighteenth session					
	83/1981, Machado					
	Twentieth session					
	84/1981, Dermis					
	Seventeenth session					
	85/1981, Romero					
	Twenty-first session					
	88/1981, Bequio Eighteenth					
	session					
	92/1981, Nieto					
	Nineteenth session					
	103/1981, Scarone					
	Twentieth session					
	105/1981, Cabreira					
	Nineteenth session					
	109/1981, Voituret Twenty-					
	first session					
	123/1982, <i>Lluberas</i>					
	Twenty-first session]					

B. [103/1981, Scarone			
73/1980, <i>Izquierdo</i>			
92/1981, <i>Nieto</i>			
85/1981, Romero]			
C. [63/1979, Antonaccio			
80/1980, <i>Vasiliskis</i>			
123/1982, <i>Lluberas</i>]			
D. [57/1979, Martins			
Fifteenth session			
77/1980, Liechtenstein			
Eighteenth session			
106/1981, Montero			
Eighteenth session			
108/1981, <i>Nu</i> ňez			
Nineteenth session]			

	1/1977, Ramirez	
	th session	
	17, Sequeiro	
	session	
8/1	17, Perdomo	
Ni	n session	
9/1	17, Valcada	
Eig	th session	
10/	77, Gonzalez	
Fif	enth session	
11/	77, Motta	
Te	n session	
25/	978, Massiotti	
Siz	enth session	
28/	978, Weisz Eleventh	
ses	on	
32/	778, Touron Twelfth	
ses	on en	
33/	978, Carballal	
Tw	fth session	
37/	978, De Boston	
Tw	fth session	
44/	979, Pietraroia	
Tw	fth session	
52/	779, Lopez Burgos	
	eenth session	
56/	979, Celiberti	
	eenth session	

66/1980, Schweizer			
Seventeenth session			
70/1980, Simones			
Fifteenth session			
74/1980, Estrella			
Eighteenth session			
110/1981, Viana			
Twenty-first session			
139/1983, Conteris			
Twenty-fifth session			
147/1983, Gilboa			
Twenty-sixth session			
162/1983, Acosta Thirty-			
fourth session]			
F. [30/1978, Bleier			
Fifteenth session			
84/1981, Barbato			
Seventeenth session			
107/1981, Quinteros			
Nineteenth session]			
G. 34/1978, Silva			
Twelfth session			

=	n was provided on 17 October 199								
that on 1 March 1985, the cor	npetence of the civil courts was re-	established. The amnesty law	of 8 March 1985 benefited al	l the individuals					
who had been involved as aut	hors, accomplices or accessory par	rticipants in political crimes or	crimes committed for politica	l purposes					
committed from 1 January 19	committed from 1 January 1962 to 1 March 1985. The law allowed those individuals held responsible for intentional murder to have either								
their sentence reviewed or the	ir conviction reduced. Pursuant to	article 10 of the Law on Nati	onal Pacification, all the indivi	iduals imprisoned					
under "measures of security"	were released. In cases subjected	to review, appellate courts eith	ner acquitted or convicted the i	individuals. By					
virtue of law 15.783 of 20 No	vember, all the individuals who ha	nd previously held public office	e were entitled to resume their	jobs. On cases					
under B : the State party state	s that these individuals were pardo	oned by virtue of law 15.737 ar	nd released on 10 March 1985.	. On cases under					
C: these individuals were rel	eased on 14 March 1985; their cas	es were included under law 15	.737. On cases under D: from	the date on which					
it entered into force, the amne	sty law ended the regimes for the	surveillance of individuals, per	nding arrest warrants; the restr	rictions on entering					
or exiting the country; and ev	ery official inquiry into crimes cov	rered by the amnesty. From 8	March 1985, the issuance of tr	ravel documents					
was no longer subjected to an	y restriction. Samuel Liechtenstei	n, after his return to Hungary,	resumed his position as the He	ead of the					
University of the Republic. C	on cases under E: from 1 March 1	985, the possibility of filing an	n action for damages was open	to all of the					
victims of human rights viola	tions that had occurred during the	de facto Government. From 19	985 to date, 36 suits for damag	ges have been filed,					
22 of them related to arbitrary	detention and 12 to the restitution	of property. The Governmen	t settled Mr. López's case on 2	21 November 1990					
by paying him US\$ 200,000.	The suit filed by Ms. Celiberti is s	still pending. Besides the above	ve-mentioned cases, no other v	ictim has filed a					
lawsuit against the State clain	ning compensation. On cases unde	er F: on 22 December 1986, th	ne Congress passed law 15.848	3, known as "the					
expiration of the State power	to prosecute". The law extinguish	ed the power of State authoriti	es to prosecute crimes commit	tted by military or					
	poses or in the execution of orders		-	_					
-	d. On 16 April 1989, the law was			g judges to send					
reports submitted to the judic	ary about victims of disappearanc	es to the executive, for the latt	er to initiate inquiries.						
159/1983, Cariboni			X	X					
A/43/40 and									
Selected Decisions, vol. 2									
322/1988, <i>Rodríguez</i>			X	X					
A/49/40			A/51/40						

^a The location refers to the document symbol of the *Official Records of the General Assembly, Supplement No. 40*, which is the annual report of the Committee to the respective sessions of the Assembly.

