
**INTER-AMERICAN COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS
RESOLUTION TO LIFT PRECAUTIONARY MEASURES
59/2024**

Precautionary Measure No. 132-00

Jorge Cardona Alzate and Alba Patricia Ribera Uribe regarding Colombia¹

August 27, 2024

Original: Spanish

I. SUMMARY

1. The Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (IACHR) decides to lift these precautionary measures in favor of Jorge Cardona Alzate and Alba Patricia Ribera Uribe regarding Colombia. Despite several requests for updates, the accredited representation has not sent the Commission any information since 2021. Upon being notified that a risk assessment would be carried out, the representation did not respond. Consequently, upon not identifying compliance with the procedural requirements, the IACHR has decided to lift these precautionary measures. Lastly, the Commission recalls that the Inter-American Court of Human Rights has been overseeing Jineth Bedoya Lima's situation as part of the ruling in the *Case of Bedoya Lima et al. v. Colombia*.

II. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2. On June 2, 2000, the Commission granted precautionary measures to protect the life and personal integrity of Jineth Bedoya Lima, then journalist of *El Espectador*; Hollman Morris Rincón, then peace editor of *El Espectador*; and Jorge Cardona Alzate, then judicial editor of *El Espectador* in Colombia. The available information indicates that on May 25, 2000, Jineth Bedoya received a call from an individual nicknamed *El Panadero* ("The Baker"), who expressed interest in having an article written on the paramilitary's version of the outbreak of violence on April 27, 2000 in the National Model Prison of Bogotá. However, she was intercepted at the entrance of the facilities, surrounded, sedated, and then taken to a nearby house. There, she was gagged, beaten, and subjected to degrading treatment by several individuals, who later left her in an isolated area.

3. On June 19, 2000, the Commission requested that the State issue an extension of the precautionary measures to include Alba Patricia Ribera Uribe, a journalist with *NTC Noticias* due to the threats she received, which were similar to those received by her colleagues.² On June 29, 2005, the Commission ordered that the situation regarding Hollman Morris and his family unit be separated under File No. 1-00. The institutions who exert accredited representation in this matter are the Center for Justice and International Law (CEJIL) and the Foundation for Freedom of the Press (*La Fundación para la Libertad de Prensa*, FLIP), who provided information on Jineth Bedoya Lima's situation.

4. In the framework of the *Case of Bedoya Lima et al. v. Colombia*, on March 24, 2021, the Inter-American Court granted provisional measures in favor of Jineth Bedoya Lima and her mother Luz Nelly Lima, in Colombia.³ On that occasion, the Inter-American Court requested that the State "immediately adopt all

¹ In accordance with Article 17.2.a of the Rules of Procedure of the IACHR, the Commissioner Carlos Bernal Pulido, of Colombian nationality, did not participate in the debate and deliberation of this matter.

² Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (IACHR), Annual Report 2000, Chapter III, [Section C: Petitions and Cases before the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights](#).

³ Inter-American Court of Human Rights (I/A Court H.R.), [Case of Bedoya Lima et al.](#), Provisional Measures regarding Colombia, Order of March 24, 2021 (Available only in Spanish).

appropriate measures to effectively protect the rights to life and personal integrity of Jineth Bedoya Lima and Luz Nelly Lima, [then] alleged victims within this matter before the Court [...].⁴

5. On August 26, 2021, the Court issued a judgment holding the State internationally responsible for violating the rights of journalist Jineth Bedoya Lima to personal integrity, liberty, honor and dignity, as well as freedom of thought and expression. This decision was based on the events of May 25, 2000, when Ms. Bedoya was intercepted and abducted by paramilitaries at the entrance of La Modelo Prison. She endured approximately 10 hours of degrading and extremely violent treatment, including severe verbal, physical abuse, and sexual assault, by several of the kidnappers.⁵ The Court also found the State internationally responsible for violating the rights to judicial guarantees, judicial protection, and equality before the law. It cited a lack of due diligence in the investigations, the discriminatory nature of these investigations based on gender, and a violation of the reasonable time limit.⁶ In this judgment, the Inter-American Court ordered that the State, among other actions, promote and continue the investigations necessary to determine, judge and, if applicable, punish the remaining persons responsible for the acts against Ms. Jineth Bedoya;⁷ and adopt the necessary measures to guarantee the life, personal integrity, and safety of Ms. Jineth Bedoya and her mother in the course of these investigations and proceedings.⁸ By resolution of February 7, 2023, the Inter-American Court decided to keep the compliance monitoring procedure active in regards to several measures of reparation.⁹

