

They were told

Yes, it was ratified on January 29, 2001.

La Casita is a state-run organization.

It was a public institution.

Yes.

See answer 8.

Supreme Court of Justice of Exclutia.

See answer 24.

See paragraph 33 of the facts of the case.

t





This information is not relevant to the analysis of the case.

In its two communications subsequent to the adoption of the merits report, the State provided information on the draft bill, on the improvements made at "La Casita," and on the implementation of the policies adopted in 2009.

Under the laws of the State of Exclutia, motions to vacate may be filed against any court decision.

See answer 24.

No.

In general terms, the IACHR requested that the State of Exclutia take measures designed to provide reparations to the victim and adopt measures of non-repetition.

See answer 16.

They are limited to the grounds of involuntary isolation.

They concern the residents of La Casita who may be subject to involuntary isolation.

See paragraph 16 of the facts of the case.

See answer 30.

See answer 30 and paragraph 37 of the facts of the case.

See answer 24.

The precautionary measures are in force, and the IACHR continues to monitor compliance with them.

See answer 41.

See answer 41.

For the State to take measures to protect and guarantee the rights of the beneficiaries to life and humane treatment.

See answer 52.

See answer 41.





See answer 61.

La Casita is a free, public entity. With respect to the second part of the question, see paragraph 12 of the facts of the case.

See answer 28.

See answer 28.

See answer 28.

See answer 16.

According to the laws currently in force in Exclutia, the revocation must be ordered by the judge.