

DOSSIER

VENEZUELA



PRESIDENTIAL RECALL REFERENDUM

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

*

LEGAL FRAMEWORK

*

POSSIBLE SCENARIOS – BRIEF ANALYSIS

Contacts:

New York City

Maritza Ramírez de Aghena

VP Public Relations

Group  *11abril.com*

maritza@11abril.com

Mobile (908) 922.65.95

Caracas

Kathy Sans

La Red Venezuela



ksans@cantv.net

Mobile +58(416) 623.36.16

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

By
Maritza Ramírez de Agena

*

Background information

Appointment of the Board of Directors of the National Electoral Council (CNE)
CNE attempts to obstruct the presidential recall referendum process
Judicial battle between the Electoral and Constitutional Chambers of the Supreme Court

By
Kathy Sans
Marisol Sarria

Edited and translated by
Maritza Ramírez de Agena

*

Legal Framework

Supreme Court precedents establishing:
Citizens rights of participation in political affairs
Autonomy and equal rank of the Chambers of the Supreme Court

By
Kathy Sans
Marisol Sarria

Edited and translated by
Maritza Ramírez de Agena

*

Possible Scenarios

Brief Analysis

By
Maritza Ramírez de Agena
Kathy Sans

*

Petition to the International Community

By
Kathy Sans
Marisol Sarria

Edited and translated by
Maritza Ramírez de Agena

*

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this document is to describe the status of the presidential recall referendum in Venezuela as of April 25, 2004

To evaluate the future of a potential recall referendum to revoke Chavez's presidency, it is important to have a clear understanding of:

- 1) How the National Electoral Council (CNE) has obstructed the signature validation process by changing the recall referendum regulations regarding the signature collection process posteriori.
- 2) The judicial battle between the Electoral and Constitutional Chambers of the Supreme Court and the role of the Plenary Council (Sala Plena) of the Supreme Court in the resolution of the legal dispute.

The information provided in this document should help you understand the questionable decisions made by the electoral authorities (CNE) that have put in jeopardy the process that could bring about a constitutional, democratic, peaceful and electoral solution to the political crisis in Venezuela.

The international community has observed with concern that the erosion of rule of law in Venezuela has reached an alarming level, to such an extent that government interference may prevent Venezuelans from exercising their constitutional right to participate in political affairs. A presidential recall referendum may represent the one peaceful opportunity for Venezuelans to reach political stability and strengthen the now fragile democratic foundations of the country.

*

This document complements the White Paper:

“Background Information on Legal Issues Concerning the Recall Referendum”

Published by the organization *Coordinadora Internacional Venezolana (CIV)*



Coordinadora Internacional Venezolana
Washington, D.C.

For information about the White Paper, please write to:

washington@civw.org

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

APPOINTMENT OF THE NATIONAL ELECTORAL COUNCIL (CNE) BOARD

- The new Board of the National Electoral Council (CNE) was appointed by the magistrates of the Constitutional Chamber of the Supreme Court on August 26, 2003.
- The CNE Board is comprised of five members:
 - * CNE President, Francisco Carrasquero (Pro-government official)
 - * CNE Vice-president, Ezequiel Zamora
 - * CNE Board Director, Jorge Rodríguez (Pro-government official)
 - * CNE Board Director, Sobella Mejías
 - * CNE Board Director, Oscar Battaglini (Pro-government official)
- Decisions at the CNE are made by a simple 3-2 majority.

There is evidence of politically motivated dismissal of magistrates in Venezuela. "Government interference and intimidation increase the pressure on magistrates seeking to act impartially in accordance with the law."

