

OEA/Ser.L/V/II.
Doc. 325
13 October 2020
Original: Spanish

REPORT No. 308/20
PETITION 512-15
REPORT ON ADMISSIBILITY

KURT HEINZ ARENS OSTENDORF ET AL
PERU

Approved electronically by the Commission on October 13, 2020.

Cite as: IACHR, Report No. 308/20. Petition 512-15. Admissibility. Kurt Heinz Arens Ostendorf et al. Peru. October 13, 2020.



I. INFORMATION ABOUT THE PETITION

Petitioners:	Luz Cecilia Catacora Torres, José Antonio Olaechea Álvarez Calderón, and Manuel Augusto Villa-García Noriega
Alleged victims:	Kurt Heinz Arens Ostendorf et al. ¹
State denounced:	Peru ²
Rights invoked:	Articles 8 (due legal guarantees), 21 (property), 24 (equal protection), and 25 (judicial protection) of the American Convention on Human Rights, ³ in connection with Articles 1(1) (obligation to respect rights) and 2 (obligation to adopt domestic laws) thereof

II. PROCEDURE BEFORE THE IACHR⁴

Filing of the petition:	June 1, 2015
Additional information received during the review stage:	August 25, 2015, October 5, 2015, November 9, 2015, November 9, 2015, and May 26, 2016
Notification of the petition to the State:	December 11, 2018
State's first response:	February 14, 2020
Additional observations from the petitioners:	June 30, 2020

III. COMPETENCE

<i>Ratione personae:</i>	Yes
<i>Ratione loci:</i>	Yes
<i>Ratione temporis:</i>	Yes
<i>Ratione materiae:</i>	Yes, American Convention (instrument of ratification deposited on July 28, 1978)

IV. DUPLICATION OF PROCEDURES AND INTERNATIONAL RES JUDICATA, CHARACTERIZATION, EXHAUSTION OF DOMESTIC REMEDIES, AND TIMELINESS OF THE PETITION

Duplication of procedures and international <i>res judicata</i>:	No
Rights declared admissible:	Articles 8 (due legal guarantees), 21 (property), 24 (equal protection), and 25 (judicial protection) of the American Convention, in connection with Articles 1(1) (obligation to respect rights) and 2 (obligation to adopt domestic laws) thereof
Exhaustion of domestic remedies or where an exception applies:	Yes, under the terms of section VI
Timeliness of the petition:	Yes, under the terms of section VI

¹ The petition was filed on behalf of 115 alleged victims, listed individually in the annex to this document.

² Pursuant to the provisions of Article 17(2)(a) of the Commission's Rules of Procedure, Commissioner Julissa Mantilla Falcón, a Peruvian national, did not participate in either the debate or the decision on this case.

³ Hereinafter, the "Convention" or the "American Convention."

⁴ Each party's observations were duly forwarded to the other party.

V. SUMMARY OF THE FACTS BEING ALLEGED

1. The petitioners hold that the State violated the rights of the alleged victims by failing to honor its obligation to pay them a fair and appropriate value, in a reasonable period, for the property expropriated from them or their family members during the 1969 agrarian reform.

2. They indicate that the Peruvian State enacted Decree Law 17716 in 1969, carrying out an agrarian reform that consisted of expropriating millions of hectares of farmland and handing them over to the country's *campesinos* [peasants]. Those who lost land were compensated via three types of state bonds (hereinafter, "agrarian debt bonds" [*bonos de la deuda agraria*]), which were to be paid in annual installments of 20, 25, and 30 years, respectively, at interest rates of 4%, 5%, or 6%, depending on the type of bond.

3. The petitioners note that the State halted payment of the agrarian debt bonds in the 1980s because of a severe economic crisis, and that in 1991, it enacted Legislative Decree 653, which, invoking the recession, repealed the above-mentioned Decree Law 17716 and established the rules to be applied for resumption of the appraisals and payoffs of the expropriations underway. This decree called for the expropriated land be compensated at market value and in cash.⁵ However, two laws invalidating this form of payment were enacted. Law 26597 was published on April 24, 1996; this Law provided that payment of the debt be made based on face value rather than market value.⁶ And on October 9, 2000, Emergency Decree 088-2000 was issued, which established a procedure for paying the outstanding agrarian debt bonds, ordering such debts to be converted into United States (U.S.) dollars at the exchange rate in effect on the date the bonds were issued.⁷

