

## **HUMAN RIGHTS COMMITTEE**

### **U. R. v. Uruguay**

**Communication No. 128/1982**

**6 April 1983**

### **ADMISSIBILITY**

*Submitted by: L. A. (name deleted) on 7 October 1982*

*Alleged victim: U. R.*

*State party: Uruguay*

*Declared inadmissible: 6 April 1983 (eighteenth session)*

### **Decision on Admissibility**

1. The author of the communication, dated 7 October 1982, is L. A., a Swedish medical doctor residing in Sweden. He submits the communication to the Human Rights Committee, on behalf of U. R., a Uruguayan medical student, who is presently detained in Libertad prison, Uruguay, and is unable to present the communication on his own behalf.
2. The author alleges that U. R. is a victim of a breach by Uruguay of articles 9, 10 and 14 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. L. A. indicates that, as a member of a Swedish branch of Amnesty International, he has been working on the case, without avail, since 27 March 1980. He claims to have the authority to act on behalf of U. R. because he believes "that every prisoner treated unjustly would appreciate further investigation of his case by the Human Rights Committee".
3. Before considering any claims contained in a communication, the Human Rights Committee shall, in accordance with rule 87 of its provisional rules of procedure, decide whether or not it is admissible under the Optional Protocol to the Covenant.
4. Articles I and 2 of the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights provide that individuals who themselves claim to be victims of violations of any of the rights set forth in the Covenant may submit communications to the Human Rights Committee. The Human Rights Committee has established through a number of decisions on admissibility that a communication submitted by a third party on behalf of an alleged victim can only be considered if the author justifies his authority to submit the

communication. With regard to the present communication, the Committee cannot accept on the basis of the information before it that the author has any authority to submit the communication on behalf of the alleged victim.

5. The Human Rights Committee therefore decides:

That the communication is inadmissible.