

OEA/Ser.L/V/II
Doc. 207
14 October 2025
Original: Spanish

REPORT No. 196/25

CASE 13.318

REPORT ON FRIENDLY SETTLEMENT

RUBÉN DARÍO OCAMPO HENAO AND HÉCTOR CORRALES
OCAMPO
COLOMBIA

Approved electronically by the Commission on October 14, 2025.

Cite as: IACHR, Report No. 196/25, Case 13.318, Friendly Settlement, Rubén Darío Ocampo Henao and Héctor Corrales Ocampo, Colombia, October 14, 2025.

REPORT No. 196/25
CASE 13.318
FRIENDLY SETTLEMENT
RUBÉN DARÍO OCAMPO HENAO AND HÉCTOR CORRALES OCAMPO
COLOMBIA¹
OCTOBER 14, 2025

I. SUMMARY AND RELEVANT PROCEEDINGS OF THE FRIENDLY SETTLEMENT PROCESS

1. On April 23, 2008, the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (hereinafter "the Commission" or "IACHR") received a petition filed by Luis Carlos José Peña Rodríguez and Luis Francisco Peña Ramírez, (hereinafter "the petitioners") alleging—generally and without detailing specific rights violations—that the Republic of Colombia (hereinafter "State" or "Colombian State" or "Colombia") was responsible for circumstances that fall "within the realm of the international human rights treaty or San José, Costa Rica Agreement", in connection with the alleged extrajudicial executions of Rubén Darío Ocampo Henao and Héctor Corrales Ocampo (hereinafter "alleged victims") by the Unified Action Group for Personal Liberty [-GAULA- *in Spanish*], comprised of members of the National Army, the Office of the Attorney General of the Nation (FGN) and the Administrative Security Department [-DAS- *in Spanish*], as well as with an improper investigation before military jurisdiction, the forced displacement of family members as a result of these facts, and a failure to provide reparations.

2. On January 27, 2017, the Commission issued Admissibility Report No. 9/17, in which declared the petition admissible and asserted its competence to hear the petitioners' claim with respect to the alleged violation of the rights contained in articles 2 (domestic legal effects), 4 (right to life), 5 (right to humane treatment), 8 (right to a fair trial), 11 (right to privacy), 22 (freedom of movement and residency), and 25 (right to judicial protection) of the Convention, in conjunction with Article 1(1) (obligation to respect rights) of the American Convention on Human Rights (hereinafter the "Convention" or the "American Convention").

3. On November 26, 2024, the parties signed a memorandum of understanding in an effort to reach a friendly settlement, along with a work timeline to advance the negotiations. Over the following months, the parties held bilateral meetings to analyze the reparation measures to be included in the friendly settlement agreement (hereinafter "FSA" or "agreement"), leading to its signing on April 10, 2025, in the city of Bogotá D.C. Subsequently, on May 23, 2025, the parties presented a joint report to the IACHR on the progress made toward implementing the measure of satisfaction related to the recognition of international responsibility and requested its approval.

4. Pursuant to the provisions of Article 49 of the Convention and Article 40(5) of the Rules of Procedure of the Commission, this friendly settlement report will include an overview of the facts alleged by the petitioners and the text of the friendly settlement agreement, as signed on April 10, 2025, by the petitioners and the representatives of the Colombian State. Likewise, the agreement signed by the parties is approved, along with the publication of this report in the Annual Report of the IACHR to the General Assembly of the Organization of American States.

II. THE FACTS ALLEGED

5. According to the petitioners, around 8:00 pm on June 25, 2003, rural workers Rubén Darío Ocampo Henao and Héctor Corrales Ocampo, first cousins, were allegedly murdered in a rural area near Pereira, Risaralda department, by the Unified Action Group for Personal Liberty (GAULA). The group included members from the National Army, the Office of the Attorney General of the Nation (FGN), and the Administrative Security Department (DAS). The deaths occurred during an operation aimed at identifying and capturing individuals who were allegedly extorting the owner of a local farm.