CCPR, A/60/40 vol. II (2005)

...

Annex VII

FOLLOW-UP OF THE HUMAN RIGHTS COMMITTEE ON INDIVIDUAL COMMUNICATIONS UNDER THE OPTIONAL PROTOCOL TO THE INTERNATIONAL COVENANT ON CIVIL AND POLITICAL RIGHTS

This report sets out all information provided by States parties and authors or their counsel since the last Annual Report (A/59/40).

• • •

State party	URUGUAY
Case	Viana, 110/1981
Views adopted on	31 March 1983
Issues and violations found	Inhuman treatment, no legal counsel of own choosing and trial with undue delay - articles 7, 10, paragraph 1, 14, paragraph 3 (b), (c), (d).
Remedy recommended	Provision of effective remedies and, in particular, with compensation for physical and mental injury and suffering caused to him by the inhuman treatment to which he was subjected.
State party response	On 31 May 2000, the State party had informed the Committee that it had decided to provide the author with compensation of US\$ 120,000.
Author's comments	By letter of 4 November 2004, the author alleges that the State party has not complied with the Committee's Views.

...

CHAPTER VI FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES UNDER THE OPTIONAL PROTOCOL

- 227. In July 1990, the Committee established a procedure for the monitoring of follow-up to its Views under article 5, paragraph 4, of the Optional Protocol, and created the mandate of the Special Rapporteur for follow-up to Views to this effect. Mr. Ando has been the Special Rapporteur since March 2001 (seventy-first session).
- 228. In 1991, the Special Rapporteur began to request follow-up information from States parties. Such information has been systematically requested in respect of all Views with a finding of a violation of Covenant rights; 429 Views out of the 547 Views adopted since 1979 concluded that there had been a violation of the Covenant.
- 229. All attempts to categorize follow-up replies by States parties are inherently imprecise and subjective: it accordingly is not possible to provide a neat statistical breakdown of follow-up replies. Many follow-up replies received may be considered satisfactory, in that they display the willingness of the State party to implement the Committee's recommendations or to offer the complainant an appropriate remedy. Other replies cannot be considered satisfactory because they either do not address the Committee's Views at all or only relate to certain aspects of them. Some replies simply note that the victim has filed a claim for compensation outside statutory deadlines and that no compensation can therefore be paid. Still other replies indicate that there is no legal obligation on the State party to provide a remedy, but that a remedy will be afforded to the complainant on an *ex gratia* basis.
- 230. The remaining follow-up replies challenge the Committee's Views and findings on factual or legal grounds, constitute much-belated submissions on the merits of the complaint, promise an investigation of the matter considered by the Committee or indicate that the State party will not, for one reason or another, give effect to the Committee's Views.
- 231. In many cases, the Secretariat has also received information from complainants to the effect that the Committee's Views have not been implemented. Conversely, in rare instances, the petitioner has informed the Committee that the State party had in fact given effect to the Committee's recommendations, even though the State party had not itself provided that information.
- 232. The present annual report adopts the same format for the presentation of follow-up information as the last annual report. The table below displays a complete picture of follow-up replies from States parties received up to 7 July 2006, in relation to Views in which the Committee found violations of the Covenant. Wherever possible, it indicates whether follow-up replies are or have been considered as satisfactory or unsatisfactory, in terms of their compliance with the Committee's Views, or whether the dialogue between the State party and the Special Rapporteur for follow-up to Views continues. The Notes following a number of case entries convey an idea of the difficulties in categorizing follow-up replies.

233. Follow-up information provided by States parties and by petitioners or their representative subsequent to the last annual report $(A/60/40, \text{ vol. I}, \text{ chap. VI})$ is set out in annex VII to volume I of the present annual report.

FOLLOW-UP RECEIVED TO DATE FOR ALL CASES OF VIOLATIONS OF THE COVENANT

State party and number of cases with violation	Communication number, author and location	Follow-up response received from State party and location	Satisfactory response	Unsatisfactory response	No follow-up response received	Follow-up dialogue ongoing
Uruguay (45)	A. [5/1977, Massera Seventh session 43/1979, Caldas Nineteenth session 63/1979, Antonaccio Fourteenth session 73/1980, Izquierdo Fifteenth session 80/1980, Vasiliskis Eighteenth session 83/1981, Machado Twentieth session 84/1981, Dermis Seventeenth session 85/1981, Romero Twenty-first session 88/1981, Bequio Eighteenth session	X 43 follow-up replies received in A/59/40*	X (relating to cases D and G)	X (relating to cases A, B, C, E, F)		X

