



The Inter-American Court had, in previous decisions, m

pieces of information and ideas. By seeing it as a right –enshrined under article 13 of the American Convention on Human Rights– it is possible for stakeholders to seek national or international courts whenever this right is violated. It is, of course, understood that any person can request information without having to proof any direct interest with the information requested.

Second, since it is a right we are talking about, the state is responsible for ensuring compliance. Consequently, the state must make sure that the right can be exercised. The Court has consistently underlined two basic norms in the Convention that are intended to guide state action in this regard. On the one hand, the general obligation to protect human rights codified under article 1.1 of the Convention, and on the other, the commitment, pursuant to article 2, to modify the domestic laws and the functioning of the state according to the Convention. This implies the obligation to organize the overall structure of the state0084 Tm(i)Tj12Pt1s.e8 T30.70099 Tm(i)T3

decision to deny access was neither communicated in writing nor properly justified. In addition, the Court concluded that the legal process and resolution of the protection recourse put forth violated the standards of due process codified in article 8.1 of the Convention. The Court reiterates the very basic principle that once the disclosure of information in the hands of the state is denied, there must be a legal recourse that is simple, quick, and effective in determining