¹ Commissioner Carlos Bernal Pulido, of Colombian nationality, did not participate in the discussion and decision on this case, pursuant to Article 17(2)(a) of the Rules of Procedure of the IACHR.

6. The petitioners stated that the alleged victims, rural workers from humble families, would have been walking through the area of the operation when they were intercepted by the GAULA commander and a non-commissioned officer, who identified themselves as law enforcement officers and immediately proceeded to fire upon them, killing them. Furthermore, according to the petitioners, the deceased would have been defenseless and unable to respond to the excessive use of force, given the clear superiority of GAULA in both weapons and numbers. In this regard, they stated that the military's version of the story, in which the alleged victims had fired a shotgun in poor condition, was contradicted by an expert opinion that concluded the weapon was not functional. The petitioners also argued that 32 GAULA troops have surrounded the operation, so if they intended to detain the alleged victims, they could have done so without resistance. The petitioners concluded that the GAULA members' reaction would have been disproportionate and aimed at "killing them" and "showing them off as a crime-fighting trophy".

7. According to the petition, the case file of the criminal investigation indicates that on June 25, 2003, after receiving a message from SIJIN's Communications Center, the Second Local Public Prosecutor of the Pereira Quick Response Unit launched an investigation into the deaths of Mr. Ocampo Henao and Mr. Corrales Ocampo. The documentation states that the public prosecutor ordered several proceedings, which were to be sent to the 56th Military Criminal Trial Court on June 27, 2003. The court opened a preliminary investigation into the homicide of the alleged victims. According to the petition, the court reportedly examined evidence from expert witnesses and received statements from both relatives of the alleged victims and agents involved in the operation. The petitioners argued that the conclusion of the waiver of prosecution issued by the military criminal court, which claimed that the Group acted in legitimate self-defense, was incorrect. The petitioners contend that the State violated due process, the right to life and to humane treatment, and the right to privacy of both the victims and their families.

8. Additionally, the petitioners held that they filed a reparations lawsuit with the First Administrative Court of Pereira, which ruled in their favor on October 30, 2006. According to the petition, the court concluded that the GAULA used excessive force during the operation, shooting the alleged victims with bursts from an R-15, a powerful weapon with a long barrel range. The petitioners also indicate that, after the public prosecutor filed an appeal on July 12, 2007, the Contentious Administrative Court of Risaralda overturned the ruling, determining that the State agents had acted in legitimate self-defense. According to the petitioners, the *tutela*—a writ of protection—filed with the Council of State against the higher court's judgment was rejected as inadmissible, and they were notified of this on December 6, 2007. Finally, they indicate that due to the deaths of the alleged victims, their families were displaced and constantly forced to move "to avoid revenge at the hands of radical right-wing groups".

III. FRIENDLY SETTLEMENT

9. On April 10, 2025, in the city of Bogotá D.C., the parties signed a friendly settlement agreement, the text of which establishes the following:

FRIENDLY SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT CASE 13,318, RUBÉN DARÍO OCAMPO AND HÉCTOR CORRALES OCAMPO

On the tenth (10th) day of April, 2025, in the city of Bogotá D.C., **Yebrail Haddad Linero**, Director of International Legal Defense for the National Agency for the Legal Defense of the State, acting pursuant to Article 5 of Law 1444 of 2011, and Decree 4085 of 2011, as amended by Decrees 915 of 2017, 1698 of 2019, 2269 of 2019, and 1244 of 2021, is acting for and on behalf of the Colombian State, hereinafter referred to as the "State" or the "Colombian State"; and on the other hand, **Luis Carlos Peña and Luis Francisco Peña**, acting on behalf of the victims, hereinafter "the Petitioners," collectively "the Parties," have agreed to enter into this Friendly Settlement Agreement within the framework of **Case No. 13,318, Rubén Darío Ocampo and Héctor Corrales Ocampo**, currently pending before the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights.

PART ONE: DEFINITIONS

For the purposes of this Agreement, the below terms shall be understood as follows:

IACHR or Inter-American Commission: Inter-American Commission on Human Rights.