92/1981, Nieto Nineteenth session 103/1981, Scarone Twentieth session 105/1981, Cabreira Nineteenth session 109/1981, Voituret Twenty-first session		
123/1982, Lluberas Twenty-first session]		
B. [103/1981, Scarone 73/1980, Izquierdo 92/1981, Nieto 85/1981, Romero]		
C. [63/1979, Antonaccio 80/1980, Vasiliskis 123/1982, Lluberas]		
D. [57/1979, Martins Fifteenth session 77/1980, Liechtenstein Eighteenth session 106/1981, Eighteenth session 108/1981, Nuñez Nineteenth session]		

E. [4/1977, Ramirez			
Fourth session			
6/1977, Sequeiro			
Sixth session			
8/1977, <i>Perdomo</i>			
Ninth session			
9/19 77, Valcada			
Eighth session			
10/1977, Gonzalez			
Fifteenth session			
11/1977, Motta			
Tenth session			
25/1978, <i>Massiotti</i>			
Sixteenth session			
28/1978, Weisz			
Eleventh session			
32/1978, Touron			
Twelfth session			
33/1978, <i>Carballal</i>			
Twelfth session			
37/1978, De Boston			
Twelfth session			
44/1979, Pietraroia			
Twelfth session			
52/1979, Lopez Burgos			
Thirteenth session			
56/1979, <i>Celiberti</i>			
Thirteenth session			

	66/1980, Schweizer			
	Seventeenth session			
	70/1980, Simones			
	Fifteenth session			
	74/1980, <i>Estrella</i>			
	Eighteenth session			
	110/1981, <i>Viana</i>			
	Twenty-first session			
	139/1983, Conteris			
	Twenty-fifth session			
	147/1983, Gilboa			
	Twenty-sixth session			
	162/1983, Acosta			
	Thirty-fourth session]			
	F. [30/1978, Bleier			
	Fifteenth session			
	84/1981, <i>Barbato</i>			
	Seventeenth session			
	107/1981, <i>Quinteros</i>			
	Nineteenth session]			
	G. 34/1978, <i>Silva</i> Twelfth session			
	159/1983, <i>Cariboni</i> A/43/40		X	X
	Selected Decisions vol. 2			
	322/1988, A/51/40		X	X
	Rodríguez		A/51/40	
	A/49/40			
•••				

*Note: Follow-up information was provided on 17 October 1991 (unpublished). The list of cases under A: the State party submitted that on 1 March 1985, the competence of the civil courts was re-established. The amnesty law of 8 March 1985 benefited all the individuals who had been involved as authors, accomplices or accessory participants of political crimes or crimes committed for political purposes, from 1 January 1962 to 1 March 1985. The law allowed those individuals held responsible of intentional murder to have either their sentence reviewed or their conviction reduced. Pursuant to article 10 of the Law on National Pacification all the individuals imprisoned under "measures of security" were released. In cases subjected to review, appellate courts either acquitted or condemned the individuals. By virtue of Law 15.783 of 20 November 1985 all the individuals who had previously held a public office were entitled to resume their jobs. On cases under B: it states that these individuals were pardoned by virtue of Law 15.737 and released on 10 March 1985. On cases under C: these individuals were released on 14 March 1985; their cases were included under law 15.737. On cases under D: the amnesty law ended, from the date on which it entered into force, the regimes for the surveillance of individuals, pending arrest warrants, the restrictions to enter or exit the country; and every official inquiry into crimes covered by the amnesty. From 8 March 1985, the issuance of travel documents was no longer subjected to any restriction. Samuel Liechtenstein, after his return to Hungary, resumed his position as the Head of the University of the Republic. On cases under E: from 1 March 1985, the possibility to file an action for damages was open to all of the victims of human rights violations which occurred during the de facto government. From 1985 up to date, 36 suits in damages have been filed, 22 of them are related to arbitrary detention and 12 to the restitution of property. The Government settled Mr. Lopez's case on 21 November 1990, by paying him US\$ 200,000. The suit filed by Ms. Lilian Celiberti is still pending. Besides the above-mentioned cases, no other victim has filed a law-suit against the State claiming compensation. On cases under F: on 22 December 1986, the Congress passed Law 15.848, known as "the expiration of the State powers to prosecute". The law extinguished the power of State authorities to prosecute crimes committed by military or police agents for political purposes or in the execution of orders given to them by their superiors before 1 March 1985. All pending proceedings were discontinued. On 16 April 1989, the law was confirmed by referendum. The law ordered the investigating judges to send reports submitted to the judiciary about victims of disappearances to the Executive, for the latter to initiate inquiries.

...