CNE BOARD ATTEMPS TO OBSTRUCT THE RECALL REFERENDUM PROCESS

- In 2002, the opposition presented a proposal to organize a non-binding referendum to determine whether or not President Chavez should resign. On November 28, 2002, the CNE (Former Board, not the one appointed by the Constitutional Chamber in 2003) accepted the proposal and scheduled a non-binding referendum for February 2, 2003.
- At the beginning of 2003, government officials requested the Electoral Chamber of the Supreme Court to open an appeals process to review and annul the decision of the National Electoral Council to hold a non-binding referendum.
- The Chavez administration proceeded to substitute the magistrates of the Electoral Chamber to ensure the ruling was favorable to the Chavez regime. These substitute justices canceled the non-binding referendum.
- The opposition coalition, *Coordinadora Democrática*, immediately requested the Constitutional Chamber of the Supreme Court to oversee the case by opening an appeals process to review the decision made by these substitute justices of the Electoral Chamber.
- The opposition then requested the annulment of the Electoral Chamber's ruling that cancelled the non-binding referendum on the grounds of irregularities related to the dismissal of the magistrates, and the arbitrary appointment of substitute justices by the government.

Importantly, the Constitutional Chamber ruled the request inadmissible, stating that all chambers of the Supreme Court have equal rank and **enjoy complete autonomy**. This principle of equality would later be reversed when it became potentially detrimental to Chavez.
- On September 12, 2003, the signatures collected by the opposition on February 12, 2003 to petition a presidential recall referendum were annulled by the CNE Board. The CNE annulled the signatures claiming that:
 - 1) The signature drive took place before the middle of President Chavez's term.
 - 2) The signature drive was not organized by a political party, but by the civil association SUMATE.
 - 3) The design of the petition forms was not appropriate.

The Constitutional Chamber ignored the legal request arguing that the law allows the review of final rulings, not decisions that only repair or eliminate incidental obstructions in a legal process.

PRESIDENTIAL RECALL REFERENDUM

The Venezuelan Constitution does not stipulate requirements regarding a specific time frame within which the signatures must be collected, does not restrict the right to organize a signature drive exclusively to political parties and does not stipulate specifications regarding the design of the petition forms.

- From November 28 to December 1, 2003, a second signature drive was carried out in Venezuela, this time organized by the political parties members of the opposition coalition, *Coordinadora Democrática*. The OAS, Carter Center and the European Parliament sent missions to Venezuela to monitor the signature collection process.
- On February 24, 2004, the CNE arbitrarily changed the recall referendum regulations approved in November 2003, to include a new requirement that would later allow the electoral authorities to place under review 870,000 signatures.

Venezuelans overseas were forbidden by the CNE to participate in the official signature drive.

The addition to the referendum regulations established that all petition forms with similar handwriting in the sections containing personal information should be placed under review and not declared valid until the voter ratifies the signature during an appeals process. The change made to the referendum regulations regarding the signature collection process posteriori could be a violation of the Constitution, according to the Electoral Chamber in its March 15, 2004 ruling.

- On March 2, 2004, The CNE President announced that out of 3,448,747 signatures collected, only 1,832,493 signatures were valid. 876,017 signatures were placed under review to be affirmed by voters in May 2004. (2.4 million signatures are needed to trigger the recall referendum)

OAS and Carter Center expressed their disagreement with the decision to place under review 876,017 signatures, as it ignored the principle of presumption of good faith of the voter.

JUDICIAL BATTLE BETWEEN THE ELECTORAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL CHAMBERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

The opposition introduced an appeal before the Electoral Chamber to request the annulment of the CNE ruling that placed under review the so called “planillas planas” or petition forms with similar handwriting in the sections containing personal information.

In this case the signatures placed under review were questioned because while the voter's signature and fingerprint were each unique, to avoid potential problems volunteers aided some signers by completing personal information like printed name, date of birth and national identification number.

The law clearly states that the voter's signature and the finger print are the only legal requirements that grant validity to a petition to recall a public official, not the manner used to document the personal information in the petition form (Article 22 of the recall referendum regulations).

- On March 10, 2004, Government officials requested the Constitutional Chamber to oversee the appeal introduced before the Electoral Chamber by the opposition.
- On March 11, 2004, the Constitutional Chamber ordered the Electoral Chamber to submit the presidential recall referendum file to the Constitutional Chamber and not to make any ruling related to the CNE and the recall referendum process. The magistrates of the Electoral Chamber were notified of the decision through an unofficial document, an action that violated legal procedures.