4. The petitioners claim that the Peruvian Engineers Association and the Ica Bar Association challenged those laws by filing two unconstitutionality actions. On May 11, 2001, the Constitutional Court (case file 022-96-I/TC) ruled that Articles 1 and 2 and the First Final Provision of Law 26597 were unconstitutional, as they violated Articles 70 and 139, paragraph 3, of Peru's constitution by not respecting the right to fair value compensation and by ignoring the right to avail oneself of a procedure pre-established by law.⁸ The petitioners allege that in its judgment, the Court deemed that the provisions cited established an immutable fair value treatment, unbound by time, and ordered that the agrarian debt bonds be paid based on market value, in other words, an up-to-date value.

⁵ Legislative Decree 653 (Law to Promote Investments in the Agricultural Sector). TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS: FOURTH. – The appraisal and payment of expropriations in process shall be governed by the provisions of Article 15 of this Law. Article 15: (...) The expropriation of rural properties shall be governed by the provisions of the General Law on Expropriation, Legislative Decree 313. The value of the expropriated land is to be paid at market value and in cash.

⁶ Law 26597. Article 1: Proceedings concerning injury referred to in the Third Transitional Provision of Legislative Decree 653, as well as expropriation processes for purposes of agrarian reform still underway, shall be carried out in accordance with the provisions of Law 26207. It is understood that proceedings still in process are those in which the legal representative has not withdrawn, being expressly authorized in each case. Article 2: Pursuant to the provisions of Article 29 of Peru's 1993 constitution, as amended by Law 15242, agrarian debt bonds were offered to cover the value of the expropriation. Consequently, regardless of the time at which such bonds were issued, payment thereof is to be for their face value, plus interest as established for each issue and type of bond, pursuant to the legal provisions that gave rise thereto, the readjustment provided for in part two of Article 1236 of the Civil Code not being applicable, in accordance with the amendment introduced by Legislative Decree 768.

⁷ Emergency Decree 088-2000. [...] Article 5. – Update of the debts. Debts accredited and recognized based on the stipulations of this provision shall be updated in accordance with the following: (a) The unpaid principal of the agrarian debt bonds shall be converted into U.S. dollars at the official exchange rate in effect on the date of issue and, on the resulting amount, an interest rate of seven and a half percent (7.5%) will be applied annually until the month immediately preceding that to which the calculation is made, which can be capitalized annually; (b) In all other cases, the unpaid amount of the appraised value approved by the Ministry of Agriculture will be converted into U.S. dollars at the official exchange rate in effect on the date of the Valuation Resolution, and, on the resulting amount, an interest rate of seven and half percent (7.5%) will be applied annually until the month immediately preceding that to which the calculation is made, which may be capitalized annually.

⁸ Political Constitution of Peru of 1993. Article 70. – Inviolability of property rights. The right to property is inviolable. The State so guarantees. This right is exercised in harmony with the common good and within the confines of the law. No one may be deprived of his or her property, except on the grounds of national security or public need, as stipulated by law, and upon payment in cash of a just compensation, including compensation for any injury. [...]; Article 139. Principles of administration of justice. [...] 3. Observance of due process and judicial protection. No person may be diverted from the jurisdiction predetermined by law, or subjected to procedures other than those previously established, or judged by special jurisdictional bodies or special commissions created for that purpose, whatever they may be called.

5. The petitioners indicate that on August 2, 2004, the Constitutional Court (case file 0009-2004-AI/TC) found the claim filed against Emergency Decree 088-2000 to be without merit, thereby upholding the Decree's constitutionality. The Court nevertheless ruled that the administrative procedure and conversion of the agrarian debt bonds into U.S. dollars should have been interpreted as optional rather than as a mandatory formula to be applied to the detriment of the bondholders.

6. The petitioners argue that, given the State's unwillingness to make good on the payment of the debt, on October 5, 2011, the Peruvian Association of Engineers asked the Constitutional Court to enforce the first judgement cited, which had been handed down in case 022-96-I/TC. They indicate that the following actions were requested: (i) Order the launch of processes to update the claims arising from the agrarian reform and the corresponding payment, in accordance with Article 70 of the Constitution; and (ii) calculate the updates based on the consumer price index and apply the interest stipulated for each class of bond.

