



**Digital Commons@**  
Loyola Marymount University  
LMU Loyola Law School

## Loyola of Los Angeles International and Comparative Law Review

---

Volume 47 | Number 1

Article 3

---

Spring 3-16-2024

### Case of the "Caracazo" v. Venezuela

Douglas Clark  
*LMU Loyola Law School*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.lmu.edu/ilr>



Part of the [Comparative and Foreign Law Commons](#), and the [International Law Commons](#)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Douglas Clark, *Case of the "Caracazo" v. Venezuela*, 47 Loy. L.A. Int'l & Comp. L. Rev. 55 (2024).  
Available at: <https://digitalcommons.lmu.edu/ilr/vol47/iss1/3>

This IACHR Summary is brought to you for free and open access by the Law Reviews at Digital Commons @ Loyola Marymount University and Loyola Law School. It has been accepted for inclusion in Loyola of Los Angeles International and Comparative Law Review by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Loyola Marymount University and Loyola Law School. For more information, please contact [digitalcommons@lmu.edu](mailto:digitalcommons@lmu.edu).

# Case of the “Caracazo” v. Venezuela

## I. COMPLIANCE AND FOLLOW-UP ADDENDUM<sup>1</sup>

**May 30, 2018:** The Court found that the State fully complied with three of the eight total reparation measures.<sup>2</sup> The State published the Judgment, paid pecuniary and non-pecuniary damages, and reimbursed the costs and expenses from the 2004 and 2009 Compliance Monitoring Reports.<sup>3</sup> The Court resolved that the State continues to be responsible for criminally punishing the perpetrators; exhuming and identifying the remains of the eighteen victims and delivering the remains to their next of kin; training the State’s armed forces to protect human rights; preventing harm by amending local and operational plans concerning public disturbances; and guaranteeing that the local armed forces’ response to public disturbances are rational and proportionate.<sup>4</sup> The Court required the State to submit and present a compliance report on these remaining reparations by September 7, 2018.<sup>5</sup>

**November 18, 2020:** The Court found that the State failed to fully comply with the remaining five reparation measures above.<sup>6</sup> The Court ordered the State to adopt the necessary measures to achieve compliance as soon as possible.<sup>7</sup> Additionally, the State failed to comply with the Court’s request to submit an updated report no later than September 7, 2018, and had not provided an update to the Court since 2009.<sup>8</sup> Therefore, the Court decided to continue supervising the State’s

---

<sup>1</sup> Douglas Clark, Author; Aria Soeprono, Editor; Emily Bernstein and Davina Shoumer, Senior IACHR Editors; Sophia Suarez, Chief IACHR Editor; Cesare Romano, Faculty Advisor.

<sup>2</sup> Case of the Caracazo v. Venezuela, Monitoring Compliance with Judgment, Order of the Court, Inter-Am. Ct. H.R. “Considering That,” ¶ 1 (May 30, 2018).

<sup>3</sup> *Id.*

<sup>4</sup> *Id.* “Resolves,” ¶ 1.

<sup>5</sup> *Id.* ¶ 3.

<sup>6</sup> Case of the Caracazo v. Venezuela, Monitoring Compliance with Judgment, Order of the Court, Inter-Am. Ct. H.R. “And Solves,” ¶ 4 (Nov. 18, 2020).

<sup>7</sup> *Id.* “And Solves,” ¶ 5.

<sup>8</sup> *Id.* “Considering That,” ¶¶ 2-3.

compliance with the remaining reparations.<sup>9</sup> Unless the State proves it is adopting the necessary measures to comply with the reparations, the Court will continue to include its findings on the State's non-compliance in its Annual Report.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> Case of the Caracazo v. Venezuela, Monitoring Compliance with Judgment, Order of the Court, "And Solves," ¶ 4 (2020).

<sup>10</sup> *Id.*