PRESIDENTIAL RECALL REFERENDUM

The Constitutional Chamber also violated Article 54 of the Organic Law of the Supreme Court, by preventing two magistrates from participating in the decision process.

Additionally, the ruling of the Constitutional Chamber violated the agreement signed on the Forum for Negotiations and Agreement on May 2003, facilitated by the OAS, Carter Center and UNDP. The agreement foresees the Presidential recall referendum (granted by Article 72 of the Venezuelan Constitution) as the constitutional, democratic, peaceful and electoral solution to the political crisis.

- On March 15, 2004, the Electoral Chamber, exercising the right granted to it by Article 297 of the Venezuelan Constitution, ruled: "The jurisdiction on electoral matters shall be exercised by the Electoral Chamber of the Supreme Court." The Chairman of the Electoral Chamber, Alberto Martini Urdaneta, ordered the CNE to validate the signatures placed under review and announced that only those voters who claimed their signatures had been forged and those who wished to withdraw their signature for any other reason should be subjected to the signature review process.

The Electoral Chamber also ordered the CNE to convoke a recall referendum immediately, if once finalized the appeals process, the total number of valid signatures represented 20% of the voters registered in the national electoral database.

- On March 16, 2004, The Constitutional Chamber made official the order given to the Electoral Chamber not to make any ruling on matters related to the CNE and the recall referendum.
- On March 29, 2004, the Electoral Chamber ruled restating that electoral matters were under its purview, in accordance with Article 297 of the Venezuelan Constitution. The ruling described as unacceptable the interference of the Constitutional Chamber for all the Chambers of the Supreme Court have been granted equal rank and autonomy by the Constitution.

The Electoral Chamber requested the "Sala Plena" or Plenary Council, highest instance in the Supreme Court, to resolve the conflict between the Electoral and Constitutional Chambers and encouraged the members of the government, the opposition and the National Electoral Council to negotiate a solution to the electoral dispute while the "Plenary Council" ruled on the matter.

- On April 12, 2004, The Constitutional Chamber overturned the ruling of the Electoral Chamber that ordered the CNE to validate the signatures placed under review. The latest ruling grants the CNE the right to change signature collection requirements for a recall referendum regulations after their collection. Such action violates the no retroactive principle of the law.
- On April 20, 2004, The CNE announced that the guidelines for the signature review process had been approved after weeks of negotiations with representatives of the opposition coalition *Coordinadora Democrática*. The CNE announced the following:
 - The signature review process has been scheduled for May 27 – 31, 2004
 - The validation process of signatures ratified and/or excluded has been scheduled for Jun 1 – 4, 2004.
 - On June 4, 2004, the CNE will announce if a presidential recall referendum will take place.
 - Updated number of signatures validated to petition the recall referendum to end Chavez's presidency: 1,910,965 (+ 83,948 than the number announced on March 2, 2004)

PRESIDENTIAL RECALL REFERENDUM

- Signatures invalidated (deceased and non registered voters): 375,241
 - Signatures needed to trigger presidential recall referendum: 2,491,196
 - Signatures the opposition needs to ratify in the signature review process to trigger the referendum: 580,231
- On April 23, 2004, The Constitutional Chamber declared that there was no conflict between itself and the Electoral Chamber. The magistrates stated that their rulings are binding for all chambers, even for the Plenary Court – the highest tribunal of the Supreme Court. Additionally, the magistrates declared they have, at this time, exclusive competence on any matter related to the recall referendum process.

*

To read the Articles of the Venezuelan Constitution, please visit:

<http://www.11abril.com/index/especiales/venezuelanlegislation.asp>

Article 5 : Sovereignty resides in the people.

Article 70: The Venezuelan people have the right to participate in political affairs. The recall referendum of government officials is one of several electoral mechanisms provided by the constitution.