7. The petitioners argue that in response to their request, on July 16, 2013 the Constitutional Court issued an enforcement order that contravened the provisions of the two previous rulings on the matter. They point out that, in its decision, the Court ordered the agrarian debt bonds and interest to be updated by converting the debt into U.S. dollars, taking as a base, the exchange rate in force on the date on which payments were halted. The petitioners claim that this method of update violates their right to fair payment inasmuch as it drastically reduces the value of their bonds. They specify that when the regular consumer price index method is applied, the bonds are worth millions of Peruvian soles, while with the formula prescribed in the aforementioned judgement, the value of the bonds drops to a price that does not exceed one peso (*nuevo sol*). Finally, the petitioners underscore that the Constitutional Court itself acknowledged that it was curtailing the property rights of the bondholders, invoking the general welfare of the Peruvian people as justification for the reduction.

8. The petitioners maintain that several individuals impacted by the aforementioned decision filed appeals for clarification with the Constitutional Court, challenging the dollarization method and its obligatory nature. They state that on August 8, 2013, the Constitutional Court issued a second enforcement order, ruling that the requests for clarification were inadmissible. In that decision, the Court reaffirmed that the dollarization method set forth in its July 16, 2013 enforcement order had to be used in cases still pending before the judiciary, and even in cases already settled for which the value of the debt had not yet been definitively calculated. The Court further stated that although in its August 2, 2004 judgment it had indicated that that formula was constitutional only insofar as it was optional for the bondholder, such ruling did not take into consideration the fact that this rule undermined the principle of equal protection by impacting the State's fulfillment of its other basic obligations and the budget.

9. The petitioners add that on September 30, 2013, the Association of Agrarian Debt Bondholders filed a new request for clarification with the Constitutional Court, asking, among other things, that it explain the grounds used in its July 16, 2013 enforcement order to conclude that application of the consumer price index would make payment of the agrarian debt impracticable. They indicate that the Constitutional Court issued a third order on November 4, 2013, which reiterated the content of its previous decisions and indicated that the Ministry of Economy and Finance was responsible for calculating the value that would result from an update using the dollarization method.

10. The petitioners add that on August 8, 2013 and July 15, 2014, the Ica Bar Association requested of the Constitutional Court, respectively, enforcement of judgment 0009-2004-AI/TC, and, as an interested third party, annulment of the enforcement orders of July 16, 2013, August 8, 2013, and November 4, 2013. They state that, with respect to the request for enforcement of the judgment, on March 25, 2015, the Court ruled the request inadmissible, considering that the dispute had been settled with the issue of the three aforementioned orders. They allege that the Constitutional Court ultimately ruled the appeal for annulment inadmissible on April 1, 2015.

11. The petitioners claim that the aforementioned decisions violated the rights to property and equal protection, to the detriment of the alleged victims. They argue that the dollarization method only applies to calculation of the updated value of the agrarian debt bonds and not to other debts of the Peruvian State,

which constitutes unjustified unequal treatment, to the detriment of the alleged victims' property rights. They further allege the violation of due legal guarantees and judicial protection insofar as the alleged victims lack a remedy to challenge that payment method since the already contested rulings of the Constitutional Court compelled all administrative and judicial authorities to use that debt valuation formula.

12. The petitioners further allege that this petition differs from the one settled by the IACHR in Report on Inadmissibility No. 166/11, which also concerned the situation of the agrarian bondholders. They state that the IACHR declared the petition inadmissible in that report owing to a failure to exhaust domestic remedies, arguing that, pursuant to the May 11, 2001 judgment (case file 022-96-I/TC), the Peruvian legal system offered a suitable remedy for receiving payment of the bonds via civil proceedings (*proceso de conocimiento en la vía civil*). In this connection, the petitioners argue that Constitutional Court's new decisions have rendered that remedy ineffective for access to fair compensation since domestic authorities would be required to apply the disputed dollarization method.

13. For this reason, the petitioners emphasize that the alleged victims are exempt from the requirement to exhaust domestic remedies in accordance with Article 46(2)(a) of the American Convention, since, in their opinion, there is no adequate and effective legal remedy for protection of the rights being claimed. They note that, despite the fact that the aforementioned persons individually initiated civil proceedings to obtain payment at the updated value, such proceedings are no longer adequate and effective insofar as the new Constitutional Court rulings apply *erga omnes* and compel judges to apply the dollarization formula. Proof of this is the fact that the Supreme Court has already nullified all actions in number proceedings concerning the calculation and payment of the agrarian debt bonds so that the lower courts may apply the Constitutional Court decisions. Lastly, the petitioners specify that the alleged victims also did not have the opportunity to challenge the enforcement orders, as they were not party to the unconstitutionality action. Nor are they able to file *amparo* appeals since that Court is the last instance in that jurisdiction.