CHAPTER VI. FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES UNDER THE OPTIONAL PROTOCOL

- 213. In July 1990, the Committee established a procedure for the monitoring of follow-up to its Views under article 5, paragraph 4, of the Optional Protocol, and created the mandate of the Special Rapporteur for follow-up to Views to this effect. Mr. Ando has been the Special Rapporteur since March 2001 (seventy-first session).
- 214. In 1991, the Special Rapporteur began to request follow-up information from States parties. Such information has been systematically requested in respect of all Views with a finding of a violation of Covenant rights; 452 Views out of the 570 Views adopted since 1979 concluded that there had been a violation of the Covenant.
- 215. All attempts to categorize follow-up replies by States parties are inherently imprecise and subjective: it accordingly is not possible to provide a neat statistical breakdown of follow-up replies. Many follow-up replies received may be considered satisfactory, in that they display the willingness of the State party to implement the Committee's recommendations or to offer the complainant an appropriate remedy. Other replies cannot be considered satisfactory because they either do not address the Committee's Views at all or only relate to certain aspects of them. Some replies simply note that the victim has filed a claim for compensation outside statutory deadlines and that no compensation can therefore be paid. Still other replies indicate that there is no legal obligation on the State party to provide a remedy, but that a remedy will be afforded to the complainant on an *ex gratia* basis.
- 216. The remaining follow-up replies challenge the Committee's Views and findings on factual or legal grounds, constitute much-belated submissions on the merits of the complaint, promise an investigation of the matter considered by the Committee or indicate that the State party will not, for one reason or another, give effect to the Committee's Views.
- 217. In many cases, the Committee secretariat has also received information from complainants to the effect that the Committee's Views have not been implemented. Conversely, in rare instances, the petitioner has informed the Committee that the State party had in fact given effect to the Committee's recommendations, even though the State party had not itself provided that information.
- 218. The present annual report adopts the same format for the presentation of follow-up information as the last annual report. The table below displays a complete picture of follow-up replies from States parties received up to 7 July 2007, in relation to Views in which the Committee found violations of the Covenant. Wherever possible, it indicates whether follow-up replies are or have been considered as satisfactory or unsatisfactory, in terms of their compliance with the Committee's Views, or whether the dialogue between the State party and the Special Rapporteur for follow-up to Views continues. The Notes following a number of case entries convey an idea of the difficulties in categorizing follow-up replies.

219. Follow-up information provided by States parties and by petitioners or their representatives subsequent to the last annual report (A/61/40, vol. I, chap. VI) is set out in annex VII to volume II of the present annual report.

FOLLOW-UP RECEIVED TO DATE FOR ALL CASES OF VIOLATIONS OF THE COVENANT

State party and number of cases with violation	Communication number, author and location	Follow-up response received from State party and location	Satisfactory response	Unsatisfactory response	No follow-up response received	Follow-up dialogue ongoing
Uruguay (52)	A. [5/1977, Massera Seventh session 43/1979, Caldas Nineteenth session 63/1979, Antonaccio Fourteenth session 73/1980, Izquierdo Fifteenth session 80/1980, Vasiliskis Eighteenth session 83/1981, Machado Twentieth session 84/1981, Dermis Seventeenth session 85/1981, Romero Twenty-first session 88/1981, Bequio Eighteenth session 92/1981, Nieto Nineteenth session 103/1981, Scarone Twentieth session 105/1981, Cabreira Nineteenth session 109/1981, Voituret	X 43 follow-up replies received in A/59/40*	X (relating to cases D and G)	X (relating to cases A, B, C, E, F)		X

State party and number of cases	,	Follow-up response received from State	Satisfactory response	Unsatisfactory response	No follow-up response	Follow-up dialogue
with violation	author and location	party and location			received	ongoing
	123/1982, <i>Lluberas</i>					
	Twenty-first session]					
	B . [103/1981, Scarone					
	73/1980, <i>Izquierdo</i>					
	92/1981, <i>Nieto</i>					
	85/1981, Romero]					
	C. [63/1979, Antonaccio			+	+	
	80/1980, Vasiliskis					
	123/1982, <i>Lluberas</i>]					
	D . [57/1979, <i>Martins</i>			+		
	Fifteenth session					
	77/1980, Lichtensztejn					
	Eighteenth session					
	106/1981, <i>Montero</i>					
	Eighteenth session					
	108/1981,					
	<i>Nuñez</i> Nineteenth session]					

State party and	Communication	Follow-up response	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	No follow-up	Follow-up
number of cases	number,	received from State	response	response	response	dialogue
with violation	author and location	party and location			received	ongoing
	E . [4/1977, <i>Ramirez</i>					
	Fourth session					
	6/1977, <i>Sequeiro</i>					
	Sixth session					
	8/1977, <i>Perdomo</i>					
	Ninth session					
	9/1977, Valcada Eighth					
	session					
	10/1977,					
	GonzalezFifteenth					
	session					
	11/1977, <i>Motta</i> Tenth					
	session					
	66/1980, <i>Schweizer</i>					
	Seventeenth session					
	70/1980, <i>Simones</i>					
	Fifteenth session					
	74/1980, <i>Estrella</i>					
	Eighteenth session					
	110/1981, <i>Viana</i> Twenty-					
	first session					
	139/1983,					
	ConterisTwenty-fifth					
	session					
	147/1983, <i>Gilboa</i>					
	Twenty-sixth session					