6. In the judgment of the *Case of Bedoya Lima et al. v. Colombia* of 2021, the Inter-American Court indicated the following:

“174. [...] deems it appropriate to instruct the State to take all necessary measures to ensure the life, personal integrity, and safety of Ms. Bedoya and her mother, Ms. Luz Nelly Lima, during the ongoing investigations and proceedings, and to provide them with the required protection from any individual. The Court therefore considers that the provisional measures adopted in the framework of this matter are included in this reparation measure and will be monitored in the framework of the supervision of the Judgment at hand. The State shall continue to report to the Court every two months, as from the submission of its last report, regarding compliance with this measure.”¹⁰

7. The Commission recalls that on March 29, 2021, it informed the parties that, “Given that the Inter-American Court of Human Rights issued provisional measures in favor of Jineth Bedoya Lima and her mother on March 24, 2021, we will proceed with the ongoing monitoring of the precautionary measures for the other two identified beneficiaries: Jorge Cardona Alzate and Alba Ribera Uribe.” Consequently, since that time, the Commission has requested information from the parties on the situation of the two identified individuals.

III. SUMMARY OF THE INFORMATION PROVIDED DURING THE TIME THE PRECAUTIONARY MEASURES WERE IN FORCE

8. During the time the precautionary measures were in force, the Commission followed-up on the situation by requesting information from both parties and by having working meetings. More recently, communications from the parties and the IACHR have been documented on the following dates:

⁴ *Ibid.*, Resolution Point 1 of the provisional measure.

⁵ I/A Court H.R., [Case of Bedoya Lima et al. v. Colombia. Judgment of August 26, 2021 \(Merits, Reparations and Costs\). Official summary.](#)

⁶ *Ibidem*

⁷ I/A Court H.R., [Case of Bedoya Lima et al. v. Colombia. Colombia. Judgment of August 26, 2021 \(Merits, Reparations and Costs\)](#), resolution point 8.

⁸ I/A Court H.R., [Case of Bedoya Lima et al. v. Colombia. Judgment of August 26, 2021 \(Merits, Reparations and Costs\)](#), Resolution Point 10.

⁹ I/A Court H.R., [Case of Bedoya Lima et al. v. Colombia. Judgment Compliance Supervision Order](#), February 7, 2023 (Available only in Spanish).

¹⁰ I/A Court H.R., [Case of Bedoya Lima et al. v. Colombia. Judgment of August 26, 2021 \(Merits, Reparations and Costs\)](#), para. 174.

	State	Representation	IACHR
2011	May 19, November 2, December 30	October 25, November 24, December 16	October 24, November 7, December 21
2012	February 9, April 4, May 31	February 3, March 31	January 13, February 29, May 10, and July 24
2013	July 11, September 3	February 11, April 3	June 5 and August 7
2015	No communications	July 29, October 26	September 18
2016	April 15, June 30	April 8, December 7	March 30, May 9, and June 14
2017	May 5, May 16, June 2, July 7	May 8, December 4, December 19	April 5, June 13, and September 5
2018	February 21, March 9, April 16, June 25	July 24, July 26	March 16
2019	February 8, March 22	May 15, August 6	January 11, May 16
2020	July 15	October 14	December 14
2021	No communications	March 31	March 31
2022	No communications	No communications	October 28
2023	No communications	No communications	November 20
2024	July 12 ¹¹	No communications	June 17

9. On October 21, 2015, the Commission held a working meeting with the parties within the framework of the 156th Period of Sessions. On October 28, 2022, the Commission requested information from the representation in order to evaluate keeping the precautionary measures in force. The request was reiterated on November 20, 2023 and June 17, 2024.

10. Since 2021, the Commission has requested updated information regarding the situation of Jorge Cardona Alzate and Alba Patricia Ribera Uribe in order to evaluate keeping the precautionary measures in force. However, the parties did not send the IACHR any information on the situation of the two indicated individuals and all granted deadlines have since expired.

A. Information provided by the State

11. From 2011 to 2013, the State presented information about the conciliation meetings that took place. In 2013, the State confirmed the continuity of Jineth Bedoya’s protection detail that consisted of an armored vehicle, an ordinary escort vehicle, and four security agents. On September 10, 2012, the Prosecutor’s Office imposed a preventive detention order on the suspects accused of aggravated kidnapping, torture, and violent carnal assault against Jineth Bedoya Lima. The State requested the partial lifting of the measure given that the information presented by the representation only referred to Jineth Bedoya and not to the rest of the beneficiaries.