Nonpecuniary damages: Harmful effects of the facts of the case that are not economic or financial in nature but manifest in the form of pain, affliction, sadness, anguish, and anxiety felt by the victims.

Pecuniary damage: A loss of, or detriment to, the income of the victims, the expenses incurred as a result of the events, and the pecuniary consequences that may have a cause-and-effect link with the events in the case.

Non-pecuniary damage: Includes emotional distress and suffering caused to the victims, tampering with individual core values, and changes of a non-pecuniary nature in the living conditions of the victims or their families².

State or Colombian State: In accordance with international law, understood as a signatory to the American Convention on Human Rights, hereinafter referred to as “American Convention” or “ACHR.”

The Petitioners: Luis Carlos Peña and Luis Francisco Peña.

Parties: Colombian State and the Petitioners.

Satisfaction measures: Non-monetary measures aimed at helping the victims recover from the harm caused to them.

Acknowledgment of responsibility: Acceptance of the facts and the human rights violations attributed to the State.

Comprehensive reparations: All measures that objectively and symbolically restore the victim to the state before the harm was done.

Friendly Settlement: Alternative dispute resolution mechanism, used for peaceful and consensual settlement before the Inter-American Commission.

Victims: The relatives of Rubén Darío Ocampo Henao and Héctor Corrales Ocampo, listed in the third part of this Friendly Settlement Agreement.

PART TWO BACKGROUND

1. On April 23, 2008, a petition was filed before the Inter-American Commission against the Colombian State, alleging that the State was internationally responsible for the murders of Rubén Darío Ocampo and Héctor Corrales Ocampo during an operation carried out by the Unified Action Group for Personal Liberty (GAULA). It was also alleged to be internationally responsible for the impunity in which these facts have remained³.

2. The petitioners state that at approximately 8:00 pm on June 25, 2003, rural workers Rubén Darío Ocampo Henao and Héctor Corrales Ocampo, first cousins, were killed in a rural area near Pereira, Risaralda department, by the GAULA. The group includes members from the National Army, the Office of the Attorney General of the Nation (FGN), and the Administrative Security Department (DAS). The deaths occurred during an operation aimed at identifying and capturing individuals suspected of extorting the owner of a local farm⁴.

3. According to the Petitioners, the victims—rural workers of humble origin—were passing by the operation site when the GAULA commander and a non-commissioned officer identified themselves as law enforcement officers and immediately opened fire, killing them. They hold that the victims were entirely defenseless, which is evident from the GAULA’s superiority in weapons and numbers, and the fact that the victims couldn’t react to the disproportionate and excessive use of force⁵.

² Inter-American Court. *Case of Caesar v. Trinidad and Tobago* (merits, reparations and costs). Judgment of March 11, 2005. Series C No. 123, para. 125.

³ IACHR, Admissibility report 9/17, Rubén Darío Ocampo Henao *et al.*, January 27, 2017.

⁴ Ibidem, para. 1.

⁵ Ibidem, para. 2.

4. In this regard, the military stated that the victims fired a poorly-maintained shotgun. This claim was refuted by an expert opinion that determined that the weapon was not functional. In addition, the Petitioners emphasized that the perimeter of the operation was secured by 32 members of the GAULA, so if they wanted to capture the victims, they could have done so without resistance. They consequently argue that the GAULA members' reaction was disproportionate and that they intended to "take them down" and "present them as a crime-fighting trophy"⁶.

5. In response to what happened to Mr. Ocampo Henao and Mr. Corrales Ocampo, the Second Local Public Prosecutor of the Pereira Quick Response Unit opened an investigation, during which several investigative measures were ordered.

6. On June 27, 2003, the investigative procedures were referred to the 56th Military Criminal Trial Court, which opened a preliminary investigation into the murder of the alleged victims. During the proceedings, evidence was collected from expert witnesses, as well as from both the relatives of the deceased and the members of the security forces involved in the operation. After reviewing the evidence, the 56th Court of Military Criminal Instruction issued a waiver of prosecution regarding the investigation⁷.