State party and number of cases	Communication number,	Follow-up response received from State	Satisfactory response	Unsatisfactory response	No follow-up response	Follow-up dialogue
with violation	author and location	party and location	F		received	ongoing
	F. [30/1978, Bleier Fifteenth session 84/1981, Barbato Seventeenth session 107/1981, Quinteros Nineteenth session]					
	G. [34/1978, Silva Twelfth session]					

*Note: Follow-up information was provided on 17 October 1991 (unpublished). The list of cases under A: the State party submitted that on 1 March 1985, the competence of the civil courts was re-established. The amnesty law of 8 March 1985 benefited all the individuals who had been involved as authors, accomplices or accessory participants of political crimes or crimes committed for political purposes, from 1 January 1962 to 1 March 1985. The law allowed those individuals held responsible of intentional murder to have either their sentence reviewed or their conviction reduced. Pursuant to article 10 of the Law on National Pacification all the individuals imprisoned under "measures of security" were released. In cases subjected to review, appellate courts either acquitted or condemned the individuals. By virtue of Law 15.783 of 20 November 1985 all the individuals who had previously held a public office were entitled to resume their jobs. On cases under **B**: it states that these individuals were pardoned by virtue of Law 15.737 and released on 10 March 1985. On cases under C: these individuals were released on 14 March 1985; their cases were included under law 15.737. On cases under **D**: the amnesty law ended, from the date on which it entered into force, the regimes for the surveillance of individuals, pending arrest warrants, the restrictions to enter or exit the country; and every official inquiry into crimes covered by the amnesty. From 8 March 1985, the issuance of travel documents was no longer subjected to any restriction. Samuel Lichtensztein, after his return to Hungary, resumed his position as the Head of the University of the Republic. On cases under E: from 1 March 1985, the possibility to file an action for damages was open to all of the victims of human rights violations which occurred during the de facto government. From 1985 up to date, 36 suits in damages have been filed, 22 of them are related to arbitrary detention and 12 to the restitution of property. The Government settled Mr. Lopez's case on 21 November 1990, by paying him US\$ 200,000. The suit filed by Ms. Lilian Celiberti is still pending. Besides the above-mentioned cases, no

State party and	Communication	Follow-up response	Satisfactory	Unsatisfactory	No follow-up	Follow-up			
number of cases with violation	number, author and location	received from State party and location	response	response	response received	dialogue ongoing			
	other victim has filed a law-suit against the State claiming compensation. On cases under F : on 22 December 1986, the Congress passed Law 15.848, known as "the expiration of the State powers to prosecute". The law extinguished the power of State authorities to prosecute crimes committed by military or police agents for political purposes or in the execution of orders given to them by their superiors before 1 March 1985. All pending proceedings were discontinued. On 16 April 1989, the law was confirmed by referendum. The law ordered the investigating judges to send reports submitted to the judiciary about victims of disappearances to the Executive, for the latter to initiate								
	inquiries. 159/1983, Cariboni								
	12 .27 .0								

CCPR, A/63/40 vol. I (2008)

VI. FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES UNDER THE OPTIONAL PROTOCOL

- 187. In July 1990, the Committee established a procedure for the monitoring of follow-up to its Views under article 5, paragraph 4, of the Optional Protocol, and created the mandate of the Special Rapporteur for follow-up to Views to this effect. Mr. Ando has been the Special Rapporteur since March 2001 (seventy-first session).
- 188. In 1991, the Special Rapporteur began to request follow-up information from States parties. Such information had been systematically requested in respect of all Views with a finding of a violation of Covenant rights; 429 Views out of the 547 Views adopted since 1979 concluded that there had been a violation of the Covenant.
- 189. All attempts to categorize follow-up replies by States parties are inherently imprecise and subjective: it accordingly is not possible to provide a neat statistical breakdown of follow-up replies. Many follow-up replies received may be considered satisfactory, in that they display the willingness of the State party to implement the Committee's recommendations or to offer the complainant an appropriate remedy. Other replies cannot be considered satisfactory because they either do not address the Committee's Views at all or relate only to certain aspects of them. Some replies simply note that the victim has filed a claim for compensation outside statutory deadlines and that no compensation can therefore be paid. Still other replies indicate that there is no legal obligation on the State party to provide a remedy, but that a remedy will be afforded to the complainant on an ex gratia basis.
- 190. The remaining follow-up replies challenge the Committee's Views and findings on factual or legal grounds, constitute much-belated submissions on the merits of the complaint, promise an investigation of the matter considered by the Committee or indicate that the State party will not, for one reason or another, give effect to the Committee's recommendations.
- 191. In many cases, the Secretariat has also received information from complainants to the effect that the Committee's Views have not been implemented. Conversely, in rare instances, the petitioner has informed the Committee that the State party had in fact given effect to the Committee's recommendations, even though the State party had not itself provided that information.
- 192. The present annual report adopts the same format for the presentation of follow-up information as the last annual report. The table below displays a complete picture of follow-up replies from States parties received up to 7 July 2008, in relation to Views in which the Committee found violations of the Covenant. Wherever possible, it indicates whether follow-up replies are or have been considered as satisfactory or unsatisfactory, in terms of their compliance with the Committee's Views, or whether the dialogue between the State party and the Special Rapporteur for follow-up to Views continues. The notes following a number of case entries convey an idea of the difficulties in categorizing follow-up replies.
- 193. Follow-up information provided by States parties and by petitioners or their representatives

subsequent to the last annual report $(A/62/40)$ is set out in annex VII to volume II of the present annual report.