14. For its part, the State argues that the petition is inadmissible due to failure to exhaust domestic remedies. It argues that the petitioners have expressly acknowledged that they have not exhausted domestic remedies by requesting the exception provided for in Article 46(2)(a) of the American Convention. In this regard, the State contends that that provision does not apply to the instant case insofar as there are legal processes and remedies in place to protect the rights alleged to have been violated. It points out that, even though the alleged victims were unable to challenge the judgments and orders issued in the context of the unconstitutionality actions as they were not party to the proceedings, they do have the regular civil courts or *amparo* actions at their disposal for challenging the contested Constitutional Court orders relating to calculation of the value of the agrarian debt bonds.

15. Along these lines, the State argues that with respect to both the civil jurisdiction and *amparo*, the courts may disregard the Constitutional Court's rulings based on the legal techniques of "distinguishing" or "overruling." The State maintains that in Report on Inadmissibility No. 166/11, the IACHR already examined the situation of a number of agrarian bondholders in Peru and rejected the petition for failure to exhaust domestic remedies, deeming that domestic procedures for effectively collecting on the agrarian debt bonds had not been properly pursued. The State requests that the same criterion be applied to the instant case since a large number of the alleged victims currently have cases underway in the civil courts, which is proof that domestic remedies have not yet been exhausted.

16. Lastly, the State claims that the facts laid out in the petition do not constitute human rights violations, arguing that the Constitutional Court has recognized the alleged victims' property rights, and therefore the petitioners are merely seeking to avail themselves of the inter-American system to dispute an ancillary point concerning calculation of the debt. In this regard, the State argues that the petitioners have not demonstrated a causal connection and/or linkage between the facts stated and the purported violation of the rights of each one of the alleged victims, since no details have been provided on the individual situation of each of these persons. Finally, the State argues that the right to equal protection has also not been violated inasmuch as the Constitutional Court's ruling effectively weighed that right against other constitutional obligations the State must discharge.

VI. EXHAUSTION OF DOMESTIC REMEDIES AND TIMELINESS OF THE PETITION

17. The petitioners are requesting application of the exception provided for under Article 46(2)(a) of the American Convention since the alleged victims lack access to adequate and effective remedies to challenge the calculation formula imposed by the Constitutional Court to determine the value of the agrarian debt bonds. The State, for its part, holds that that exception does not apply insofar as the individuals in question may avail themselves of the civil jurisdiction and file *amparo* actions.

18. The IACHR notes that, by means of its July 16, 2013, August 8, 2013, and November 4, 2013 decisions, Peru's Constitutional Court established a payment formula for the agrarian debt bonds that violated the provisions of previous rulings on the matter. Likewise, the Constitutional Court's decisions ordered legal and administrative bodies to employ that calculation method. In other words, the Court established a precedent that reportedly led to the impairment of the rights of the alleged victims and which, pursuant to domestic law, cannot be appealed and applies *erga omnes* to all Peruvian authorities.⁹ It is likewise clear that such rulings came after Report on Inadmissibility No. 166/11, so did not figure into the analysis conducted by the Commission in that decision.

19. The IACHR therefore considers that, in the sense in which they were issued, the aforementioned decisions do render the regular civil jurisdiction and *amparo* process ineffective for providing remedy to the alleged victims, since the highest court in the constitutional jurisdiction has already established a rule regarding payment of the agrarian debt bonds. Consequently, it is unreasonable to require the presumed victims to continue exhausting additional remedies before lower courts if the highest judicial instance on constitutional matters has already ruled on the specific aspects they are contesting.¹⁰ In this regard, despite the fact that the aforementioned decisions of the Constitutional Court were not adopted in the context of procedural actions brought forward by the alleged victims, they did settle the disputed points, leaving the victims in a situation in which it is unreasonable to consider that there are remedies able to alter the direction of those decisions or obtain a different outcome in the lower courts. In conclusion, the exception provided for in Article 46(2)(a) of the American Convention does apply.