12. In 2016, the State implemented a security plan. The State reported that two of the three persons linked as alleged perpetrators were convicted. In 2017, the State reported the progress in the investigation of threats made against Jineth Bedoya by the criminal gang *Águilas Negras* (Black Eagles). In 2018, the State stated that a follow-up and consultation meeting was held on December 7, 2017. Moreover, a risk level assessment was carried out for Jineth Bedoya on January 31, 2018, and the material protection measures were confirmed. In the context of the investigation into the incidents that gave rise to the precautionary measures, it was reported that the investigations had confirmed the involvement of individuals who had since died. Subsequently, the Prosecutor’s Office announced it would concentrate its efforts on the involvement of individuals who assisted and enabled the commission of these acts. In 2019, the State stated that, in response

¹¹ The State filed a request to extend the deadline. Although an extension was granted, the State did not send a response.

to the threats received in July 2018, the Bogotá Metropolitan Police conducted inspections and patrols to protect Jineth Bedoya. Moreover, an investigation was initiated for the crime of threats.

13. In 2020, the State reported that a virtual follow-up meeting was held on June 25 of that year. At this meeting, the security detail then in force for the beneficiary, which consisted of three protection agents, an ordinary vehicle, an armored vest, and a means of communication, was endorsed. On July 7, 2020, a meeting was held between the Directorate of Investigation Support and Analysis for Citizen Security of the Office of the Attorney General and the representation. Regarding the investigations into crimes committed against Jineth Bedoya, it was indicated that an investigation for the crimes of violent sexual assault and torture, which is in the preliminary phase, is being carried out against A.L. In addition, regarding the threats made from 2010 to 2013, the proceedings are reportedly in the evidence-gathering phase of the investigation. An active investigation for the crime of threats is currently in the investigative stage, due to events that occurred on August 6, 2019. Additionally, the investigations into acts of threats of March 17, 2016 and February 27, 2020 are also reportedly active and currently in the investigative stage.

B. Information provided by the representation

14. Between 2011 and 2020, the representation stated that Jineth Bedoya was victim of intimidation and threats due to her journalistic work. In 2015, the representation reported that the beneficiary was allegedly threatened and that the situation was being adequately addressed by the UNP. The beneficiary had a security detail consisting of six security agents, an armored vehicle, and an ordinary vehicle. Regarding the investigation into the events of May 25, 2000, it was noted that three ex-paramilitaries were linked to the participation and execution of the crime against Ms. Bedoya.

15. In 2016, the representation reported that Jineth Bedoya was the victim of threats issued by paramilitary groups called *Águilas Negras*. Regarding the investigation of the events of May 25, 2000, it was indicated that two of the persons linked to the process were convicted as material authors. However, the representation questioned the investigations. In 2018, the representation stated that Jineth Bedoya had received frequent threats from the paramilitary group *Águilas Negras*. On July 14, she had been stigmatized as a guerrilla and declared a military target by means of a pamphlet signed by the “Central Block” of the *Águilas Negras*.

16. In 2019, the representation reported that Jineth Bedoya was reportedly contacted via instant messaging platforms and received calls from an unknown number on August 6, 2019. When she answered the phone, the journalist reportedly heard a voice similar to the one that she heard 20 years ago when she started receiving the threats. The individual reportedly indicated that he already knew her and provided a physical description of her at the time. The representation noted that the aforementioned facts should be considered within the broader context of progress in both national and inter-American justice related to the case of Jineth Bedoya. In 2020, the representation reported that Jineth Bedoya had received harassment via phone calls, despite having changed her phone number and only sharing it with a few people, after receiving threats on August 6, 2019. The representation reported that, notwithstanding the complaints filed with the Prosecutor’s Office in 2019, no progress has been made to date in clarifying the facts. In 2021, the incorporation of new representation was reported.

IV. ANALYSIS OF THE REQUIREMENTS OF URGENCY, SERIOUSNESS, AND IRREPARABLE HARM

17. The precautionary measures mechanism is part of the Commission’s function of overseeing compliance with the human rights obligations set forth in Article 106 of the Charter of the Organization of American States. These general oversight functions are provided for in Article 41 (b) of the American Convention on Human Rights, as well as in Article 18 (b) of the Statute of the IACHR; while the mechanism of precautionary measures is set forth in Article 25 of the Commission’s Rules of Procedure. In accordance with

this Article, the IACHR grants precautionary measures in urgent and serious situations in which these measures are necessary to avoid irreparable harm to persons or to the subject matter of a petition or case before the organs of the inter-American system.