7. From another part, the petitioners filed a reparations lawsuit with the First Administrative Court of Pereira, which ruled in their favor on October 20, 2006. In its judgement the court concluded that GAULA used excessive force during the operation, shooting the alleged victims with bursts from an R-15, a powerful weapon with a long barrel range.

8. Subsequently, on July 12, 2007 after the Public Prosecutor filed an appeal, the Contentious Administrative Court of Risaralda overturned the lower-court ruling, determining that the State agents had acted in legitimate self-defense⁸.

9. The Petitioners filed a *tutela*—a writ of protection—before the Council of State against the judgment issued by the Administrative Court of Risaralda. However, it was rejected as inadmissible.

10. Lastly, the petitioners argue that because of the deaths of the alleged victims, their families were displaced and forced to relocate elsewhere "to avoid revenge at the hands of radical right-wing groups"⁹.

11. Based on the elements presented and the nature of the matter, in Admissibility Report 9/17 dated January 27, 2017, the Inter-American Commission declared the petition admissible, to assess whether the facts constitute a violation of the rights recognized in articles 4 (right to life), 5 (right to humane treatment), 8 (right to a fair trial), 11 (right to privacy), 22 (freedom of movement and residency), and 25 (right to judicial protection) of the American Convention, read in conjunction with articles 1(1) (obligation to respect rights) and 2 (domestic legal effects) in the same instrument.

12. On November 26, 2024, within the framework of the process before the Inter-American System of Human Rights, the Colombian State and the petitioners signed a Memorandum of Understanding on Reaching a Friendly Settlement Agreement, which was presented to the Inter-American Commission on November 28, 2024.

13. On December 9, 2024, the petitioners submitted their proposal for comprehensive reparation to the National Agency for the Legal Defense of the State.

14. Once the proposal for comprehensive reparation was received and analyzed, progress was made in an inter-institutional dialogue to agree on the reparation measures to be included in the Friendly Settlement Agreement, which will be governed by the following clauses:

⁶ Ibidem.

⁷ Ministry of National defense. Order No. 2014800253342 dated March 17, 2014.

⁸ Ministry of National defense. Order No. 20148000067422 dated March 28, 2014.

⁹ IACHR, Admissibility report 9/17, Rubén Darío Ocampo Henao et al., January 27, 2017, para. 4.

PART THREE: BENEFICIARIES

“For the purposes of this Agreement, the Colombian State recognizes the following persons as victims, all Colombian citizens:

RELATIVES OF RUBÉN DARÍO OCAMPO HENAO		
Name	Document	Relationship
Blanca Nelly Corrales Ocampo	[...]	Life partner
Leidy Johana Ocampo Corrales	[...]	Daughter
Jhonatan Ocampo Corrales	[...]	Son
Luz Adriana Ocampo Vélez	[...]	Daughter
Nancy Lorena Ocampo Vélez	[...]	Daughter
María Luz Mila Ocampo Henao	[...]	Sister
José Raúl Ocampo Henao	[...]	Brother
Jorge Eleazar García Henao	[...]	Brother
Luz Miriam Henao	[...]	Sister
RELATIVES OF HÉCTOR CORRALES OCAMPO		
Héctor Isabal Corrales Cruz (R.I.P.) ¹⁰	[...]	Father
María Luz Mila Ocampo Henao	[...]	Mother
Luz Esther Restrepo Amariles	[...]	Wife
Bryan Camilo Corrales Restrepo	[...]	Son
Edwin Corrales Ocampo	[...]	Brother
Irma Rocío Corrales Ocampo	[...]	Sister
Blanca Nelly Corrales Ocampo	[...]	Sister
Nillired Corrales Ocampo	[...]	Sister
Jhon Fredy Corrales Ocampo	[...]	Brother
Luz Nelly Corrales Ocampo	[...]	Sister
Eliecer Andrés Corrales Ocampo	[...]	Brother

PARAGRAPH ONE: By signing this Friendly Settlement Agreement, the petitioners affirm that the individuals listed above are all the relatives of Rubén Darío Ocampo Henao and Héctor Corrales Ocampo who have legal standing in these proceedings and are interested in participating. They affirm that all individuals were alive at the time of the events,¹¹ and remained alive when signing the Agreement. Regarding this, no other additional victims will be included after signing the Friendly Settlement Agreement.