20. Lastly, with respect to the timeliness of the petition, the Commission observes that the disputed decisions were issued in 2013 and were challenged through special appeals until 2015. Bearing in mind that the effects of such rulings would extend to the present day, to the detriment of the alleged victims, the Commission hereby concludes that the petition was filed in a timely manner pursuant to Article 32(2) of the IACHR Rules of Procedure, in accordance with Article 46(1)(b) of the Convention.

VII. CHARACTERIZATION OF THE FACTS ALLEGED

21. In view of these considerations, and after examining the elements of fact and law put forth by the parties, the Commission considers that the petitioners' allegations concerning the State's failure to pay compensation for nearly fifty years, and the alleged unequal treatment, to the detriment of the alleged victims, resulting from the Constitutional Court rulings are not manifestly groundless and require a study of the merits. In its analysis, the IACHR will not assess the legality of the expropriation processes, rather only the consequences on alleged victims' net worth owing to the lack of payment of compensation within a reasonable timeframe.

⁹ Constitutional Procedural Code. – Effects of the reasoned judgment. Article 81. The reasoned judgments issued in the unconstitutionality actions overturned the provisions upon which they were ruling. They apply *erga omnes* and are not retroactive. They were published in their entirety in the official newspaper *El Peruano* and took effect on the day after they were published. (...) Article 82. – *Res judicata*. The Constitutional Court's judgments in the unconstitutionality actions and in the class action proceedings with final decisions are final and conclusive and therefore are binding on all government authorities and apply *erga omnes* as from the day after they are published. (...).

¹⁰ I/A Court of H.R.. *Case of Artavia Murillo et al. ("In vitro fertilization") v. Costa Rica*. Judgment of November 28, 2012, paragraph 27.

22. In light of the foregoing, the Commission considers that, if proven, the facts alleged may constitute violations of the rights set forth in Articles 8 (due legal guarantees), 21 (property), 24 (equal protection), and 25 (judicial protection) of the American Convention on Human Rights, in connection with Articles 1(1) (obligation to respect rights) and 2 (obligation to adopt domestic laws) thereof.

VIII. DECISION

1. To declare this petition admissible with regard to Articles 8, 21, 24, 25 of the American Convention, in connection with Articles 1(1) and 2 thereof; and

2. To notify the parties of this decision; to continue with its analysis of the merits of the complaint; and to publish this decision and include it in its Annual Report to the OAS General Assembly.

Approved by the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights on the 13th day of the month of October, 2020. (Signed): Joel Hernández, President; Antonia Urrejola, First Vice-President; Flávia Piovesan, Second Vice-President; Margarete May Macaulay, Esmeralda E. Arosemena Bernal de Troitiño, and Stuardo Ralón Orellana, Commissioners.

Annex 1
List of alleged victims

1. Kurt Heinz Arens Ostendorf
2. Enrique Gerd Arens Ostendorf
3. Ruth Nori Arens Ostendorf
4. Gerd Friedel Arens Ostendorf
5. Carolina Janka Ostendorf Inkey
6. María Elena Calle Rodríguez Prieto de la Piedra
7. Lucila Rosario Calle Rodríguez
8. Cecilia Esther Calle Rodríguez
9. Jorge Hipólito Cale Rodríguez
10. Jose Gerardo Calle Rodríguez
11. María Esther Rodríguez Sandfield Viuda de Calle
12. José Enrique Mansueto Canaval Park
13. Rosa María Jacquillón Ratto Viuda de Causillas
14. Esther Bertila Causillas Jacquillón
15. Jorge Ítalo Causillas Jacquillón
16. Roberto José Causillas Jacquillón
17. Carlos Guillermo Causillas Briceño
18. Celia Consuelo Guevara Llave de Coello
19. Julia Agueda Guevara Llave
20. Josefina Guevara Llave de Paca
21. Víctor Alejandro Hermoza Arrascue
22. María Francisca Jaime Viuda de Menache
23. Gonzalo Ernesto Zamalloa Jaime
24. Héctor Alejandro Jaime Jaime
25. Luis Fernando Jaime Jaime
26. Luis Virginia Jaime Jaime
27. Enriqueta Ana María Peschiera de Cabrera
28. Javier Benjamín Peschiera Rebagliati
29. Edith Carmen Miffin Dañino Viuda de Peschiera
30. Jaime Rizo Patrón Remy
31. José Rizo Patrón Buckley
32. Gregory Rizo Patrón Buckley
33. Frederick Rizo Patrón Buckley
34. Jean Ann Goodman
35. Henry Edward Steward Checa
36. Ana María Álvarez Calderón Fernandini de Olaechea
37. Pedro Carlos Olaechea Álvarez Calderón
38. José Antonio Olaechea Álvarez Calderón
39. Ana María Olaechea Álvarez Calderón
40. Luz María Olaechea Álvarez Calderón de Rizo Patrón
41. Juan de Dios Olaechea Álvarez Calderón
42. Cesar Alberto Vittorelli Wakeham
43. Piero Roberto Vittorelli Wakeham
44. Carola Marsiglia Vitorelli
45. Nora Matter de L'endroit
46. María Laura Zecevic Just
47. Milan Zecevic Juste
48. Manoylo Zecevic Juste
49. Jorge Edmundo Torrico López
50. Karlos Enrique Torrico Zecevic
51. Marco Torrico Zecevic
52. Jorge Maynolo Torrico Zecevic