18. The Inter-American Commission and the Inter-American Court of Human Rights (“the Inter-American Court” or “I/A Court H.R.”) have established repeatedly that precautionary and provisional measures have a dual nature, both protective and precautionary.¹² Regarding the protective nature, these measures seek to avoid irreparable harm and protect the exercise of human rights.¹³ To do this, the IACHR shall assess the problem raised, the effectiveness of state actions to address the situation described, and the vulnerability to which the persons proposed as beneficiaries would be exposed if the measures are not adopted.¹⁴ Regarding their precautionary nature, these measures have the purpose of preserving a legal situation while under study by the organs of the inter-American system. They aim to safeguard the rights at risk until the petition pending before the inter-American system is resolved. Their object and purpose are to ensure the integrity and effectiveness of an eventual decision on the merits and, thus, avoid any further infringement of the rights at issue, a situation that may adversely affect the useful effect (*effet utile*) of the final decision. In this regard, precautionary or provisional measures enable the State concerned to comply with the final decision and, if necessary, to implement the ordered reparations. Regarding the process of decision making and, according to Article 25(2) of its Rules of Procedure, the Commission considers that:

- a) “serious situation” refers to a grave impact that an action or omission can have on a protected right or on the eventual effect of a pending decision in a case or petition before the organs of the inter-American system;
- b) “urgent situation” refers to risk or threat that is imminent and can materialize, thus requiring immediate preventive or protective action; and
- c) “irreparable harm” refers to injury to rights which, due to their nature, would not be susceptible to reparation, restoration or adequate compensation.

19. In this sense, Article 25(7) of the Commission’s Rules of Procedure establishes that decisions “granting, extending, modifying or lifting precautionary measures shall be adopted through reasoned resolutions.” Article 25 (9) sets forth that the Commission shall evaluate periodically, at its own initiative or at the request of either party, whether to maintain, modify or lift the precautionary measures in force. In this regard, the Commission shall assess whether the serious and urgent situation and the risk of irreparable harm that caused the adoption of the precautionary measures persist. Furthermore, it shall consider whether there are new situations that may comply with the requirements outlined in Article 25 of its Rules of Procedure.

20. Similarly, the Commission recalls that while the assessment of the procedural requirements when adopting precautionary measures is carried out from a *prima facie* standard of review, keeping such measures in force requires a more rigorous evaluation.¹⁵ In this sense, when no imminent risk is identified, the

¹² I/A Court H.R., Matter of the Yare I and Yare II Capital Region Penitentiary Center, Provisional Measures regarding the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Order of March 30, 2006, considerandum 5; Case of Carpio Nicolle et al. v. Guatemala, Provisional Measures, Order of July 6, 2009, considerandum 16 (Available only in Spanish). Guatemala, Provisional Measures, Order of July 6, 2009, considerandum 16.

¹³ Matter of Capital El Rodeo I and El Rodeo II Judicial Confinement Center. Provisional Measures regarding Venezuela, Order of February 8, 2008, considerandum 8; Case of Bámaca Velásquez, Provisional Measures regarding Guatemala, Order of January 27, 2009, considerandum 45; Matter of Fernández Ortega et al. Provisional Measures regarding Mexico. Order of April 30, 2009, considerandum 5; Matter of Milagro Sala, Provisional Measures regarding Argentina, Order of November 23, 2017, considerandum 5, (Available only in Spanish).

¹⁴ I/A Court H.R., Matter of Milagro Sala, Provisional Measures regarding Argentina, Order of November 23, 2017, considerandum 5 (Available only in Spanish); Matter of Capital El Rodeo I and El Rodeo II Judicial Confinement Center, Provisional Measures regarding Venezuela, Order of February 8, 2008, considerandum 9; Matter of the Criminal Institute of Plácido de Sá Carvalho, Provisional Measures regarding Brazil, Order of February 13, 2017, considerandum 6 (Available only in Spanish).