State party and number of cases with violation	Communication number, author and relevant Committee report	Follow-up response received from State party	Satisfactory response	Unsatisfactory response	No response	Follow-up dialogue ongoing
Uruguay (52)	A. [5/1977, Massera Seventh session 43/1979, Caldas Nineteenth session 63/1979, Antonaccio Fourteenth session 73/1980, Izquierdo Fifteenth session 80/1980, Vasiliskis Eighteenth session 83/1981, Machado Twentieth session 84/1981, Dermis Seventeenth session 85/1981, Romero Twenty-first session 88/1981, Bequio Eighteenth session 92/1981, Nieto Nineteenth session 103/1981, Scarone Twentieth session 105/1981, Cabreira Nineteenth session 109/1981, Voituret Twenty-first session 109/1981, Voituret Twenty-first session 123/1982, Lluberas	X 43 follow-up replies received in A/59/40*	X (relating to cases D and G)	X (relating to cases A, B, C, E, F)		X

State party and number of cases with violation	Communication number, author and relevant Committee report	Follow-up response received from State party	Satisfactory response	Unsatisfactory response	No response	Follow-up dialogue ongoing	
	Twenty-first session]						

Uruguay (cont'd)	B. [103/1981, Scarone 73/1980, Izquierdo 92/1981, Nieto 85/1981, Romero]		
	C. [63/1979, Antonaccio 80/1980, Vasiliskis 123/1982, Lluberas]		
	D. [57/1979, Martins Fifteenth session 77/1980, Lichtensztejn Eighteenth session 106/1981, Montero Eighteenth session 108/1981, Nuñez Nineteenth session]		
	E. [4/1977, Ramirez Fourth session 6/1977, Sequeiro Sixth session 25/1978, Massiotti Sixteenth session 28/1978, Weisz		

State party and number of cases with violation	Communication number, author and relevant Committee report	Follow-up response received from State party	Satisfactory response	Unsatisfactory response	No response	Follow-up dialogue ongoing
	Eleventh session 32/1978, <i>Touron</i> Twelfth session 33/1978, <i>Carballal</i> Twelfth session					
Uruguay (cont'd)	37/1978, De Boston Twelfth session 44/1979, Pietraroia Twelfth session 52/1979, Lopez Burgos Thirteenth session 56/1979, Celiberti Thirteenth session 66/1980, Schweizer Seventeenth session 70/1980, Simones Fifteenth session 74/1980, Estrella Eighteenth session 110/1981, Viana Twenty-first session 139/1983, Conteris Twenty-fifth session 147/1983, Gilboa Twenty-sixth session 162/1983, Acosta Thirty-fourth session]					

State party and number of cases with violation	Communication number, author and relevant Committee report	Follow-up response received from State party	Satisfactory response	Unsatisfactory response	No response	Follow-up dialogue ongoing
	F. [30/1978, Bleier Fifteenth session 84/1981, Barbato Seventeenth session 107/1981, Quinteros Nineteenth session]					
Uruguay (cont'd)	G. 34/1978, <i>Silva</i> Twelfth session					

State party and number of cases with violation	Communication number, author and relevant Committee report	Follow-up response received from State party	Satisfactory response	Unsatisfactory response	No response	Follow-up dialogue ongoing
	*Note: Follow-up information State party submitted that of amnesty law of 8 March 19 accessory participants in positive 1 March 1985. The law allow conviction reviewed or their the individuals imprisoned appellate courts either acquite the individuals who had present the individuals who had present to March 1985. On cases us included under Act 15.737. The put an end to the surveillant from the country; and every issuance of travel document to Hungary, resumed his possibility violations which occurred do 22 of them for arbitrary deticate on 21 November 1990 pending. Besides the aforem compensation. On cases unwitermination of public prosesses of the march 1985 by the superiors. All pending processes appearances to the Governormal submitted that the processes are the superiors. All pending processes appearances to the Governormal submitted that the processes are the	n 1 March 1985, the con 85 benefited all the indi- olitical crimes or crimes owed those individuals has been sentence reduced. Pur- under "measures of secu- itted or condemned the eviously held a public of that these individuals wander C: these individuals On cases under D: the coordinate of individuals; pendi- ty official inquiry into cri- tes was no longer subject of its an action for dar during the de facto gove ention and 12 for the re- pulse, by paying him US\$ 20 nentioned cases, no other der F: on 22 December ecutions". Under the Act emilitary or the police for eedings were discontinued investigating judges	inpetence of the viduals who has committed for held responsible suant to article urity" were released individuals. By ffice were entity were released to any restrict to any restrict the University of mages was open from of property 10,000. The suiter victim has fing the State can for political endued. On 16 Aprito send reports	e civil courts was rad been involved as political purposes, e of intentional mu 10 of the Act on Neased. In cases subject virtue of Act 15.7 led to return to the py virtue of Act 15.8 d on 14 March 198 from the date on what with the restrictions by the amnesty. From the date on what is, the restrictions by the amnesty. From the Act was pressed Act 15 and longer prosecutes or on orders receil 1989, the Act was submitted to the justice of the Republic.	re-established as authors, acc, from 1 Januar der to have a varional Pacific jected to review 783 of 20 Novier jobs. On car 737 and releases thich it entereds on entry or a man 8 March 1 tenstein, aftern cases under ms of human lamages have at settled Mr. In Celiberti is set the State of 5.848, known the crimes contived from the as confirmed	omplices or ary 1962 to either their fication all ew, wember all uses under used on a were dinto force, departure 1985, the his return E: from 1 rights been filed, Lopez's still laiming as mmitted eir by
Uruguay (cont'd)	159/1983, <i>Cariboni</i>				X	X