53. Leonor Ana Dibós Cauvi
54. Manuel Mujica Diez Canseco
55. José Jaime Mujica Diez Canseco
56. Cecilia Alaysa de Losada Viuda de Mujica
57. Milagros Mujica Diez Canseco
58. Pedro Carlos Mujica Diez Canseco
59. Victoria Rosa Mercedes Mujica Diez Canseco
60. Miguel Octavio Mujica Diez Canseco
61. Ramón Elías Mujica Pinilla
62. Marisa Mujica Pinilla
63. Manuel Antonio Mujica Pinilla
64. María Victoria Mujica Pinilla de Bartra
65. Maribel del Rocío Mujica de Pinilla
66. María Isabel Pinilla Sánchez de Mujica
67. Maribel Del Rocío Mujica Pinilla
68. María Victoria Mujica Pinilla
69. Alfonso Rizo Patrón Remy
70. Rosemary Jane Rizo Patrón Boylan
71. Alfonso Rizo Patrón Boylan
72. Jane Cecilia Rizo Patrón Boylan
73. Eileen Teresa Rizo Patrón Boylan
74. Peter Arthur Rizo Patrón Boylan
75. Sara Ana Rizo Patrón Boylan
76. Paul Rizo Patrón Boylan
77. María Dolores García Viuda de Rizo Patrón
78. Isabel Larco Debernandi de Alvarez Calderon
79. María Teresa del Niño Jesús Santisteban Tovar Viuda de Rodrigo
80. Hella Clara Carmela Tomasini Aita
81. Nelly Lulú del Rosario Dominga Aita de Muro
82. Lara Mujica Freund
83. Manuel Mujica Freund
84. Roberto Croveti Barrios
85. Alberto Guevara Ochoa
86. Maria Teresa Buckley Castañeda
87. Roberto Buckley Castañeda
88. Fernando Jose Maria Yzaga Castañeda
89. Luis Felipe De la Puente Buckley
90. Carlos Eduardo De la Puente Buckley
91. Anines Yzaga Romero
92. Jorge Miguel Buckley Castañeda
93. Miguel Alejandro Yzaga Castañeda
94. Maria Emilia Yzaga Castañeda de Aramburu
95. Miguel Vicente Maurtua Castañeda
96. Armando Castañeda Forero
97. Elda Manuela Josefina Forero Vargas
98. Melissa Castañeda Forero
99. María Elda Castañeda Forero
100. María Lily Ramírez Muñante
101. Juana Ines Ramírez Muñante
102. José Emilio Ramírez Muñante
103. María Pauline Barberi Castañeda
104. Dino Barberi Castañeda
105. María Pia Barberi Castañeda
106. Maritza Castañeda de Hott
107. Juana Pardo Vargas

108. Gloria María Pardo Vargas
109. Teresa Antúnez de Mayolo Aguinada de Pardo
110. Rafael Guillermo Pardo Antúnez de Mayolo
111. Ramón Pardo Antúnez de Mayolo
112. Guillermo Pardo Antúnez de Mayolo
113. Nina Teresa Pardo Antúnez de Mayolo
114. María de la Consolación Pardo Vargas de Fernández Concha
115. Alberto Pedro Vargas Martinto