Article 72: All government officials elected by popular vote are subjected to be recalled.

Article 297: The electoral jurisdiction shall be exercised by the Electoral Chamber of the Supreme Court.

To read the Articles of the Supreme Court of Justice Organic Act, please visit:

<http://www.11abril.com/index/especiales/venezuelanlegislation.asp>

Article 42: Conflict between Chambers of the Supreme Court

Article 54: Internal norms and procedures of the Supreme Court regarding the review and decision making process.

To read the Article of the Organic Law of Constitutional Rights and Guarantees, please visit:

<http://www.11abril.com/index/especiales/venezuelanlegislation.asp>

Article 6 : Rulings of the Chambers of the Supreme Court are not subjected to review.

To read the Annual Report of the Inter-American Commission

On Human Rights, Please visit: <http://www.cidh.org/annualrep/2003eng/chap.4b.htm#VENEZUELA>

- Matters that undermine the rule of law in Venezuela
- Lack of independence of the Branches of government
- Provisional status of judges in Venezuela's judicial system
- Concern over certain provisions of the draft of the Supreme Court of Justice Organic Act

To read the Communiqué of the International Bar Association, please visit:

<http://www.ibanet.org/news/NewsItem.asp?NewsID=139>

To read the Communiqué of the Center for Justice and International Law, please visit:

<http://www.cejil.org/comunicados.cfm?id=520>

LEGAL FRAMEWORK
SUPREME COURT PREVIOUS RULINGS

- The Supreme Court is divided in six different Chambers or “Salas” and the Plenary Council: (Article 262 of the Constitution)
 - Constitutional Chamber
 - Electoral Chamber
 - Political Administrative Chamber
 - Civil Chamber
 - Social Chamber
 - Criminal Chamber
 - Plenary Council
- The Plenary Council or “Sala Plena” is the highest tribunal of the Supreme Court and it is comprised of the Chief Justice Ivan Rincón (also Chairman of the Constitutional Chamber) and the nineteen Associate Justices.
- All Chambers of the Supreme Court are comprised of three Justices with the exception of the Constitutional Chamber that has five Justices.
- Decisions at the Supreme Court are made by a simple majority. For a ruling to be valid, the decision must be made by a minimum quorum of 4/5 of the Justices members of the chamber.

The right to petition a recall referendum to end a government official’s term has been acknowledge and ratified by previous rulings of the Constitutional Chamber of the Supreme Court:

- Ruling No. 1253 of the Constitutional Chamber published in October 25, 2000, confirmed that the Venezuelan people have the right to participate in electoral events. The recall referendum is one of several electoral mechanisms provided by the constitution. This ruling also confirmed the right of the Electoral Chamber of the Supreme Court to oversee the events, acts and abstentions of all electoral bodies.
- A ruling of the Constitutional Chamber published in 2000, declared that the sovereignty of the Venezuelan people is sacred and that any attempt to obstruct the participation of Venezuelan citizens in political affairs should be considered a violation of the Constitutional Public Order in accordance with Article No. 5 of the Venezuelan Constitution.

Previous rulings of the Constitutional Chamber have also established precedent that all Chambers have equal rank within the Supreme Court and enjoy absolute autonomy on the matters they oversee:

- Ruling No. 25 of the Constitutional Chamber published in 2001 ratified, unequivocally, the equal rank of the Chambers of the Supreme Court and the autonomy they are granted by the constitution. In the ruling the Constitutional Chamber also confirmed its right to oversee constitutional matters and stated not to have supremacy over any other chamber of the Supreme Court.
 - The Constitutional Chamber in its April 3, 2003 ruling denied the request introduced by the opposition to annul the ruling of the Electoral Chamber to cancel the non-binding referendum claiming that by law, the Constitutional Chamber can only interfere when a court of inferior category oversees the matter. The Constitutional Chamber stated clearly in this ruling that:
 - 1) The Electoral and the Constitutional Chambers had been granted equal rank by the Venezuelan constitution.
 - 2) The Electoral Chamber had the right to oversee electoral matters.
 - The Constitutional Chamber in its December 2, 2003 ruling restated the right of the Electoral Chamber to oversee any court appeal related to decisions made by the National Electoral Council (CNE). The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, Ivan Rincón (who is also the Chairman of the Constitutional Chamber), made the announcement.
-