PARAGRAPH TWO: The victims acknowledged in this Friendly Settlement Agreement shall be entitled to benefits, contingent upon the demonstration, concerning Rubén Darío Ocampo Henao and Héctor Corrales Ocampo: (i) a relationship by affinity, namely, spouse or permanent partner, or (ii) a relationship by consanguinity.

PART FOUR: ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF RESPONSIBILITY

“The Colombian State acknowledges its international responsibility for the violation of the right to a fair trial (Article 8(1)) and judicial protection (Article 25(1)) of the American Convention, read in conjunction with the general obligation to respect rights (Article 1(1)) of the same instrument, to the detriment of the relatives of Rubén Darío Ocampo and Héctor Corrales Ocampo, as a result of the lack of diligence in investigating the facts that occurred, failing to ascertain the events and to hold accountable those responsible, thereby inflicting pain and suffering upon the victims.

Likewise, the State recognizes that, as a consequence of the failures in the criminal investigation, the State also failed by omission in its obligation to guarantee the rights to life (Article 4) and humane treatment (Article 5) established in the American Convention, to the detriment of Rubén Darío Ocampo Henao and Héctor Corrales Ocampo.”

¹⁰ In which case, the amounts to be granted as economic compensation within the framework of Law 288 of 1996, will go to the beneficiaries in accordance with the succession presented for such purpose.

¹¹ Inter-American Court. Case of the Afro-descendant Communities displaced from the Cacarica River Basin (Operation Genesis) v. Colombia. Preliminary Objections, Merits, Reparations, and Costs. Judgment dated November 20, 2023. Series C No. 270, para. 425.

PART FIVE: MEASURES OF SATISFACTION

The parties establish that, within the framework of this Agreement, the following measures of satisfaction will be carried out:

I. "Public act in acknowledgement of international responsibility:

The Colombian State will carry out a Public Act of Acknowledgement of International Responsibility with the participation of the representatives and relatives of Rubén Darío Ocampo and Héctor Corrales Ocampo. The act will be carried out in accordance with the acknowledgment of responsibility set forth in this Agreement.

The Agency for State Legal Defense will be in charge of this measure.

II. "Publication of the Article 49 Report:

Once the Inter-American Commission approves it, the Colombian State will publish the friendly settlement report on the website of the National Agency for State Legal Defense for a period of six (6) months".

PART SIX: MEASURES OF JUSTICE

"The National Agency for the Legal Defense of the State will request the Office of the Attorney General of the Nation to evaluate the possibility of seeking a review of the proceedings concerning the events that occurred on June 25, 2003, in the rural area near the city of Pereira, Risaralda department, during which Rubén Darío Ocampo Henao and Héctor Corrales Ocampo lost their lives".

PART SEVEN: COMPENSATION MEASURES

"The State shall apply Law 288 of 1996, to provide redress for the damages that may be proven in favor of the victims recognized in this Friendly Settlement Agreement. For these purposes, the criteria and amounts recognized by current domestic case law will be used.

If a victim has been compensated through the administrative litigation process or has received administrative reparations, the amounts awarded will be deducted from the pecuniary compensation in accordance with the procedure specified, to prevent double or excessive compensation.

Similarly, for damages compensation, applicable evidence shall be that admissible in accordance with Colombian procedural rules.

The State entity that will carry out the proceedings defined in Law 288 of 1996, shall be the one designated by the Committee of Ministers established by law".

PART EIGHT: APPROVAL AND MONITORING

"The parties formally request the Inter-American Commission to approve this Agreement and oversee its monitoring".

PART NINE: CONFIDENTIALITY

"The content of this Friendly Settlement Agreement is confidential and may not be published and/or disseminated by any means until it is approved by the Inter-American Commission through the issuance of the report as specified in Article 49 of the American Convention on Human Rights".

Having reviewed the Agreement and with the parties fully cognizant of its legal implications and content, it is hereby signed on April 10, 2025.