¹⁵ I/A Court [H.R., Fernandez Ortega et al.](#), Provisional Measures regarding Mexico, Order of February 7, 2017, considerandums 16 and 17.

burden of proof and argument increases over time.¹⁶ The Inter-American Court has indicated that the passage of a reasonable period of time without threats or intimidation, added to the lack of imminent risk, may lead to the lifting of international protection measures.¹⁷

21. As a preliminary matter, the Commission takes note of the information presented by the parties during the time the precautionary measures were in force in favor of *Jineth Bedoya Lima* up to 2021. This information focuses on the negotiation spaces, the protection measures implemented, and the status of the ongoing investigations. That same year, the Inter-American Court of Human Rights granted provisional measures in her favor. Subsequently, it began to monitor her safety within the framework of the ruling in the *Case of Bedoya Lima et al. v. Colombia*.

22. The Commission observes that there is no available information concerning the situations of *Jorge Cardona Alzate* and *Alba Patricia Ribera Uribe*. The information submitted, both before and after 2021, focused solely on Jineth Bedoya Lima's circumstances and did not provide any specific facts or claims regarding the other two beneficiaries. During the last 13 years that the precautionary measures have been in force, the Commission has not received any information on their situation. This has persisted over time, despite the various requests for information that the IACHR sent to the parties.

23. The Commission recalls that the representatives of the beneficiaries who wish the measures to continue must present proof of reasons for doing so.¹⁸ Consequently, in view of the lack of information on these two persons for a period of more than 10 years, the Commission notes that it does not have elements of assessment that would allow it to identify a situation of risk in the terms of Article 25 of its Rules of Procedure. In view of the foregoing and taking into account the temporary, exceptional, and complementary nature of the precautionary measures mechanism,¹⁹ the Commission considers that, in use of its procedural powers, it is appropriate to lift these measures.

24. Lastly, the Commission reminds the State of its duty to respond to the requests for information. In this regard, the Inter-American Court has indicated that failure to comply with the State duty to report on all the measures adopted in compliance with its decisions is especially serious, given the legal nature of these measures that seek to prevent irreparable harm to persons in serious and urgent situations.²⁰ The duty to inform constitutes a dual obligation that requires, for its effective fulfillment, the formal presentation of a document on time, and the specific, true, current, and detailed material references to the issues on which that obligation falls.²¹

V. DECISION

25. The Commission decides to lift the precautionary measures in favor of Jorge Cardona Alzate and Alba Patricia Ribera Uribe, in Colombia. The Commission also recalls that the Inter-American Court of

¹⁶ I/A Court H.R., [Fernandez Ortega et al.](#), Provisional Measures regarding Mexico, Order of February 7, 2017, considerandums 16 and 17 (Available only in Spanish).

¹⁷ I/A Court H.R., [Fernandez Ortega et al.](#), Provisional Measures regarding Mexico, Order of February 7, 2017, considerandums 16 and 17 (Available only in Spanish).

¹⁸ IACHR, [Basic Guidelines for the Investigation of Violations of the Rights of Human Rights Defenders in the Americas](#), OEA/Ser.L/V/II. December 31, 2017. 28-30 (Available only in Spanish).

¹⁹ I/A Court H.R., [Matter of Adrián Meléndez Quijano et al.](#), Provisional Measures regarding El Salvador, Order of August 21, 2013, para. 22; [Matter of Galdámez Álvarez et al.](#), Provisional Measures regarding Honduras, Order of November 23, 2016, para. 24 (Available only in Spanish).

²⁰ I/A Court H.R., [Matter of Communities of Jiguamiandó and Curvaradó regarding Colombia](#), Provisional Measures, Order of February 7, 2006, considerandum 16; and *Case of Luisiana Ríos et al.* (Radio Caracas Televisión – RCTV), Provisional Measures, Order of September 12, 2005, considerandum 17 (Available only in Spanish).

²¹ *Ibidem*

Human Rights has been overseeing Jineth Bedoya Lima's situation in the context of the *Case of Bedoya Lima et al. v. Colombia*.

26. The Commission emphasizes that regardless of the lifting of these measures, in accordance with Article 1(1) of the American Convention, it is the obligation of the State to respect and guarantee the rights recognized therein, including the life and personal integrity of the beneficiaries.

27. The Commission recalls that the lifting of these measures does not prevent the filing of a new request for precautionary measures should they consider that there is a situation that meets the requirements established in Article 25 of its Rules of Procedure.

28. The Commission instructs the Executive Secretariat of the IACHR to notify this resolution to the State of Colombia and the representation.

29. Approved on August 27, 2024, by Roberta Clarke, President; José Luis Caballero Ochoa, Second Vice President; Arif Bulkan; Andrea Pochak; Edgar Stuardo Ralón Orellana, and Gloria Monique de Mees, members of the IACHR.

Jorge Meza Flores
Deputy Executive Secretary