State party and number of cases with violation	Communication number, author and relevant Committee report	Follow-up response received from State party	Satisfactory response	Unsatisfactory response	No response	Follow-up dialogue ongoing
	A/43/40 Selected Decisions, vol. 2					
	322/1988, <i>Rodríguez</i> A/51/40 A/49/40				X A/51/40	X

CCPR, A/64/40, vol. I (2009)

VI. FOLLOW UP ACTIVITIES UNDER THE OPTIONAL PROTOCOL

- 230. In July 1990, the Committee established a procedure for the monitoring of follow-up to its Views under article 5, paragraph 4, of the Optional Protocol, and created the mandate of the Special Rapporteur for follow-up on Views to this effect. Ms. Ruth Wedgwood has been the Special Rapporteur since July 2009 (ninety-sixth session).
- 231. In 1991, the Special Rapporteur began to request follow-up information from States parties. Such information had been systematically requested in respect of all Views with a finding of a violation of Covenant rights; 543 Views out of the 681 Views adopted since 1979 concluded that there had been a violation of the Covenant.
- 232. All attempts to categorize follow-up replies by States parties are inherently imprecise and subjective: it accordingly is not possible to provide a neat statistical breakdown of follow-up replies. Many follow-up replies received may be considered satisfactory, in that they display the willingness of the State party to implement the Committee's recommendations or to offer the complainant an appropriate remedy. Other replies cannot be considered satisfactory because they either do not address the Committee's Views at all or relate only to certain aspects of them. Some replies simply note that the victim has filed a claim for compensation outside statutory deadlines and that no compensation can therefore be paid. Still other replies indicate that there is no legal obligation on the State party to provide a remedy, but that a remedy will be afforded to the complainant on an ex gratia basis.
- 233. The remaining follow-up replies challenge the Committee's Views and findings on factual or legal grounds, constitute much belated submissions on the merits of the complaint, promise an investigation of the matter considered by the Committee or indicate that the State party will not, for one reason or another, give effect to the Committee's recommendations.
- 234. In many cases, the Secretariat has also received information from complainants to the effect that the Committee's Views have not been implemented. Conversely, in rare instances, the petitioner has informed the Committee that the State party had in fact given effect to the Committee's recommendations, even though the State party had not itself provided that information.
- 235. The present annual report adopts the same format for the presentation of follow-up information as the last annual report. The table below displays a complete picture of follow-up replies from States parties received up to the ninety-sixth session (13-31 July 2009), in relation to Views in which the Committee found violations of the Covenant. Wherever possible, it indicates whether follow-up replies are or have been considered as satisfactory or unsatisfactory, in terms of their compliance with the Committee's Views, or whether the dialogue between the State party and the Special Rapporteur for follow-up on Views continues. The notes following a number of case entries convey an idea of the difficulties in categorizing follow-up replies.
- 236. Follow-up information provided by States parties and by petitioners or their representatives

subsequent to the last annual report $(A/63/40)$ is set out in annex IX to volume II of the present annual report.

State party and number of cases with violation	Communication number, author and relevant Committee report	Follow-up response received from State party	Satisfactory response	Unsatisfactory response	No response	Follow- up dialogue ongoing
Uruguay (52)	A. [5/1977, Massera Seventh session 43/1979, Caldas Nineteenth session 63/1979, Antonaccio Fourteenth session 73/1980, Izquierdo Fifteenth session 80/1980, Vasiliskis Eighteenth session 83/1981, Machado Twentieth session 84/1981, Dermis Seventeenth session 85/1981, Romero Twenty-first session 88/1981, Bequio Eighteenth session 92/1981, Nieto Nineteenth session 103/1981, Scarone Twentieth session 105/1981, Cabreira	X 43 follow-up replies received, see A/59/40*	X (relating to cases D and G)	X (relating to cases A, B, C, E, F)		X