POSSIBLE SCENARIOS

BRIEF ANALYSIS

The Plenary Court of the Supreme Court has been officially notified by the Electoral Chamber about the conflict of purview between the Electoral and Constitutional chambers. The future of the presidential recall referendum is in the hands of the twenty Justices of the Plenary Council.

The transparency and impartiality of the process is compromised by magistrates like the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, Ivan Rincón and Associate Justices José Delgado and Jesús Eduardo Cabrera. The three pro-government magistrates of the Constitutional Chamber have consistently disregarded the Venezuelan Constitution, the precedents made by the Constitutional Chamber itself and the norms that regulate judicial procedures.

Additionally, it is important to consider the impact that government interference and the intimidation directed toward magistrates of the Supreme Court may have on the decisions made by the Plenary Council. The government has dismissed magistrates to ensure a favorable ruling.

The CNE and the National Assembly have a pro-government majority. In fact, at this very moment the congressmen are discussing a proposal to change the Supreme Court of Justice Organic Act. If approved, the new law would make it easier for the government to dismiss magistrates who do not accommodate President Chavez's demands.

The majority in the National Assembly is the result of the votes President Chavez obtained in the 1998 elections.

SCENARIOS
BRIEF ANALYSIS

1) **The Plenary Council of the Supreme Court rules on the conflict between the Electoral and Constitutional Chamber before the signature review process.**

1.1 Ruling in favor of the Electoral Chamber

1.2 Ruling in favor of the Constitutional Chamber

2) **The Plenary Council of the Supreme Court DOES NOT rule on the conflict between the Electoral and Constitutional Chamber before the signature review process.**

2.1 Most of the signatures under review are ratified in the signature review process

2.2 CNE obstructs the signature review process and invalidates the majority of the signatures placed under scrutiny.

2.3 The *Coordinadora Democrática* does not accept the signature review process under the new rules imposed by the CNE and waits for a ruling of the Plenary Council of the Supreme Court.

2.4 The Electoral Chamber orders the CNE to comply with the March 15, 2004 ruling.

3) **The Constitutional Chamber overrides the Plenary Court and makes a final ruling on the conflict between the Electoral and Constitutional Chambers of the Supreme Court.**

1) The Plenary Council of the Supreme Court rules on the conflict between the Electoral and Constitutional Chamber before the signature review process.

1.1 Ruling in favor of the Electoral Chamber

- a. The Plenary Council of the Supreme Court ratifies the competence of the Electoral Chamber to oversee and rule on electoral matters and matters related to the CNE and the recall referendum. The CNE must then execute immediately the March 15, 2004 ruling of the Electoral Chamber. Ruling the magistrates of the Electoral Chamber later ratified in a final ruling on April 12, 2004.

The CNE must validate the signatures placed under scrutiny, announced the total number of valid signatures and implement a signature review process where only those Venezuelans who desire to withdraw their signature from the petition are required to participate.

Once the signature validation process is completed, the CNE must convoke a recall referendum if the total number of signatures represents at least the 20% of the voters registered in the national electoral database. If the signature validation process is completed on time and the recall referendum takes place before Aug 19, 2004, there is a very high probability that Chavez's presidency will be revoked.

In this scenario, the CNE must call for elections within the next 30 days. Chavez could be nominated as a presidential candidate as the constitution does not explicitly prevent an official who has been recalled from participating in the next election.

- b. The Plenary Council of the Supreme Court ratifies the competence of the Electoral Chamber to rule on matters related to the CNE and the recall referendum, but all the delays of the CNE before and after the signature review process cause the recall referendum to take place after Aug 19, 2004. In this case, the law stipulates that the Vice President shall complete the presidential term. Next elections shall be held in 2006. Chavez could be nominated as presidential candidate.