IV. DETERMINATION OF COMPATIBILITY AND COMPLIANCE

10. The IACHR reiterates that in accordance with Articles 48(1)(f) and 49 of the American Convention, the purpose of this procedure is to “reach a friendly settlement of the matter based on respect for the human rights recognized in the Convention.” The acceptance to pursue this process expresses the good faith of the State to comply with the purposes and objectives of the Convention pursuant to the principle of *pacta sunt servanda*, by which States must comply with the obligations assumed in the treaties in good faith.¹² It also wishes to highlight that the friendly settlement procedure set forth in the Convention allows for conclusion of individual cases in a non-contentious manner, and has proven, in cases involving a variety of countries, to provide an important vehicle for resolution that can be used by both parties.

11. The Inter-American Commission has closely monitored the progression of the friendly settlement achieved in this case and appreciates the efforts exerted by both parties throughout the negotiation process to reach this friendly resolution, which aligns with the objective and aims of the Convention.

12. In accordance with the provisions outlined in clause eight of the agreement signed between the parties, whereby they requested the Commission’s approval of the friendly settlement established under Article 49 of the American Convention, and considering the parties’ request dated May 23, 2025, to proceed in this way, the Commission will now evaluate the fulfillment of the commitments undertaken herein.

13. In this regard, the Commission considers that clauses one (Definitions), two (Background), three (Beneficiaries), four (Acknowledgement of Responsibility), eight (Approval and Monitoring), and nine (Confidentiality) are of a declarative nature, and that supervision of compliance with these sections is not required.

14. On the other hand, the Inter-American Commission values the fourth clause, which is also declarative, wherein the Colombian State acknowledges its international responsibility for the violation of the right to a fair trial (Article 8(1)) and judicial protection (Article 25(1)) of the American Convention, read in conjunction with the general obligation to respect human rights (Article 1(1)) resulting in detriment to the relatives of Rubén Darío Ocampo and Héctor Corrales Ocampo, due to the lack of diligence in investigating the events that occurred, resulting in a failure to establish their circumstances and to hold those responsible accountable, thereby causing them pain and suffering. Furthermore, it appreciates the State’s recognition of its failure by omission to fulfill its obligation to guarantee the rights to life (Article 4) and to humane treatment (Article 5), as established in the American Convention, to the detriment of Rubén Darío Ocampo Henao and Héctor Corrales Ocampo.

15. Concerning paragraph I of the fifth clause regarding the act of acknowledgment of international responsibility, the parties jointly reported that it occurred on April 22, 2025, at the Marriott Hotel in Bogotá. The parties noted that the State and the petitioners’ representatives maintained constant communication to reach an agreement on all details related to the implementation of the measure.

16. The parties indicated that the National Agency for the Legal Defense of the State invited the representatives of the victims and, through them, the victims’ relatives to the public act of acknowledgment of responsibility and sent a copy of the notice prepared for such purpose. They also provided the link to the live broadcast of the event on the National Agency for the Legal Defense of the State’s YouTube channel¹³, detailed the actions taken to disseminate the link on social media, and described the content of the agreed-upon agenda that included an opening and introduction, the national anthem of the Republic of Colombia, and the interventions made by petitioner Luis Francisco Peña, by the State, and by the Commissioner Rapporteur of the IACHR for Colombia. At the event’s conclusion, commemorative plaques were presented to Blanca Nelly Corrales Ocampo (wife of Rubén Darío Ocampo) and Luz Esther Restrepo Ameriles (wife of Héctor Corrales Ocampo), and a video was shown with photos of the families and background music chosen by them.

¹² Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, United Nations Doc A/CONF.39/27 (1969), Article 26: “*Pacta sunt servanda*” Every treaty in force is binding upon the parties to it and must be performed by them in good faith.

¹³ See, ANDJE, YouTube, Acto de reconocimiento de responsabilidad - Caso 13.318 Rubén Darío Ocampo, Héctor Corrales Ocampo y Familias. Available at: <https://www.youtube.com/live/wfHAL7kDYwo> (Last accessed July 16, 2025).