State party and number of cases with violation	Communication number, author and relevant Committee report	Follow-up response received from State party	Satisfactory response	Unsatisfactory response	No response	Follow- up dialogue ongoing
	Nineteenth session 109/1981, <i>Voituret</i> Twenty-first session 123/1982, <i>Lluberas</i> Twenty-first session]					
Uruguay (cont'd)	B. [103/1981, Scarone 73/1980, Izquierdo 92/1981, Nieto 85/1981, Romero]					
	C. [63/1979, Antonaccio 80/1980, Vasiliskis 123/1982, Lluberas]					
	D. [57/1979, <i>Martins</i> Fifteenth session 77/1980, <i>Lichtensztejn</i> Eighteenth session 106/1981, <i>Montero</i> Eighteenth session 108/1981, <i>Nuñez</i> Nineteenth session]					
	E. [4/1977, <i>Ramirez</i> Fourth session					

State party and number of cases with violation	Communication number, author and relevant Committee report	Follow-up response received from State party	Satisfactory response	Unsatisfactory response	No response	Follow- up dialogue ongoing
	6/1977, Sequeiro Sixth session 25/1978, Massiotti Sixteenth session 28/1978, Weisz Eleventh session 32/1978, Touron Twelfth session 33/1978, Carballal Twelfth session					
Uruguay (cont'd)	37/1978, De Boston Twelfth session 44/1979, Pietraroia Twelfth session 52/1979, Lopez Burgos Thirteenth session 56/1979, Celiberti Thirteenth session 66/1980, Schweizer Seventeenth session 70/1980, Simones Fifteenth session 74/1980, Estrella Eighteenth session 110/1981, Viana					

State party and number of cases with violation	Communication number, author and relevant Committee report	Follow-up response received from State party	Satisfactory response	Unsatisfactory response	No response	Follow- up dialogue ongoing
	Twenty-first session 139/1983, Conteris Twenty-fifth session 147/1983, Gilboa Twenty-sixth session 162/1983, Acosta Thirty-fourth session]					
	F. [30/1978, Bleier Fifteenth session 84/1981, Barbato Seventeenth session 107/1981, Quinteros Nineteenth session]					
Uruguay (cont'd)	G. 34/1978, Silva Twelfth session					

State party and number of cases with violation	Communication number, author and relevant Committee report	Follow-up response received from State party	Satisfactory response	Unsatisfactory response	No response	Follow- up dialogue ongoing
	*Note: Follow-up informati the State party submitted th amnesty law of 8 March 19 or accessory participants in 1962 to 1 March 1985. The either their conviction revie Pacification all the individu to review, appellate courts of 20 November all the individu jobs. On cases under B: the Act 15.737 and released on March 1985; their cases we date on which it entered into the restrictions on entry or amnesty. From 8 March 198 Samuel Liechtenstein, after the Republic. On cases under to all of the victims of huma 36 suits for damages have be The Government settled Mr filed by Ms. Lilian Celibert lawsuit against the State cla passed Act 15.848, known a prosecute crimes committed orders received from their s Act was confirmed by refer	at on 1 March 1985, the 85 benefited all the in political crimes or crillaw allowed those income allowed or their sentence all imprisoned under either acquitted or conduals who had previous State party indicates to 10 March 1985. On cre included under Act to force, put an end to departure from the course, the issuance of training return to Hungary er E: from 1 March 1985 an rights violations who seen filed, 22 of them are to the course of the cou	the competence of dividuals who had mes committed dividuals held reserved. Pursua "measures of seedemned the industy held a public that these individuals held a public that these individuals as under C: the 15.737. On case the surveillance untry; and every wel documents well accuments well accument to the possibility of the possibility of arbitrary det November 1990 des the aforeme On cases under this proceedings we proceedings we	of the civil courts and been involved for political purposes ponsible of intendent to article 10 of curity" were releasividuals. By virtue coffice were entited under the entity of the Article of individuals were pardorn the entity in the Article of individuals; per official inquiry in the Article of individuals in the Action and 12 for the paying him Unitioned cases, no article of the police for per discontinued. Of the police for per discontinued.	was re-estable as authors, access, from 1 Jutional murde of the Act on Nased. In cases the of Act 15.78 and the return are deby virtue ere released of mnesty Act, fronting arrest of the Union for damage government. It is a considered to the State can political ends on 16 April 1	ished. The ecomplices January r to have Jational subjected 33 of to their of on 14 from the warrants; wered by the striction. versity of s was open Since 1985, property. The suit has filed a Congress no longer or on 989, the

State party and number of cases with violation	Communication number, author and relevant Committee report	Follow-up response received from State party	Satisfactory response	Unsatisfactory response	No response	Follow- up dialogue ongoing		
	judiciary about victims of disappearances to the Government, for the latter to initiate inquiries.							
Uruguay (cont'd)	159/1983, <i>Cariboni</i> A/43/40 Selected Decisions, vol. 2				X	X		
	322/1988, <i>Rodríguez</i> A/51/40 A/49/40				X A/51/40	X		