<p>The opposition coalition could file an electoral judicial recourse to denounce the faults incurred by the CNE that caused the delay of the recall referendum; however unlikely that the outcome would be favorable to the opposition.</p>
--

1.2 Ruling in favor of the Constitutional Chamber

- c. The Plenary Council rules that the Constitutional Chamber has the competence to rule on matters related to the CNE and the recall referendum and orders the magistrates of the Electoral Chamber to refrain from overseeing and ruling on any matter related to the CNE and the recall referendum. In this case, the CNE will have no legal impediment to continue disregarding the final ruling of the Electoral Chamber given on April 12, 2004. The CNE will implement, as scheduled, the signature review process under the new referendum regulations approved on April 20, 2004.

The signature review process approved by the CNE requires that the following persons go to the signature validation centers:

PRESIDENTIAL RECALL REFERENDUM

- All Venezuelans who wish to withdraw their signatures from the petition.
- All Venezuelans whose signatures have been placed under review on the grounds of irregularities related to similar handwriting in the sections containing personal information and wish to ratify their wish to include their signature in the petition.
- All Venezuelans whose signatures have been invalidated for illegible information or problems related to the fingerprint or signature.

If the Plenary Council rules in favor of the Constitutional Chamber, we estimate the most probable scenarios are those described in points (2.1) (2.2) of this analysis.

2) The Plenary Council of the Supreme Court **DOES NOT** rule on the conflict between the Electoral and Constitutional Chamber before the signature review process.

The CNE, disregarding the ruling of the Electoral Chamber, approved on April 20, 2004, the new signature validation norms and procedures. The new regulations contain certain points proposed by the opposition coalition *Coordinadora Democrática*; however the signature review process itself violates the orders given to the CNE by the Electoral Chamber in its March 15, 2004 ruling. The opposition coalition will go to the signature review process, but not without putting on record the following:

- The CNE has violated the constitution by changing the recall referendum regulations regarding the signature collection process posteriori.
- The CNE actions and the interference of the Constitutional Chamber of the Supreme Court on electoral matters are evidence of government interference and therefore evidence of the erosion of the rule of law in Venezuela
- The CNE, the Constitutional Chamber and the Chavez administration are violating the agreement made in the Forum for Negotiation and Agreements in Venezuela, signed on May 2003 and facilitated by the OAS, the Carter Center and the UNDP.

2.1 Most of the signatures placed under scrutiny are ratified in the signature review process

- a. Most signatures are ratified and validated during the signature review process scheduled for May 27 – 31, 2004. The signature validation process is completed within the time frame and the total number of signatures validated to petition a presidential recall referendum represents at least 20% of the voters registered in the national electoral database. In this case, the CNE should convoke a recall referendum on June 4, 2004.

If the planning and organization of the recall referendum are carried out on time, allowing for it to take place before Aug 19, 2004, there is a very high probability that Chavez's presidency will be terminated. The CNE should then call for elections within the next 30 days. Chavez could be nominated as a presidential candidate.

The opposition needs 2,491,196 signatures to trigger the referendum. Potential recall referendum scheduled for Aug 8, 2004.

PRESIDENTIAL RECALL REFERENDUM

- b. Most signatures are ratified and validated during the signature review process, but either the signature validation process is delayed or the time frame scheduled to organize a potential recall referendum results insufficient. In this case the recall referendum would take place after Aug 19, 2004. If Chavez's presidency is ended, by law, the Vice President shall complete the presidential term. Next elections should be held on 2006. Chavez could be nominated as a presidential candidate.

The opposition coalition could, with no guarantee of success, file an appeal to denounce the faults incurred by the CNE that caused the delay of the recall referendum.

2.2 The CNE's new regulations prove to be inadequate, the signature review process is a failure and as result most of the signatures placed under scrutiny are invalidated.