17. The director of the National Agency for the Legal Defense of the State represented the State at the event. He acknowledged the international responsibility in the terms established in the friendly settlement agreement, stating the following:

[...]

As the Director General of the National Agency for the Legal Defense of the State, and on behalf of the Colombian State, I wish to extend my sincerest gratitude for joining us in this public act of acknowledgement of international responsibility concerning Case 13.318, Rubén Darío Ocampo Henao, Héctor Corrales Ocampo, and their families. The facts of this case deeply pain us all today and should serve as an impetus for the ongoing effort to build a nation grounded in peace and reconciliation. Today, we gather to remember and pay tribute to the memory of Rubén Darío Ocampo and Héctor Corrales Ocampo, two humble rural workers who dedicated their lives to work and to their families. [...]

[O]n June 25, 2003, their lives were unjustly taken in a rural area near the city of Pereira, Risaralda department. Rubén Darío and Héctor were victims of an operation carried out by the GAULA, comprised of members of the National Army, the Attorney General's Office, and the now-defunct Administrative Department of Security. It was part of an operation aimed at capturing alleged extortionists, and ended in an act of indiscriminate violence. [...]

It is for this reason that, on behalf of the Colombian State, I acknowledge international responsibility for the violation of the rights to a fair trial and judicial protection, as set forth in articles 8 and 25 of the American Convention on Human Rights, read in conjunction with the general obligation to guarantee human rights established in the same instrument, to the detriment of the next of kin of Rubén Darío Ocampo and Héctor Corrales Ocampo. This acknowledgment is made as a result of the lack of diligence in investigating the events, resulting in a failure to establish the circumstances and hold those responsible accountable, thereby causing them pain and suffering.

Furthermore, the State recognizes that, as a consequence of the deficiencies in criminal investigation procedures, it failed by omission to uphold its obligation to ensure the rights to life (Article 4) and to humane treatment (Article 5) as outlined in the American Convention, to the detriment of Rubén Darío Ocampo and Héctor Corrales Ocampo.

[...]

18. The event was concluded by the IACHR Commissioner-Rapporteur for Colombia, who acknowledged the efforts of the involved parties in reaching this friendly settlement agreement and reaffirmed the Commission's commitment to monitoring its complete implementation. In this context, he articulated the following statement:

[...]

This negotiation process provides an opportunity to observe the acknowledgement of responsibility (...) and has established a pathway for dialogue and cultivation of mutual trust. The willingness demonstrated by the parties throughout this process underscores their dedication to the principles of justice and comprehensive reparations. Accordingly, we sincerely appreciate the trust placed by the Ocampo family and their representatives in the Inter-American Commission, in its potential to secure justice and reparations, and in the effectiveness of this friendly settlement mechanism. Furthermore, we commend the Colombian State for its acknowledgement of responsibility, its efforts to redress the harm inflicted, and its commitment not only to material compensation but also to providing a symbolic recognition of the victims' dignity, as well as its pledge to prevent the recurrence of such events in the future.

This recognition of international responsibility signifies the commencement of a significant journey. It marks the initiation of the implementation of the friendly settlement agreement and represents a new beginning for the families of Ruben Dario and Hector, ensuring they can soon observe the full realization of the measures outlined and agreed upon in the instrument.

In my capacity as Rapporteur of the Inter-American Commission for Colombia, I strongly urge the State to fulfill all commitments assumed in this agreement. Its effective implementation is essential for strengthening trust in this friendly settlement mechanism and for demonstrating the tangible impact of these measures. As Dr. Luis Francisco Peña articulated, "the law expressed in this agreement is a healing tool," and our objective is to facilitate this, transcending mere formalities. Through such formalities, we establish a tool for healing that aspires to culminate in the actual fulfillment of the agreed-upon measures and to illustrate the genuine influence this mechanism can exert on the lives of victims and on the broader guarantee of non-repetition of incidents that have led us here. [...]

To the Ocampo family, I wish to once again express my profound respect and solidarity. Their perseverance and resilience have been essential in this accomplishment. I extend my gratitude to the Colombian State for its willingness to address this and related matters (...) through this friendly channel, and appreciate the fact that this mechanism facilitates the parties in reaching an agreement concerning compensation for the victims. I commend the willingness to engage in dialogue, to achieve consensus, and to endeavor to fulfill this significant agreement.

[...]

19. Finally, it should be noted that the Colombian State provided continuous psychosocial support before, during, and after the event, through a specialized team supplied by the Comprehensive Victim Support and Reparations Unit. This support was essential for ensuring emotional well-being, protection, and welfare for family members, thereby facilitating their active participation in the proceedings.

20. Therefore, the Commission concludes that paragraph I of clause five of the agreement, regarding the execution of a public act of acknowledgment of international responsibility, is fully complied with and declares thusly.

21. Concerning the sixth clause on the justice measure, the Commission acknowledges the agreement reached between the parties. It also wishes to reiterate that the State bears a duty to thoroughly investigate the facts before ordinary courts, both diligently and ex officio, and where applicable, to establish the corresponding criminal responsibilities within a reasonable timeframe, in accordance with international standards. Furthermore, the Commission emphasizes that this obligation must be fulfilled by States as a legal duty, not merely as a procedural formality inherently destined for failure or as a superficial handling of private interests dependent solely on the procedural initiative of victims, their relatives, or the submission of evidentiary elements by private parties.

22. Lastly, concerning paragraph II of the fifth clause (publication of the Article 49 Report) and sixth (measures of justice) and seventh (compensation measures) clauses of the friendly settlement agreement, and by virtue of the joint request of the parties to proceed with the approval of the agreement prior to its execution, the Commission notes that the measures must be implemented subsequent to the publication of this report. It therefore considers them to be pending compliance. The Commission will consequently await updated information from the parties within the framework of the friendly settlement follow-up process.

23. In light of the foregoing, the Commission concludes that paragraph I of the fifth clause (act of recognition of international responsibility) has been fully satisfied and hereby declares the same. Concurrently, the Commission observes that paragraph II of the fifth clause (publication of the Article 49 Report) and the sixth (measures of justice) and seventh (compensation measures) clauses of the friendly settlement agreement are still pending compliance and accordingly declares so.

24. With regard to the remaining matters, the IACHR determines that the residual content of the friendly settlement agreement is of a declaratory nature, thereby rendering supervision unnecessary. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that the friendly settlement agreement has been partially executed and will persist in monitoring the implementation of the aforementioned clauses until full compliance is achieved.

V. CONCLUSIONS

25. In light of the considerations outlined above and in accordance with the procedures established under articles 48(1)(f) and 49 of the American Convention, the Commission wishes to express its sincere appreciation for the efforts undertaken by the parties and its satisfaction with the friendly settlement agreement reached in this matter, which is grounded in respect for human rights and aligns with the object and purpose of the American Convention.

26. Considering the above points and findings,

THE INTER-AMERICAN COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

DECIDES:

1. To approve the terms of the agreement signed by the parties on April 10, 2025.
2. To declare full compliance with paragraph I of the fifth clause (act of acknowledgment of international responsibility) of the friendly settlement agreement pursuant to the analysis contained herein.
3. To declare paragraph II of the fifth clause (publication of the Article 49 Report), along with clauses six (measures of justice) and seven (compensation measures), of the friendly settlement agreement remain pending compliance, in accordance with the analysis contained herein.
4. To continue to oversee compliance with the commitments outlined in paragraph II of the fifth clause (publication of the Article 49 Report), as well as clauses six (measures of justice) and seven (compensation measures), of the friendly settlement agreement, as detailed herein. To that end, remind the parties of their obligation to regularly report to the IACHR on compliance.
5. To publicize this report and include it in the Commission's Annual Report to the OAS General Assembly.

Approved by the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights on the 14th day of the month of October, 2025. (Signed): José Luis Caballero Ochoa, President; Andrea Pochak, First Vice President; Arif Bulkan, Second Vice President; Gloria Monique de Mees, Roberta Clarke, and Edgar Stuardo Ralón Orellana, Commissioners.