- c. If the time scheduled to carry out the signature review process and the resources allocated to it are insufficient and the norms and procedures are inappropriate to regulate an event of such nature, the success of the signature review process could be compromised. Venezuelans could be, once again, punished by the incompetence of the officials in charge of planning and implementing an electoral process. Most likely there will be no recall referendum, unless the Plenary Court of the Supreme Court rules in favor of the Electoral Chamber.

2.3 The *Coordinadora Democrática* DOES NOT accept submitting to the signature review process under the new rules imposed by the CNE and waits for a ruling of the Plenary Council of the Supreme Court.

- d. The opposition coalition does not accept the new recall referendum regulations and the review norms and procedures imposed by the CNE, and decides to wait for a decision by the Plenary Court of the Supreme Court, hoping there is a ruling in favor of the Electoral Chamber.

In this case, there is a high probability that the Plenary Council will not rule on time to organize and carry out a recall referendum before Aug 19, 2004. The Vice President shall assume the presidency and next presidential elections shall be held in 2006. Chavez could be nominated as presidential candidate.

2.4 The Electoral Chamber orders the CNE with its March 15, 2004 ruling.

- e. This is the most unlikely scenario considering that this action would require the cooperation of the Attorney General Isaías Rodríguez, a pro-government official with a questionable reputation for being overly accommodating to President Chavez's demands.

The magistrates of the Electoral Chamber could order the detainment of the pro-government CNE Board members who have disobeyed the Electoral Chamber's orders; but the Attorney General would, most probably, obstruct and/or delay the process while government officials find a way to overrule the Electoral Chamber.

3) The Constitutional Chamber overrides the Plenary Court and makes a final ruling on the conflict between the Electoral and Constitutional Chambers of the Supreme Court.

- f. A ruling of this nature would constitute a violation of the Venezuelan Constitution, which states that the highest instance of the Supreme Court is the Plenary Council of 20 Justices. By overriding the Plenary Council, the Supreme Court Chief Justice, Ivan Rincón, who is also the Chairman of the Constitutional Chamber, would provide further evidence of the erosion of the rule of law in Venezuela.

Chief Justice Rincón would obviously ratify the competence of the Constitutional Chamber on any matter related to the CNE and the recall referendum. Rincón would certainly count on the support of three Associate Justices of the Constitutional Chamber: Delgado, Cabrera and Vadell. The fate of the recall referendum in Venezuela would be in the hands of the other sixteen Associate Justices of the Plenary Council of the Supreme Court.

Under these circumstances, Venezuelans would be able to exercise their constitutional right to vote in a recall referendum only if the majority of the Justices of the Plenary Court ruled inadmissible those rulings made by the Constitutional Chamber in the judicial battle pursued against the Electoral Chamber of the Supreme Court.

PETITION TO THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY

We, the Venezuelan people ask the international community for its continued support by:

- Maintaining the presence of the Missions of the Organization of American States, Carter Center and the United Nations Development Program in Venezuela.
- Promoting the recall referendum as the constitutional, democratic, peaceful and electoral solution to the political crisis in Venezuela, as established in the agreement of the Forum for Negotiation and Agreements in Venezuela signed by the Venezuelan government and the opposition coalition, Coordinadora Democrática, on May 29, 2003.
- Urging the government and the opposition coalition to guarantee transparency and compliance with the law to ensure the will of the Venezuelan people is heard.
- Monitoring the signature review process, the signature validation process and potential elections in Venezuela.
- Denouncing the erosion of the rule of law in Venezuela and urging the Chavez administration to guarantee the independence of the Venezuelan institutions.
- Denouncing the violation of human rights in Venezuela and urging the Venezuelan government to guarantee the civil, political and human rights of the Venezuelan people.

*

Contacts:

New York City

Maritza Ramírez de Avena

VP Public Relations



maritza@11abril.com

Mobile (908) 922.65.95

Caracas

Kathy Sans

La Red Venezuela



ksans@cantv.net

Mobile +58(416) 623.36.16
